

Report to the Secretary of State for Transport

by Martin Whitehead LLB BSc(Hons) CEng MICE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport

Date: 27 September 2016

**HIGHWAYS ACT 1980
ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981**

**THE SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL
(BECCLES SOUTHERN RELIEF ROAD SCHEME - CLASSIFIED ROAD)
(SIDE ROADS) ORDER 2015**

**THE SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL
(BECCLES SOUTHERN RELIEF ROAD)
COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2015**

Date of Inquiry: 16 August 2016

Ref: NATTRAN/E/LAO/102

Contents

	Abbreviations	1
	Case Details	2
1	Preamble	2
2	Description of the Site and Surroundings	4
3	Legal Submission	5
4	The Case for the Acquiring Authority (Suffolk County Council)	6
5	The Cases for the Objectors	16
6	Representation regarding the Alternative Route	22
7	Inspector's Conclusions	23
8	Recommendations	29
	Appendices	
A	Appearances	30
B	Documents	31

Abbreviations

AA	Acquiring Authority (Suffolk County Council)
BHS	British Horse Society (Objector 8)
BSRR	Beccles Southern Relief Road (scheme that is being promoted)
CCL	Cucumber Lane
CPO	Compulsory Purchase Order
cu m	cubic metres
DAS	Design and Access Statement
DfT	Department for Transport
DMRB	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
FP3	Footpath 3
ha	hectares
HA	Highway Authority
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
km	kilometres
kph	kilometres per hour
LEP	Local Enterprise Partnership
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
m	metres
mph	miles per hour
PMA	Private Means of Access
SCC	Suffolk County Council
SofS	Secretary of State for Transport
sq m	square metres
SRO	Side Roads Order
SSD	Stopping Sight Distance
TRO	Traffic Regulation Order
WBBA	Waveney Byway & Bridleway Association (Objector 9)
WLH	Mr William L Hall (Objector 3)

CASE DETAILS

- The Side Roads Order (SRO) is made under sections 14 and 125 of the Highways Act 1980 by Suffolk County Council (SCC) and is dated 2 October 2015.
 - The Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) is made under sections 239, 240, 246 and 250 of the Highways Act 1980 and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 by SCC and is dated 4 November 2015.
 - SCC (also referred to as the 'Acquiring Authority') submitted the Orders for confirmation to the Secretary of State for Transport.
 - If confirmed, the SRO would authorise the Acquiring Authority (AA) to improve, stop-up and construct new highways and stop-up and provide new means of access to premises.
 - If confirmed, the CPO would authorise the AA to compulsorily purchase land and the rights over land for the purposes of the construction of new highways; the improvement of existing highways; the provision of new means of access to premises and land; use by the AA in connection with the construction and improvement of highways and the provision of new means of access; and the mitigation of any adverse effects which the existence or use of the highways proposed to be constructed or improved will have on their surroundings.
 - When the Inquiry opened there was one statutory objection to the CPO, 3 non-statutory objections to the SRO and CPO and two non-statutory objections to the SRO remaining.
-

**Summary of Recommendations: I recommend that:
the SRO be modified and confirmed; and
the CPO be modified and confirmed.**

1 PREAMBLE

- 1.1 I was appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport (SofS) to conduct the Inquiry in accordance with section 13(2) of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 and paragraph 7 of Schedule 1 of the Highways Act 1980.
- 1.2 I opened the Inquiry at Beccles Primary Academy, Ellough Road, Beccles, Suffolk NR34 7AB on 16 August 2016 to hear representations and objections concerning the submission made by SCC, as the order making authority, for confirmation of the above-mentioned Orders. The Inquiry sat for 3 days, closing on 18 August 2016.
- 1.3 I carried out an accompanied site inspection of the land and surrounding area on 18 August 2016 at about 1000 hours. I also completed an unaccompanied site visit of the area on 15 August 2016, prior to opening the Inquiry.
- 1.4 At the opening of the Inquiry, SCC informed me that 9 objections to the Orders have been received by the Department for Transport (DfT). I have

- numbered them as referred to by SCC¹. Of these, 3 were statutory objections to the SRO and CPO, one was a statutory objection to the CPO, 3 were non-statutory objections to the SRO and CPO and 2 were non-statutory objections to the SRO. SCC gave me copies of e-mails and letters withdrawing the 3 statutory objections to the SRO and CPO². By the close of the Inquiry there was one remaining statutory objection to the CPO, 2 non-statutory objections to the CPO and SRO and 2 non-statutory objections to the SRO, following the withdrawal of the objection to the SRO and CPO by Ms Gill Griffiths³.
- 1.5 Following the withdrawals of objections, the main outstanding grounds for objection to the Orders were regarding the design of the highway scheme, with an alternative route being suggested; access to Cucumber Lane (CCL) North; and access across the new road for pedestrians, cyclists and horses.
- 1.6 I prepared and circulated a note at the opening of the Inquiry setting out the tests that must be addressed in the CPO and the SRO⁴, with regard to Government guidance and legislation.
- 1.7 The Orders are required to implement a highway scheme, known as the Beccles Southern Relief Road (BSRR). The scheme would provide a new two-way single carriageway highway that would be 2.2 km in length and would connect the existing A145 London Road via a new four armed roundabout located approximately 1.5 km south of Beccles with the C969 Ellough Road via a new three armed roundabout situated 1.3 km south east of Beccles where Ellough Road meets Benacre Road and in doing so connect the south and west of Suffolk with the Ellough Industrial Estate and former Ellough Airfield, now an Enterprise Zone⁵.
- 1.8 SCC confirmed at the Inquiry that it had complied with all necessary statutory formalities. It also provided a letter and a copy of a certificate to confirm compliance with the statutory requirements⁶ and, at my site visit prior to the Inquiry, I observed that notices have been posted along the proposed route. No one has suggested that there has not been compliance with the statutory formalities.
- 1.9 This report contains a brief description of the site and surroundings, the gist of the cases presented, including a legal submission, and my conclusions and recommendations. Lists of appearances and Inquiry documents are appended and abbreviations are given at the start of this report.

¹ Document SCC/02/01 paragraph 5.1

² Documents SCC/PI/03, 04 and 05 and SCC/PI/19, 20 and 21

³ Document SCC/PI/22

⁴ Document X/02

⁵ Document SCC 3: Statement of Reasons paragraph 4.1

⁶ Documents SCC/PI/12 and SCC/PI/18

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS⁷

- 2.1 The land required to construct and thereafter maintain the BSRR is set out in the Order documents⁸. The BSRR would use land on the A145 London Road to the south of the historic market town of Beccles, on the northern boundary of Suffolk, to construct a new 4 arm roundabout that would include a Private Means of Access (PMA) connection to Evergreen Garden Centre. The A145 would be re-aligned and the roundabout and Relief Road would use agricultural land in the ownership of Mr William L Hall (WLH) to enable embankments and an attenuation pond to be constructed.
- 2.2 The BSRR would follow an easterly line about 1.5 km to the south of Beccles across a medium sized agricultural field and would then cross a public footpath (western FP3). FP3 would be diverted to lead up an embankment about 3m above ground level on both sides of the BSRR. A badger tunnel would be provided under the BSRR and an uncontrolled pedestrian and equestrian crossing would also be provided to enable access to FP3.
- 2.3 The BSRR would head across a shelter belt of semi-mature evergreen and deciduous trees and then across another agricultural field, passing a collection of agricultural and residential buildings, known as Chenery's Farm. It would be constructed across the unclassified road U1524 CCL, which is a single lane carriageway with passing places for much of its length that links to the U1502 Oak Lane. Oak Lane joins the residential streets to the south of Beccles that have vehicular access onto the A145 via Banham Road, which is a bus route, and St Georges Road, which has a narrow single lane railway bridge on it. The residential area to the south west of Beccles does not have a direct vehicular connection to CCL, but can access the A145 via Kemps Lane, which includes a one-way bridge over the railway.
- 2.4 An access to Chenery's Farm would be provided directly from the BSRR by way of a new T junction. Opposite this junction, a gated access would connect the U1524 CCL North to the BSRR to allow agricultural vehicles to access land. Further to the east, a connection to the U1502 CCL South would be provided by way of a new T junction.
- 2.5 The BSRR would pass through another shelter belt of semi-mature green and deciduous trees and in a generally south easterly direction along the southern edge of an agricultural field, parallel with and immediately to the north of a concrete byway (BY16 and BY8) that is bordered by a medium height mature oak hedgerow with an agricultural field beyond. At its most easterly point, the BSRR would connect with the C969 Ellough Road, and then Benacre Road, via a 3 armed roundabout junction. A new access track to agricultural land would be provided to run parallel to the BSRR on its northern side for about 1 km between this roundabout junction and the U1502 CCL/U1502 Oak Lane. Benacre Road leads to the south to Ellough Industrial Estate and the old Ellough Airfield, which is an Enterprise Zone. Ellough Road forms a junction with Ingate, near to a railway level crossing in Beccles.

⁷ Document SCC 3 paragraphs 4.1 to 4.18

⁸ Document SCC 1

- 2.6 The existing byways BY16 and BY8 would be maintained for about 1 km from a point to the south of the new roundabout at the eastern end of the BSRR in a westerly direction. About 7,495 sq m of currently arable land would be required for the purposes of a construction compound, immediately to the west of Ellough Road.

3 LEGAL SUBMISSION

At the Inquiry a legal submission was made on behalf of WLH (Objector 3) regarding whether an assumption that a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) would be likely to be made would be unlawful.

Legal Submission on behalf of WLH

The material points⁹ were:

- 3.1 With regard to the need to reduce the speed limit on the approach to the proposed roundabout on the A145 for safety reasons, the assumption put forward by SCC that a TRO to achieve a speed limit of 30 mph would be likely to be made would be unlawful. It would prejudice the outcome of another process and undermine the role of public consultation.
- 3.2 The AA has to show that it is in the public interest to allow the scheme to go forward. The approach to the roundabout has been shown to be unsafe unless there is a speed limit on it. It is not known what the outcome of the TRO process would be to implement such a speed limit. If the SofS confirmed the Orders without such a TRO in place, it would be unlawful as it would be based on the outcome of another statutory process, which could include an objection by the Police¹⁰. Following confirmation of the Orders, the scheme would be able to be implemented without the TRO, but would be unsafe. It is not the same as in the case of planning permission, as the scheme would not be able to be implemented without that permission.

Response on behalf of Suffolk County Council

The material points¹¹ were:

- 3.3 It is not correct that it would be unlawful to confirm the Orders without the TRO in place. The Government guidance in paragraph 15¹² is regarding how the AA addresses whether there are any other impediments to the scheme going ahead, which include planning permission or other consent or licence. In terms of planning permission, the AA should demonstrate that there are no obvious reasons why it might be withheld. This could be applied to the outcome of the TRO, where there are no obvious reasons why it would be withheld.
- 3.4 The TRO would be subject to public consultation and a Speed Limit Panel of the SCC to make sure that it would tie in with other speed limits. If there were no objections, the TRO would be made. If there were objections, the TRO would go to the SCC's Development Control Committee to consider the

⁹ Document OBJ3/PI/04 paragraph 12 and oral submissions made by Mr Choongh at the Inquiry

¹⁰ Oral evidence given by Mr Cage at the Inquiry

¹¹ Oral submissions made by Mr Bedford at the Inquiry

¹² Document: Guidance on Compulsory purchase process and The Crichel Down Rules for the disposal of surplus land acquired by, or under the threat of, compulsion paragraph 15

objections¹³. There is a good likelihood that the TRO would be made, if found to be necessary in the Stage 2 Safety Audit¹⁴. The A145 is not a trunk road and therefore is not subject to the mandatory requirements in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)¹⁵. There is no reason why the SofS cannot confirm the Orders subject to being informed on the position regarding the TRO if he considers it necessary.

Inspector's Conclusions on the Legal Submission

- 3.5 Whether or not the Orders can be confirmed with or without the TRO, if it is necessary for reasons of safety, is a matter of law. However, it is my opinion that SCC, as the Highway Authority (HA), would be legally entitled to construct the roundabout on the A145 without the TRO in place, particularly as it is not a trunk road. Whilst the outcome of a TRO is not certain, no valid reasons have been given as to why a TRO to impose a speed limit would be opposed. Therefore, it has a strong likelihood that it could be made, if found to be necessary in a Stage 2 Safety Audit or other assessment of the design. In these circumstances it could be treated in a similar way to a planning permission under paragraph 15 of the Government guidance. As such, I find no evidence to demonstrate that the confirmation of the Orders would be unlawful without the making of the TRO.

4 THE CASE FOR THE ACQUIRING AUTHORITY (SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL)

The material points¹⁶ were:

Need

- 4.1 The BSRR would enable traffic, and in particular Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs), which has an origin or destination at the existing and expanding employment cluster focused at the Ellough Road Industrial Estate, to connect with south and west Suffolk without needing to penetrate either the main built up area of Beccles or the narrow country lanes to the south of the town. To deliver the BSRR, SCC has made the SRO and CPO to authorise changes to the highway network and to acquire the necessary land.
- 4.2 The road network in the town centre of Beccles is inadequate to cater for all the traffic demands placed upon it and its historic character provides little opportunity for improvements to be made. Traffic, and in particular HGV traffic, causes environmental detriment through noise, disturbance, and dominance, and the conditions for non-motorised users sharing limited road space and the pedestrian environment are poor. There are difficult turning manoeuvres for larger vehicles and at times congested conditions which cause significant queuing on the main route through the town via Ingate. The highway network in the rural hinterland to the south of the town centre is also subjected to the environmental disbenefits from vehicular traffic,

¹³ Oral evidence given by Mr Wilkinson at the Inquiry

¹⁴ Oral evidence given by Mr Evans at the Inquiry

¹⁵ Document SCC/PI/28 paragraph 19

¹⁶ Document SCC/PI/28

particularly when using the narrow country lanes as a short cut for 'rat-running'. There is no serious challenge to the need for a Relief Road.

4.3 The BSRR has positive support as a commitment in the Core Strategy (Policy CS15)¹⁷, is a key strategic scheme in the Local Transport Plan 2011-2031¹⁸ and capital programme for 2014-2017¹⁹, and is supported by the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Strategic Economic Plan²⁰. It provides a series of key benefits that include the following²¹:

- Reducing the dominance of traffic in the Conservation Area.
- Benefits for local residents.
- Reduction in congestion at the Ingate/Blyburgate corner.
- Improved pedestrian and cycle access to local schools.
- Reduction in travel time by approximately 4 minutes.
- Support the development of the Enterprise Zone.
- Removal of vehicular traffic from unsuitable roads.

4.4 There is little dispute about any of the above benefits, which are all important as public benefits, helping to deliver on local policy objectives and on the environmental and economic roles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework²². The argument put forward that benefits for local residents could be increased by an alternative route²³ is based on a misunderstanding of the information on travel patterns and a disregard of the importance of travel times in route choice decisions. It does not detract from the point that the BSRR would deliver significant benefits to the local area and at the same time make the employment cluster at Ellough Industrial Estate more attractive to further investment and growth.

4.5 It is a priority for the scheme to remove traffic from the town centre which is routing to/from the Ellough Industrial Estate from/to the London Road (A145) to the south west of the town. The evidence for the alternative route does not attempt to assess on any quantified basis the re-assignments that would arise with the BSRR, that the west/south movement (Bungay Road to London Road) is minimal and that other movements originating in the south east of the town would tend to utilise the town centre. SCC has carried out a detailed traffic assignment incorporating the results of Automated Number Plate Recognition survey data and a more realistic assessment of local travel patterns to demonstrate how they would be changed with the BSRR in place²⁴.

¹⁷ Document SCC 5

¹⁸ Document SCC 12B: Suffolk Local Transport Plan 2011-2031 Part 2

¹⁹ Document SCC/01/01 paragraph 6.8

²⁰ Document SCC/03/02 Appendix AJS1 paragraph 6.42 page 57

²¹ Document SCC/03/03 paragraph 5.3

²² Document SCC 9 paragraphs 17 and 31

²³ Document OBJ3/01/01

²⁴ Document SCC/05/01

Alternative Route

- 4.6 The alternative route was first put forward in 2012 as a route for a house builder client who was seeking to reduce the impact of a Relief Road on WLH's land and to maximise its development potential²⁵. It was not identified on the basis of seeking to find the optimum solution in the public interest to deliver the objectives of the Relief Road.
- 4.7 The alternative route has fundamental compromises in prioritising private interests over the public interest. It achieves a horizontal alignment that minimises the land take from WLH but not the land take of the alternative route overall. It has been necessary to depart from the objective of providing a route with a 60 mph (96 kph) speed limit and settle instead for a route that only works on the basis that it is accompanied by a speed limit of 40 mph (64 kph), as a higher speed limit is not achievable on the western half because of the tight curves that its horizontal alignment necessitates. This is not appropriate for a newly designed rural road that is intended to function as an attractive route to divert primarily employment and business-related traffic away from the town centre. It necessarily produces the outcome that journey times would be longer than with the BSRR and for some key routes, particularly from west to south, the result is that instead of providing journey time savings compared to town centre routes, it produces increased journey times²⁶. Claims that such increases are not material because they relate to a limited number of journeys and represent only a limited additional time penalty²⁷ are not supported by any detailed assessment and materially undervalue the importance of journey times in route choices.
- 4.8 New purpose built lower speed roads are not necessarily any safer than new purpose built higher speed roads²⁸, and slow moving vehicles associated with some of the land that would be served by the route would make up a very small proportion of the overall traffic that would use the route. Agricultural vehicles and other low speed vehicles can and do safely use derestricted rural roads and, if junctions and accesses are designed to meet the required standards of visibility, there is no reason why a 60 mph route should not be safe for such users. For the majority of users, a 60 mph route would provide the positive benefit of shorter journey times, which is an essential part of the rationale for the BSRR.
- 4.9 The alternative route would introduce a direct connection to CCL North from a proposed roundabout in an attempt to avoid criticism of the introduction of an inappropriate roundabout on an otherwise through route. It would not be beneficial for residents of the southern part of the town as those wishing to travel south to the A145 are not a significant part of the problems in the town centre, because such trips are more likely to route to the A145 without using the town centre²⁹. The shorter route is via St Georges Road and, notwithstanding the rail bridge and parked cars, this is the most obvious route compared to the more congested route via

²⁵ Mr Cage in cross examination

²⁶ Document SCC/00/02 paragraph 5.6: Mr Fulcher estimates up to 65 seconds longer journey times

²⁷ Oral evidence given by Mr Cage at the Inquiry

²⁸ Mr Cage conceded in cross examination that it finds no support in the DMRB

²⁹ Mr Fulcher's evidence to the Inquiry

ingate, which also involves traffic light junctions and level crossings. Any increased use of Banham Road, or Queen Elizabeth Drive, or CCL North itself would be undesirable because of their character as residential access roads and/or as a narrow country lane, and such increases would be inevitable if CCL North linked directly to the Relief Road³⁰. Whilst it could be predominantly local traffic rather than through traffic that would be tempted to use such a connection, once provided the link would be available to all traffic, and even increased levels of local traffic on the roads in question would be undesirable.

- 4.10 In the light of the consultation undertaken on Options A and B at the formative stages of the BSRR, which revealed broad support for a route that did not provide a connection with CCL North, SCC has decided to promote a scheme which does not contain such a link. The alternative route cannot constitute such a scheme, precisely because it does include this link as an integral element. Therefore, due to the 40 mph speed limit and the direct connection with CCL North, the alternative route is not a reasonable alternative to the BSRR and would not fulfil the identified aims and objectives for the Relief Road.
- 4.11 The BSRR A145 roundabout would not comply with the Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) guidance in DMRB TD 16/07³¹ using the SSD values in DMRB TD 9/93³² with the existing derestricted speed limit on the relevant section of the A145. However, the design has been the subject of an independent Safety Audit and, although the visibility issue was explicitly identified in the Audit, the recommended solution was neither to relocate the roundabout nor to reduce the speed limit³³. The recommendation which will be taken forward was to provide advance warning of the roundabout. The independence of the Safety Audit is not challenged. Whilst no departure from standards was notified, it is not plausible to conclude from this that the auditors, who identified the fact that the bend would obscure the view of the roundabout, were unaware that there was non-compliance with the SSD guidance. This guidance in the DMRB is part of the 'common currency' of highway designers and safety auditors and, given the visibility issue the auditors identified, it was obvious that the SSD was below the recommended value.
- 4.12 Compliance with the DMRB is clearly best practice but it is not mandatory for non-trunk roads. It will be for SCC to consider this issue further as the detailed design for the BSRR progresses, and the Stage 2 Safety Audit is undertaken. That stage has not yet been reached. It would be open to SCC to put forward a case at that stage for a departure but a more obvious solution³⁴ would be to propose a change to the speed limit on the northern approach to the A145 roundabout, as already anticipated in the Design and Access Statement (DAS), so that the available visibility of 123m would then meet or exceed the SSD value in DMRB TD 9/93. This would be the case if the speed limit was 30 mph (48 kph), where the desirable minimum SSD

³⁰ Mr Fulcher's evidence to the Inquiry

³¹ Document OBJ3/PI/01

³² Document OBJ3/PI/02

³³ Document SCC/01/04 Appendix F Page 10 Problem 4.10

³⁴ Oral evidence given by Mr Evans at the Inquiry

would be 90m, or 40 mph (64 kph), where the desirable minimum SSD would be 120m³⁵.

- 4.13 A change to the speed limit would require a TRO, which would be subject to its own processes, including public and stakeholder consultation. Whilst the outcome of such a process cannot be assured, a view can be formed now on the likelihood of such a TRO being achieved. There is already a 30 mph speed limit a short distance to the north and the change would therefore be a modest extension of the speed limit. The A145 already contains an existing junction (Cromwell Road) and frontage development (Cromwell Cottage and Marlborough Cottage) in the derestricted section and, with the introduction of a roundabout for the BSRR, it is not easy to see why there should be any particular issues with an extension of the 30 mph speed limit or an intermediate transitional 40 mph speed limit on the approach to the roundabout. There is no evidential basis to support the view that the police might object³⁶.
- 4.14 SCC is the local HA with responsibilities in relation to the safety of the local highway network. It is not credible to suggest that SCC would be promoting the provision of a roundabout for the BSRR which would be unsafe. The accident records identify that the only accident recorded in the most recent 3 year period to have occurred near to the proposed roundabout location was as a result of ice on the road³⁷. SCC can be expected to take appropriate steps as the detail design work progresses to ensure that the final design for the A145 roundabout would be safe. If that requires the making of a TRO there is no good reason to think that a TRO would not be made. SCC has already shown its willingness to make TROs in conjunction with the BSRR in relation to the U1524. It is not correct that the Relief Road would not be safe unless the A145 roundabout is relocated to the south³⁸.
- 4.15 The alternative route would locate two of its three roundabouts close to either existing accesses (the A145 roundabout) or to a junction (the CCL roundabout). In the latter case, DMRB TD 16/07 makes the point that *'interactive effects should be examined'*³⁹ but offers no prescriptive guidance on how this should be done. The proximity of the CCL roundabout to the Chenery's Farm junction is some 38m, which is less even than the 50m stagger distance given in DMRB TD 42/95⁴⁰. DMRB TD 41/95's advice in relation to new direct accesses not encroaching into the visibility requirements of adjoining junctions is directly referred to in relation to Chenery's Farm⁴¹, but is more appropriate to the A145 roundabout where there are direct accesses at Marlborough House and Marlborough Farm within 60m of the new roundabout.

³⁵ Document OBJ3/PI/02 DMRB TD 9/93 Table 3

³⁶ Oral evidence given by Mr Cage at the Inquiry

³⁷ Documents SCC/05/02 page 80 and SCC/PI/15

³⁸ Document OBJ3/01/01 and oral evidence given by Mr Cage at the Inquiry

³⁹ Document OBJ3/PI/01 paragraph 4.9

⁴⁰ Document SCC/PI/16 paragraph 7.64

⁴¹ Document SCC/00/02 paragraph 4.10

- 4.16 A vehicle exiting a roundabout is generally expecting to accelerate as it enters the link served by that roundabout. It is not expecting that its exit path may be obstructed by a stationary or slow moving vehicle, entering or emerging from an access or a junction in close proximity to that roundabout. If there is inadequate inter-visibility between the vehicle exiting the roundabout and the vehicle using the access/junction, there is a risk of unexpected and unanticipated conflicts. Whilst the guidance does not set out a specific SSD for roundabout exit arms, it can be noted that a SSD for a 40 mph (64 kph) road is 120m, and the alternative route is proposed to be a 40 mph road. A vehicle joining the alternative route at the CCL roundabout from CCL North would therefore be joining a 40 mph road and leaving a derestricted road, and a vehicle leaving the alternative route at the A145 roundabout would be joining a derestricted road and leaving a 40 mph road. In that context, separation distances of 38m (at Chenery's Farm) and 60m (at Marlborough House/Farm) would be too short and give rise to justified safety concerns.
- 4.17 The alternative route, by moving the roundabout southwards, carries with it the necessary consequence that it would then be subject to a 40 mph speed limit and would include an additional, and otherwise unnecessary, roundabout at CCL. Therefore, the alternative route is not a better traffic solution to the problems facing Beccles than the BSRR.
- 4.18 With regard to the drainage of the retained southern parcel of WLH's land, it would be drained via the new highway drainage and utilising an attenuation pond in the northern parcel. Given the land available within the northern parcel and the opportunity to design the new drainage so that it is fit for purpose, including the provision of adequate drainage to WLH's land, there is no justification for any concern about this drainage.
- 4.19 In terms of the environmental impact, full details of the vertical alignment have been provided, and part of the route is on embankment and part is in cutting. The embankment would be at 3.37m at its highest point. However, this was fully assessed in a detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)⁴² which formed part of the Environmental Impact Assessment process at the planning application stage, a landscape mitigation strategy forms an integral part of the approved BSRR scheme and there is no evidential basis for considering that the landscape and visual impacts would be unacceptable⁴³. No landscape evidence has been submitted by, or on behalf of, any objector.
- 4.20 The reasons for the vertical alignment are not only the drainage requirements, which are a key factor, but also there is the need to balance a number of different considerations, including tie-ins to existing levels where there are connections with other highways or access points, satisfactorily managing changes in gradient for the road itself to achieve acceptable forward visibility and comfortable driving conditions, and at one point the provision of a badger tunnel to meet the requirements of the planning permission⁴⁴.

⁴² Document SCC 100

⁴³ Document SCC/04/01 and oral evidence given by Mr Neesam at the Inquiry

⁴⁴ Document SCC/02/04 paragraphs 2.12 to 2.15 and oral evidence given by Mr Evans at the Inquiry

- 4.21 The claim that the alternative route could avoid being built in part on embankment has not been substantiated, as that route was devised without the benefit of any topographic survey and no attempt has been made to assess the vertical alignment that the alternative route would require in order to meet the guidance on gradients in DMRB TD 9/93. It has not been possible in the short period of time available since the alternative route was promoted by WLH on 26 July 2016 for SCC to undertake that work. The earlier work done by SCC in the evaluation of Options A and B would not stand as a proxy for such an assessment because the routes are not the same and, in any event, the conclusion then reached across a range of technical disciplines was that Option B was not to be preferred and so it was not further pursued. Having discarded that option there was no good reason for SCC to revisit it. In the absence of information, the only plausible assumption is that the alternative route would have a similar vertical profile to the BSRR, primarily because it is intended to serve the same highways function and needs to achieve adequate drainage that can operate on an economic and self-sustaining gravity system and to provide for a badger tunnel in broadly the same location. In relation to the tunnel, the key issue is that the tunnel should be dry rather than damp or water-logged, with an airflow through it⁴⁵, which is most effectively achieved by a tunnel that is at or about ground level, rather than one that is below ground level.
- 4.22 With regard to earthworks, the detailed design work which has been undertaken since the 2013 DAS has shown that substantial importation of material would not be required, as the DAS itself anticipated⁴⁶. The initial assessment in the DAS identified that at that stage of the design there was an issue that needed to be addressed, and it has been subsequently addressed in the further design work that has been undertaken. The overall scheme, including the excavation of the attenuation ponds, would result in a net export of fill but the combination of embankments, cuttings, and ponds, has enabled this to be kept to a minimum. In the absence of a vertical profile for the alternative route there is no basis for claiming that it would be able to achieve a better earthworks balance than the BSRR.
- 4.23 The alternative route would have its own environmental disbenefits in relation to the introduction of additional lighting at the CCL roundabout and potentially further west, which would be deleterious in terms of visual amenity and in relation to bats. The precise degree of additional impact is not material to the assessment because in a comparative exercise it is sufficient to note that it would be an additional impact that would not arise with the BSRR. There would also be closer proximity to residential properties, with the propensity for increased visual impact and noise/disturbance. In addition, the alternative route would be some 230m longer⁴⁷ and would include the additional infrastructure of a further roundabout. These works would require the use of additional natural resources and would involve taking more land from the countryside.

⁴⁵ Document SCC/PI/13: DMRB HA 59/92, paragraphs 9.9 and 9.11

⁴⁶ Document SCC 14V paragraph 7.2.1

⁴⁷ Document SCC/00/02 paragraph 5.3 for the western section (200m extra) and paragraph 5.4 for the eastern section (30m extra)

- 4.24 The alternative route would not avoid the need for there to be a taking of private property interests for public purposes. There is no indication that land required for the alternative route could be achieved without the need to use powers of compulsory acquisition. On the basis that the vertical profile of the alternative route would be similar to that for the BSRR, the overall land take would be greater than that for the BSRR because of the additional 230m of carriageway length. Assuming a carriageway width of 7.3m and flanking verges of 3.5m westbound and 5m eastbound to accommodate the shared use footway/cycleway of 3m⁴⁸, and disregarding the footprint of the additional CCL roundabout, landscaping, drainage, and other requirements, it would amount to a further 3,634 sq m (or 0.36 ha) of land take. Thus, the consequence of reducing the impact of the Relief Road on WLH's land interest would be to increase the impact on other land ownerships. The alternative route therefore would increase the overall effects on private property rights.
- 4.25 The alternative route would leave WLH with two oblong shaped parcels of land, which would then be bisected by the new road. There is no reason to think that if the land remains in its existing use this would have any particular benefits, since the southern parcel would be long and thin and not dissimilar to the northern parcel under the BSRR, and the northern parcel would be on the 'inside' of the new road rather than on the 'outside' under the BSRR. SCC is proposing with the BSRR to take the whole of the northern parcel for drainage, attenuation, and wildlife/landscaping purposes, which would be fully addressed under the compensation code. Under the alternative route, the adjacent parcels to the east of WLH's land would be severed by its alignment, leaving the land 'outside' the alternative route of doubtful utility in its existing use. Therefore, there would not be a material benefit in terms of the effects on existing land use.
- 4.26 In terms of future development, there is no planning permission to authorise any such development along the alternative route, and nor are there any development plan allocations to suggest that this would be an acceptable land use change. The emerging Local Plan Options work being undertaken by Waveney District Council as local planning authority is at too early and embryonic a stage to attract any weight⁴⁹. With a plan-led system, it is not appropriate for the routing of new infrastructure to seek to anticipate decisions which have yet to be made, or to seek to frame the debate for those decisions. In terms of the wider public interest, there is no reason to think that, if further land to the south of Beccles were in due course ever to be considered for development, the route of the BSRR would prevent sites from being identified.
- 4.27 Unlike the BSRR, the alternative route does not benefit from planning permission, nor is it the subject of any statutory orders to enable its delivery. It has different impacts on the affected land to the impacts of the BSRR and also has different impacts on nearby residential properties. It cannot be assumed that, if it was the subject of the necessary statutory processes, it would ultimately secure the required approvals. At the very least, there would be a delay to enable those processes to be undertaken, so delaying the time when the benefits of the new road would be realised, both

⁴⁸ Document SCC/02/01 paragraph 4.4

⁴⁹ Document SCC/03/01 paragraph 3.11

for the residents of Beccles and for those undertaking or wishing to undertake economic endeavour at the Ellough Road Industrial Estate and the associated Enterprise Zone.

Other Objections

- 4.28 The remaining issues for consideration are very narrow. The original objection pursued by WLH relating to the height of the embankment across his land and drainage matters appears to have been abandoned in favour of the promotion of the alternative route. To the extent that it remains as an objection, it is comprehensively rebutted⁵⁰.
- 4.29 The other objections to the CPO do not seek to challenge the CPO itself but simply the nature of the arrangements for equestrians to cross the BSRR. SCC has set out the detailed guidance on when a signal controlled equestrian crossing is advised⁵¹, and it is quite clear that the recorded flows of equestrian users and the projected vehicular flows for the BSRR would be too low to justify the provision of a signalised crossing. The actual counts of equestrian usage should be preferred to a survey of riders asking questions about what they would wish to do in terms of usage. The general information on accidents to equestrians in Suffolk, and information on the crossings provided on roads with much higher flows and very different characteristics, does not provide a sound basis for revising the arrangements proposed in the BSRR.
- 4.30 Safe crossing points would be provided, with horse corrals to enable riders to dismount should they so wish, at the crossing with FP3, which now benefits from a formally granted permissive licence to enable its continued use by equestrians⁵² and to the east of CCL North⁵³. A further crossing would also be possible at the U1524/Chenery's Farm junction. Since the BSRR would not affect the interaction between Bridleway BR15 and the A145 or Bridleway BR12 and CCL North there is no reason for the Relief Road to address those locations. SCC would, however, keep the question of the appropriateness of the crossings under review as part of its routine network management and monitoring of post-opening conditions, and if further provision was justified that could then be considered. The evidence to date does not justify signalised crossings.
- 4.31 The upgrading of FP3 to allow equestrian use has been done in the form of a permissive licence, which is revocable. However, the permissive use has continued for many years without objection and this has now been formalised by the licence agreement; there is in any event a public right of way (FP3) which covers the same route and which could not be removed without statutory process; the land is in agricultural use and can co-exist with the current use; and there is no reason to think that for the foreseeable future the permissive rights would not suffice. Were the position to change, SCC would have the opportunity to consider the use of its powers to create a public path.

⁵⁰ Document SCC/02/01 paragraphs 5.12 to 5.28

⁵¹ Documents SCC/02/01 paragraphs 5.38 to 5.44 and SCC/05/01 paragraphs 7.10 to 7.22

⁵² Document SCC/PI/11

⁵³ Document SCC/PI/02

- 4.32 The statutory objections to the SRO have been addressed through proposed modifications to the SRO, and these have now been withdrawn⁵⁴. SCC is proposing additional accommodation works, which can be achieved within the Order land and in the exercise of SCC's permitted development rights as a local HA, to address the objection by Ms Gill Griffiths, which has been withdrawn. There is no sound basis for concluding that the absence of a connection between the BSRR and CCL North would adversely affect the residential streets in Beccles. Rather, the absence of such a connection would preclude the risk of extraneous traffic routing to or from the BSRR using the unsuitable residential roads to the south of Beccles.

Funding and Implementation

- 4.33 The total cost of the scheme has been calculated as being £7 million, including land acquisition, design and construction. SCC has allocated £2 million of its own capital funding for the scheme in its capital programme of 2014-17. Funding for the remaining £5 million has been allocated from the New Anglia LEP through the Local Growth Fund, subject to the final business case after completion of the statutory processes, and SCC has the resources to deal with any additional costs that may arise, albeit that its recent track record has been to deliver similar highway schemes on budget⁵⁵.
- 4.34 The initial business case for the scheme is in the form of a Value for Money Statement⁵⁶ that looks at its impact and the wider economic benefits. The Statement states that the Gross Value Added Contribution of the Enterprise Zone area would have a Net Present Value of £106,022,414. The BSRR would make the Enterprise Zone more attractive whilst lowering the effect on the environment.
- 4.35 Should the SofS confirm the Orders, it is expected that work would commence in the summer of 2017 with opening in 2018, allowing for a contract period of under a year⁵⁷.

Modifications

- 4.36 With regard to the SRO, SCC is proposing modifications⁵⁸ to increase the PMAs and to address technical drafting issues raised by the DfT in its letter of 12 February 2016⁵⁹. The proposed modifications to the CPO⁶⁰ are to address the technical drafting issues raised by the DfT.

Conclusions

- 4.37 The evidence shows that the test of a compelling case in the public interest to justify the interference with private property rights has been made out.

⁵⁴ Document SCC/PI/26: modifications to the SRO and Documents SCC/PI/19 to 21

⁵⁵ Document SCC/01/01 paragraphs 6.9 to 6.14 and oral evidence given by Mr Wilkinson at the Inquiry

⁵⁶ Document SCC/01/02 Appendix CW/B

⁵⁷ Document SCC/01/01 paragraph 6.14 and answer by Mr Wilkinson to question by the Inspector at the Inquiry

⁵⁸ Documents SCC/PI/08, SCC/PI/25 and SCC/PI/26

⁵⁹ Document X/01: Inspector's Dossier section 8 Doc 1

⁶⁰ Documents SCC/PI/23 and SCC/PI/24

There is no real dispute about the need for a relief road or about the public benefits it would bring in both environmental and economic terms. On an objective assessment of the evidence, there is not a preferable alternative route available that could deliver those benefits as well or better or without introducing other disbenefits. The one alternative route that has been put forward is a contrived alignment prioritising the release of land for future development, which compromises on key elements of the scheme, in particular with an artificially low speed limit which would reduce the attractiveness of the route for traffic to be diverted from the town centre and with a connection to CCL North that was expressly rejected by SCC in the evolution of the scheme.

- 4.38 SCC has shown that it has a clear idea of how it intends to use all of the land to be acquired. The necessary resources are likely to be available⁶¹. There are no impediments that are likely to block implementation. Full planning permission has been secured⁶². The TRO to support the changes to the U1524 access rights is not the subject of objections. The potential TRO to change speed limits in the vicinity of the A145 roundabout presents no particular difficulties and there are no good reasons to think that SCC would not be able to make that TRO if that would be required on completion of the final detailed design.
- 4.39 In relation to the SRO, the absence of any statutory objections confirms that the minor stoppings up that are proposed are satisfactory. They are necessary to deliver the BSRR⁶³, and there are reasonably convenient routes available both to accommodate movements made by the affected highways and to gain access to the land served by stopped up PMAs. The statutory tests in sections 14 and 125 of the Highways Act 1980 are satisfied.
- 4.40 SCC's obligations under the Equalities Act 2010 have also been addressed⁶⁴.
- 4.41 The Orders as proposed to be modified should be confirmed.

5 THE CASES for the OBJECTORS

Statutory Objector to the CPO- Objector 3: Mr William L Hall (WLH)

The material points⁶⁵ were:

- 5.1 WLH is the freeholder of land to be compulsorily acquired under the CPO (Parcel 6). He has suggested that he does not object to the Relief Road in principle but does object to the extent and position of the land to be taken in respect of Parcel 6. His grounds for objection were based on the height of the proposed embankment on the land to be acquired and the location of the proposed wetland area and pond on this land at the western end of the BSRR⁶⁶. At the Inquiry he suggested an alternative route to address these concerns.

⁶¹ Document SCC/01/01 paragraphs 6.8 to 6.14

⁶² Document SCC 10

⁶³ Document SCC/01/01 section 4

⁶⁴ Document SCC/03/01 paragraphs 5.14 and 5.15

⁶⁵ Documents X/01 Section 6.8 and OBJ3/PI/04

⁶⁶ Document X/01: Inspector's Dossier Section 6.8

- 5.2 In the case of a CPO, the onus is on the AA to show that there is a compelling case that the public interest demands that the scheme proceeds. All that an objector has to show is that there is no compelling public interest case for the scheme under consideration. In the case of a highway scheme, it may be by showing that an alternative route would perform better. As the direction from the SofS confirms, the only onus on the objector in such a case is to 'identify' the alternative route. It is not necessary to design it or provide anything more than what is required to identify the alternative route. The CPO inquiry process does not operate on the presumption that objectors have unlimited resources to 'promote' alternative schemes. It operates on the basis that once an objector has identified an alternative route, the onus is on the AA to demonstrate that it is not better and/or that it is unworkable/undeliverable.
- 5.3 The AA has in this case failed to demonstrate that the scheme is in the public interest for the following two reasons:
- a. The scheme for which it has secured planning permission would have a significant adverse impact on the safety of road users in the vicinity of the proposed roundabout on the A145; and
 - b. the public benefit put forward to justify the scheme can be better achieved, or at the very least, achieved to the same extent, by an alternative scheme which would cause less environmental harm in terms of noise and light pollution and landscape and visual impact, and would better safeguard the future development potential of land, an outcome that would help to protect both private and public interests.
- 5.4 With regard to safety, the proposed roundabout on the A145 would be positioned close to a bend. Even without the slowing down, stopping and possible queuing effects of a roundabout, the location is an accident black spot because of the lack of forward visibility⁶⁷. The scheme would introduce more vehicles that would be slowing down, stopping and queuing and a physical element that vehicles would be able to collide with, namely the centre island, which would contribute to causing more collisions. Further, it fails to comply with the mandatory requirements of design guidance. DMRB TD 16/07 read with TD 9/93 unequivocally demands a desirable minimum SSD of 215m for a design speed of 100 kph, which equates to a speed limit of 60 mph. On SCC's best case scenario, which has not been measured on site⁶⁸, only 123m would be able to be achieved, which is barely more than half of the SSD that would be required.
- 5.5 No relaxation is allowed in this situation because it is not 'specifically permitted by this Standard'⁶⁹. Even if it were, there is no evidence that the Safety Audit team compared this against the option that does meet standards⁷⁰. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated and

⁶⁷ Document SCC/02/04 Appendix F: Road Safety Audit page 10 paragraph 4.10

⁶⁸ Confirmed in oral evidence given by Mr Evans at the Inquiry

⁶⁹ Mr Cage confirmed in oral evidence given at the Inquiry and Document OBJ3/PI/01 paragraph 1.12 regarding Relaxations

⁷⁰ Document OBJ3/PI/01 paragraph 1.11 regarding overseeing organisations agreeing to a Departure from Standard

the scheme was reported to the Safety Audit team on the basis of no Departures from Standard being notified⁷¹. The Safety Audit team failed to pick up that the scheme required a departure from what is a mandatory standard and has never demanded the AA to provide a justification for the relaxation sought. No such justification has ever been provided and, accordingly, no such justification has ever been tested by the Safety Audit team. There is no public and transparent record of who took the decision that such a departure is acceptable, whether this was the right person in terms of seniority and qualification to take such a decision, or the rationale for such a decision. Therefore, very little weight should be placed on the outcome of the Safety Audit.

- 5.6 There is no plan to reduce the speed to 30 mph at the roundabout, and there is no evidence that a reduction in the limit would translate to slower speeds on the ground. Such a reduction in speed would undermine the claimed public benefit of the scheme, namely to draw traffic away from the town centre, as a significant proportion of the traffic which it is claimed would redirect from the town centre is that which comes from the west along Bungay Road and the scheme would already present drivers with a longer route. A drop down to 30 mph would in all probability add more than 1 minute to the journey time⁷². In addition, it would require a TRO and the outcome of a different statutory process cannot be assumed for the purposes of the current Inquiry. To assume that a TRO is likely to be made would be unlawful⁷³.
- 5.7 The most important benefit of the alternative route would be that, by moving the roundabout further south, it would be on a straight section of the A145 that would provide the necessary SSD, avoiding the safety problems of the BSRR.
- 5.8 The alternative route would also safeguard the future development potential of WLH's land by enclosing more of it on the inside of the Relief Road, rather than dividing it into two. Under the BSRR, the whole of the northern portion would be taken, which appears to be more than required for attenuation purposes and must recognise that any remnant would not be capable of beneficial use in any event. Also, the southern portion would be left with reduced agricultural benefit and no development potential. The alternative route would leave the majority of the land to the north of the Relief Road to provide future development should there ever be a need for Beccles to expand. This would benefit WLH, which is relevant to the confirmation of the CPO, and would also be in the public interest. Opportunities for future expansion of Beccles to the north and west of the town are limited due to environmental constraints and opportunities to the south are limited because of the lack of road infrastructure⁷⁴. If a road is to be provided to the south, which is the only side of the town with potential to expand, it should be provided on an alignment that maximises the land that can be developed to meet the town's future growth needs.

⁷¹ Document SCC/02/04 Appendix F: Road Safety Audit page 3 second paragraph from the bottom of the page

⁷² Mr Fulcher in cross examination argued that an additional 1 minute on the journey time would dissuade a significant number of drivers from taking the route

⁷³ Section 3 of this report

⁷⁴ Document SCC/03/01 paragraph 5.1

- 5.9 In terms of CCL, those residing in the south west of Beccles who wish to travel south currently need to drive north through the town centre to the A145. The links over the railway line provided by Kemps Lane and St Georges Road are sub-optimal⁷⁵, which must have the effect of pushing traffic further north towards Ingate and Peddar's Lane, the very location from which SCC wishes to remove through traffic. By providing an entrance onto the Relief Road from CCL North, the alternative route would allow residents of south west Beccles to travel south without having to go into the town centre. The alternative route therefore would enhance/maximise the central public benefit that the AA relies upon to justify the CPO.
- 5.10 The alternative route would be able to follow the existing contours of the land, would not need any significant earthworks and would drain adequately⁷⁶. Whilst no topographical survey has been used, the onus is on the AA to demonstrate, using its resources, that what is being claimed is not correct, which it has not done⁷⁷. It has not investigated the alternative route to see whether it could deliver the benefits before opting for a scheme in which the road would, for a large part of its length, be above surrounding ground levels. This would cause more landscape and visual impacts, greater light pollution and more noise than a road that is at a lower level. Further, the DAS confirms that it would not achieve an earthworks balance, with a deficit of some 19,000 cu m⁷⁸. The environmental impact of moving 1,900 lorry loads cannot be under-estimated.
- 5.11 The badger crossing could be provided in a tunnel that is designed not to flood by placing the drainage lower down in the ground so as to keep the road level lower⁷⁹. DMRB HA 59/92⁸⁰ does not support the claim made by SCC that badger tunnels have to be designed so that light can be seen from one end to the other.
- 5.12 A lower speed of 40 mph would reduce road noise and make it easier to take accesses off the road to facilitate any future development of Beccles to the south. Further, it would improve safety because it would allow traffic a greater opportunity to see and react to those using the accesses that are to be taken from the road, especially those making right turns using slower modes of transport⁸¹.
- 5.13 SCC has never at any point assessed the alternative route on an equal basis. It advertised Option B for public consultation, but this was not the same as the alternative route. Moreover, it eliminated Option B right at the outset on the basis of public opposition, rather than asking whether the public opposition was well informed and whether Option B could be amended to address the concerns and/or enhance its beneficial qualities.

⁷⁵ Mr Fulcher agreed in oral evidence at the Inquiry

⁷⁶ Evidence provided by Mr Cage

⁷⁷ Document SCC/02/04 paragraph 2.15 and Mr Evans in oral evidence at the Inquiry did not state that Mr Cage was wrong but did say that he had never checked the vertical alignment of the alternative route

⁷⁸ Document SCC 14V paragraph 7.2.1

⁷⁹ Mr Evans accepted in oral evidence at the Inquiry that it could be designed not to flood and did not challenge that the drainage could be lowered

⁸⁰ Document SCC/PI/13

⁸¹ Oral evidence given by Mrs Boltwood at the Inquiry

- 5.14 None of the alleged environmental disbenefits of the alternative route are based on an environmental assessment that considered it as a reasonable alternative⁸². The BSRR is confirmed to have an adverse effect of medium-low significance⁸³ and the corridor in which it sits is said to have a relatively limited influence on the surrounding landscape in visual terms⁸⁴. The alternative route would be likely to have similar landscape and visual effects, given that it would sit in the same landscape very close to the chosen route of the BSRR. As the greatest impact that would be caused by the BSRR would come from its height, the alternative route, sitting at grade, should have less landscape and visual impact.
- 5.15 The lighting at the CCL roundabout would not bring about any significant difference in landscape and visual terms when considering the whole road. There would not be a requirement for lighting along the whole A145 to the CCL roundabout section of the road, particularly as this requirement has not been imposed on the A145 roundabout in order to avoid light pollution. The light impact from the roundabout has to be assessed against a baseline of a road that is at points on embankment with no bunding and with HGVs and cars travelling with their headlamps on, lighting from the nearby Landoc development and a backdrop when looking from the south of Beccles and its combined light sources.
- 5.16 No ecological assessment has been presented to compare and contrast the ecological effects of the BSRR as against the alternative route. There is no evidence that the light environment for bats would be materially worse with lighting at the CCL roundabout, or that the alignment east of CCL cannot be designed so as to be identical to the BSRR.
- 5.17 The response to the public consultation demonstrates that the sole reason for moving the A145 roundabout to the north was to minimise the impact on two residential properties (Marlborough House and Marlborough Farm)⁸⁵, but no evidence has been presented that a 40 mph road would have an unacceptable impact on these properties in terms of light or noise when measured against any objective standard. No breach of highway design standards have been shown by having accesses close to the A145 and CCL roundabouts and no explanation has been given by SCC where the danger would emanate from, given the clear visibility that would be provided between those travelling on the main line and those seeking to use the accesses. At the Chenery Farm access, the alternative route would provide a safer road environment due to the roundabout enabling vehicles to turn right out of that access without having to cross the traffic in the other direction⁸⁶.
- 5.18 For the above reasons, the CPO should not be confirmed on the basis that the AA has failed to establish that there is a compelling public interest case for the scheme to proceed as currently consented which justifies the compulsory acquisition of WLH's land. As currently consented, the scheme

⁸² Document SCC/00/02 confirms that there had been no LVIA carried out for the alternative route

⁸³ Document SCC/04/01 paragraph 3.3.4

⁸⁴ Document SCC/04/01 paragraph 3.4.2

⁸⁵ Document OBJ3/01/02A Appendix C Table 6.2.2 Stakeholder and Public Comments and Response Ref 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6

⁸⁶ Oral evidence given by Mr Cage at the Inquiry

would be unsafe, and a better alternative exists which would meet the stated purpose of the CPO and would bring with it a number of benefits. These benefits include the ability to address the safety issue identified in relation to the consented scheme and safeguarding the future development potential of WLH's land in order to meet the town's future growth needs, which is in the public interest. At the very least, the AA should have to consider the alternative route further and make it subject to an assessment on an equal footing with its preferred scheme.

Non-Statutory Objector to the CPO and the SRO- Objector 8: The British Horse Society (BHS)

The material points were:

- 5.19 The BHS was represented at the Inquiry by Jean Lywood, a member of the BHS, and its objection was supported by Mrs Sadie Tattershall, who is not part of any organisation but claims that she 'hacks' her horse regularly on the local bridleways and roads. The concern is regarding the proposed crossing by the BSRR of the unclassified road (U1524) CCL where Bridleway BY12 meets. There have been many requests from horse riders for a controlled crossing of the proposed road to enable them to cross safely. If they would not be able to cross, it would deprive them of access to an extensive bridleway on either side of the road⁸⁷.
- 5.20 There have been 24 road accidents reported in Suffolk since a BHS report was launched in November 2010, of which there were 3 horse fatalities, 2 riders suffering severe injuries and 4 suffering moderate injuries, and there have been many more incidents reported to the BHS in the UK as a whole. In the local post code areas there are more than 1,000 horse owners and a recent online survey carried out by the BHS concluded that there are an estimated 70 horses kept within a 2 mile (3 km) radius of CCL and, based on answers to questions, an average of 30 riders or carriage drivers would use the route on a weekly basis. The BHS is promoting road safety and if installing a 'Pegasus Crossing' on the BSRR would save one serious incident involving pedestrians, cyclists or riders it would be worthwhile⁸⁸.

Non-Statutory Objectors to the SRO- Objectors 5 and 6: Mr D E White and Mrs Rosemary Hewlett

The material points⁸⁹ were:

- 5.21 The objections are based on the closure of CCL North. The concerns are that traffic wishing to access the A145 from the south end of Beccles would have to take a much longer route which would cause additional traffic on other roads, particularly St Georges Road. This would result in congestion on these roads and an additional risk of accidents occurring. There is currently no through road from the residential area to the south of Beccles and the A145.

⁸⁷ Document X/01: Inspector's Dossier section 6.6

⁸⁸ Documents OBJ8/PI/01 and 02

⁸⁹ Document X/01: Inspector's Dossier sections 6.1 and 6.9

***Non-Statutory Objector to the CPO and the SRO- Objector 9:
Waveney Byway & Bridleway Association (WBBA)***

The material points⁹⁰ were:

- 5.22 The objection is similar to that of the BHS and is regarding there not being any controlled crossings on the BSRR where vehicles would be travelling at speeds of up to 60 mph, the majority of which could be HGVs. There is a concern for the safety of those having to cross the BSRR, including ramblers, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders, taking account of the network of byways, bridleways, footpaths and unclassified roads in the area.

6 Representation regarding the Alternative Route

At the Inquiry the following oral statement was made by Gina Boltwood (Chenery's Farm) against the proposed Alternative Route, of which the material points were:

- 6.1 Chenery's Farm consists of 4 residential properties, a barn used for grain storage and a garage on which planning permission has been granted for it to be changed to a holiday let. The proposed access from Chenery's Farm to the BSRR has been agreed with SCC following many discussions.
- 6.2 There is concern regarding how the access would work on the Alternative Route, particularly when turning right into the access just after the proposed roundabout, as there would be the need to provide access for horse boxes, slow agricultural vehicles, grain lorries and to the residential properties. There is also concern that the proposed connection to CCL North would increase traffic on Banham Road, along which children walk to school and there are parked cars, and on the CCL/Oak Lane junction. It would not be possible to make it safe for this increase in traffic on CCL, which is currently used by very few vehicles.

⁹⁰ Document X/01: Inspector's Dossier section 6.5

7 INSPECTOR'S CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Bearing in mind the submissions and representations I have reported, I have reached the following conclusions⁹¹.

Side Roads Order (SRO)

7.2 In the case of the SRO, section 14 of the Highways Act 1980 requires it to be demonstrated that another reasonably convenient route is available or will be provided before the highway is stopped up. **[1.4 and 4.32]**

7.3 The highway that would be stopped up that is most contentious is the unclassified road referred to as CCL North (U1524). An alternative route has been pursued by one of the objectors to the CPO that includes a connection from the Relief Road to CCL North to allow all vehicles to use it. Such a connection is supported by other objectors to the Orders. However, this would provide a more direct route to the A145 via CCL North that at present is unattractive to use due to the standard of the mainly single lane roads that would be involved in reaching the A145. This suggested direct link to the Relief Road would be likely to attract significantly more traffic onto unsuitable roads to the south of Beccles, which would be undesirable for safety and amenity reasons. Whilst the BSRR would not provide this link, it would retain restricted entry to, and exit from, CCL North for appropriate vehicles in order to access the agricultural land that fronts it. **[2.3, 2.4, 4.9 and 4.32]**

7.4 SCC has carried out surveys to show that CCL North is not widely used and has demonstrated that alternative routes to and from the A145 for those residents to the south of Beccles are, and would remain, available. These include routes via St Georges Road or Kemps Lane, which have restrictions on them due to railway crossings but have been shown to be currently used. I am therefore content that, in the case of the highways to be stopped up, SCC has demonstrated that another reasonably convenient route is available or would be provided prior to the stopping up. **[2.3, 4.5, 4.9 and 4.32]**

7.5 In terms of section 125 of the Highways Act 1980, where the scheme includes the stopping up of a PMA, the evidence has demonstrated that another reasonably convenient access to the property is, or would be, available. There are no remaining objections to a loss of a PMA. I am satisfied that SCC has allowed for adequate temporary measures to ensure that PMAs would be maintained to all those properties that would require it during construction. On this basis, I accept that this criterion has been satisfied. **[2.4]**

7.6 Based on the evidence provided and the remaining objections to the SRO, I conclude that the SRO criteria are satisfied. **[4.39]**

Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO)

7.7 In reaching my recommendations with regard to the CPO, I have taken account of the following criteria that need to be met:

⁹¹ Reference being given in square brackets [] to earlier paragraphs where appropriate

- A compelling case for acquisition in the public interest;
 - evidence that the purposes for which the Order is made justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected;
 - evidence that the AA has a clear idea of how it intends to use the land which it is proposing to acquire;
 - evidence that the AA can show that all the necessary resources are likely to be available to achieve that end within a reasonable time-scale;
 - evidence as to the sources of funding available for both acquiring the land and implementing the scheme for which the land is required and the timing of that funding becoming available; and
 - evidence to show that the scheme is unlikely to be blocked by any physical or legal impediments to implementation, including the need for planning permission⁹².
- 7.8 There is one outstanding statutory objection to the CPO and none of the objectors have provided evidence to contest the need for the BSRR. I am satisfied that SCC has provided sufficient robust evidence to demonstrate that there is a need for the scheme and that it provides benefits to the public. These benefits include those associated with reducing the use of the historic town centre of Beccles by vehicular traffic, and in particular HGVs, and providing better access to and from the Enterprise Zone to encourage development. The BSRR has full support in development plan policies and the Local Transport Plan. **[1.4, 2.5, 4.1 to 4.4, 5.2 and 5.3]**
- 7.9 I have dealt with the most relevant issues raised by objectors later in my conclusions. These issues arise mainly from a proposed alternative route and whether it would represent a better solution and provide greater benefits to the public with less harm to the environment and safety than the proposed scheme. **[5.18]**
- 7.10 With regard to meeting the criteria, I am satisfied that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Order land to be acquired, having considered the issues raised and based on the evidence provided. The evidence clearly demonstrates that there is a need for the scheme and I consider the acquisition of land and rights over land that the CPO would authorise would be proportionate and the purposes for which the Order is made justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected. **[4.37]**
- 7.11 It is clear to me that the engineering design of the scheme and the design of the associated mitigation proposals are well developed. Whilst concerns have been expressed by an objector regarding the need for the height of the proposed embankments and the safety of the proposed roundabout on the A145, I have examined these issues and find that they are not sufficient to prevent the confirmation of the Order. The evidence to support a

⁹² Document: Guidance on Compulsory purchase process and The Crichel Down Rules for the disposal of surplus land acquired by, or under the threat of, compulsion paragraphs 12 to 15

connection from the proposed Relief Road to CCL North is inconclusive and there is sufficient evidence in terms of traffic survey information, use of CCL North and the unsuitability of that unclassified road and the adjoining roads to take any additional traffic to show that such a connection would be undesirable in terms of highway safety and residential and public amenity. **[2.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.9]**

- 7.12 The evidence provided has demonstrated to me that the earthworks that would be required to construct the scheme would be well balanced between volumes of cut and fill, taking account of the most recent calculations that have been provided which supersede those given in the DAS. Also, it shows that the height of the embankment would be necessary to provide an acceptable vertical alignment that would be adequately drained and would minimise the harm that would be caused to the environment, including taking account of existing mature planting and wildlife such as bats and badgers. As such, I consider that the AA has a clear idea of how the land is to be used. **[2.2, 4.19 to 4.22, 4.38, 5.10 and 5.11]**
- 7.13 With regard to resources, there is nothing before me to suggest that the budget that has been allowed for the scheme would not be sufficient to adequately fund it. The full funding has been agreed by SCC. The scheme has been programmed to start as soon as possible after confirmation of the Orders. I therefore consider that SCC has satisfactorily demonstrated that the necessary resources are likely to be available within a reasonable timescale. **[4.33, 4.34 and 4.38]**
- 7.14 The evidence indicates that the scheme is unlikely to be blocked by any impediment to its implementation. In my opinion the legal submissions made regarding the lawfulness of confirming the Orders without a TRO in place to limit the speed on the approach to the proposed A145 roundabout are ill founded. I am satisfied that all the land is required immediately for the construction of the scheme. The necessary planning permission has been granted. There is nothing before me that would suggest that, following confirmation of the Orders, the scheme would not be able to commence or open in 2018, as indicated by SCC. **[3.1 to 3.5, 4.35, 4.38 and 5.6]**
- 7.15 In the light of all the evidence, I consider that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the scheme to proceed and that this outweighs the private loss involved in compulsory acquisition. I therefore conclude that all the CPO criteria have been satisfied. **[4.37, 4.38 and 5.18]**

Modifications to the SRO and CPO

- 7.16 I conclude that all the proposed modifications to the SRO and CPO are necessary and that the Orders should be modified in accordance with the modified documents. **[4.36]**

Objections

- 7.17 The objection to the CPO by WLH was based on concerns about land take necessary for the proposed embankment and the drainage of the retained southern part of WLH's land. In respect of the embankment, SCC has provided sufficient justification for the proposed vertical alignment in terms of the need for drainage and to tie in with existing highways, accesses and features, to demonstrate that the land take for the embankment would be

- necessary. Also, the proposal would take all the remaining land in WLH's ownership to the north of the BSRR for an attenuation pond and associated works and I am satisfied that it would be able to provide adequate drainage to WLH's land to the south. **[4.18, 4.20, 4.25, 4.28 and 5.1]**
- 7.18 In terms of the alternative route proposed by WLH, it was introduced as an alternative at a relatively late stage in the inquiry process and its design has not been developed very much beyond a basic horizontal alignment. Although WLH has suggested that SCC should have assessed the alternative route on the same basis as the proposed route, this would be disproportionate and the route appears to me to be on a similar line to the Option B that was rejected by SCC following public consultation. Accordingly, the weight that I attach to the alternative route is reduced in comparison to the weight that I have given to the proposed route for the BSRR. **[4.10, 4.21, 4.27 and 5.13]**
- 7.19 The alternative route would avoid the design problems associated with the visibility on the approach to the proposed A145 roundabout, as that roundabout would be moved further south on a straighter part of the A145. However, the alternative location of the roundabout would be closer to accesses to Marlborough House and Marlborough Farm, which could cause associated harm to safety when using those accesses and amenity at those residential properties. **[4.15 to 4.17 and 5.7]**
- 7.20 The objector has claimed that, by following the lie of the land more closely than the proposed route, the alternative route would avoid the embankments that would be up to 3.37m high. However, without a detailed vertical alignment, the need to tie in with existing accesses and roads and provide an acceptable vertical alignment that would drain satisfactorily could influence the height of the road above ground level. Therefore, I have insufficient evidence to determine whether the alternative route would be preferable in terms of the earthworks. **[4.19, 4.21 and 5.10]**
- 7.21 I accept that the environmental impact of the alternative route could be less than that of the proposed route, if it can be demonstrated that it would involve significantly less cut and fill. However, this has not been demonstrated and neither has there been any form of environmental assessment of the route, such as an LVIA, as has been carried out for the proposed route. The LVIA for the proposed scheme found that, providing the proposed mitigation measures would be implemented and correctly maintained, its landscape impact would be of medium to low significance after 15 years and it would have limited visual impact. Therefore, in the absence of any substantive evidence to the contrary, I conclude that the environmental impact of the alternative route would be likely to be similar or greater, due to the likelihood that it would have a greater adverse effect on the amenity at residential properties and would affect more planted landscape. Furthermore, the objector has not disputed the claim by SCC that the alternative route would be about 230m longer and would therefore be likely to require more land take than the proposed route. **[4.19, 4.23, 4.24, 5.10, 5.14 and 5.16]**
- 7.22 WLH has claimed benefits with the alternative route by it providing a connection to CCL North via an additional roundabout. Although the lack of such a connection from the proposed BSRR has been given as a reason for objection by other objectors, there is very limited evidence to demonstrate

- that the connection would be a significant benefit. CCL North appears to me to be unsuitable for use as an access to the residential area south of Beccles, much of that residential area would not be very well connected to it anyway, and the link to the Relief Road could encourage other traffic to use CCL North and the residential streets to the south of Beccles to access the Relief Road, which could cause highway safety problems. **[2.3, 4.9, 4.10 and 5.9]**
- 7.23 The additional roundabout would be likely to add to the cost of the scheme, slow vehicles down on the road, which would require a 40 mph speed limit due to its horizontal alignment, add to light pollution in the area as it would need to be lit, and potentially cause problems with turning movements at the junction with Chenery's Farm access that would be near to the roundabout. Whilst vehicles wishing to turn right out of Chenery's Farm access would be able to make use of the roundabout, those wishing to turn right into the access would be close to the roundabout and could obstruct visibility, which would present a safety hazard, especially as it has been accepted that large slow moving vehicles use that access. Very little evidence has been provided, such as visibility splays, to show that the alternative route would be able to operate safely in the vicinity of this junction. Nor has any substantive evidence been provided to show that the 40 mph speed limit on the alternative route would make it significantly safer or quieter than the proposed route. **[2.4, 4.7, 4.8, 4.15, 4.16, 5.12, 5.15, 5.17, 6.1 and 6.2]**
- 7.24 The alternative route would not only need to have a slower speed limit on it than the proposed route of the BSRR, but would also be longer and would have an additional roundabout. All of this would add to the time that would be taken using the Relief Road and reduce its attractiveness to traffic. As a result of this, it has not been demonstrated that it would perform the same function as the proposed BSRR in taking traffic, and in particular HGVs, away from Beccles town centre. **[4.7, 4.8, 4.10 and 4.17]**
- 7.25 The other benefit of the alternative route that has been claimed by WLH is that it would provide access to potential sites for new development. Although it appears to me that it has previously been promoted for this purpose, and would also ensure that there would be less of WLH's land that would need to be taken, I have no details of any planning permissions for development or development plan allocations for the areas identified near to the Relief Road and it would be likely to take more land from other land owners. Based on the above, I find that the proposed alternative route would not provide the same level of benefit as the proposed route for the BSRR and would be likely to result in additional harm. **[2.1, 4.6, 4.7, 4.24 to 4.26 and 5.8]**
- 7.26 With regard to the objection about the safety of the proposed roundabout on the A145, an independent Stage 1 Safety Audit carried out by a team of experts has looked at the potential problem. It recommended the provision of advanced warning of the roundabout to address the safety issues associated with motorists having an obscured view of it due to a bend in the road and trees in the nearside verge when approaching it from Beccles. Whilst the Safety Audit indicates that the team was not made aware of the Departure from Standard in the DMRB guidance as a result of insufficient SSD being provided for the 60 mph speed limit on the road, the Audit team would have been likely to have examined this in reaching its

recommendation. Furthermore, the roundabout would be located where there is an existing access to Evergreen Garden Centre, which would be connected to the roundabout, and no substantive evidence has been provided to the Inquiry to show that there have been any accidents occurring on that part of the road as a result of visibility problems. **[2.1, 4.11, 4.14, 5.4 and 5.5]**

- 7.27 Whilst compliance with a mandatory requirement in the DMRB guidance would be desirable on the grounds of highway safety, this could be achieved by imposing a speed limit of either 30 mph or 40 mph on that stretch of road, based on the maximum SSD that SCC has suggested could be provided on that approach to the roundabout. Such a speed limit would require a TRO, which I accept cannot be taken for granted. However, given that that highway is not a trunk road, and therefore the DMRB guidance does not have to be applied to it, and that no evidence has been provided to show that there would be any justifiable reason for objecting to the TRO, this matter should not carry sufficient weight to prevent the Orders from being confirmed. I have dealt with the legal submission on the alleged unlawfulness of this in section 3 of the report. **[3.1 to 3.5, 4.12 to 4.14 and 5.6]**
- 7.28 The other main objection that has been raised is regarding the need for a controlled crossing across the BSRR. The evidence that has been provided by SCC does not support the need for such a crossing, even though survey information provided by the BHS indicates a wide usage of the lanes and bridleways by horse riders in the area that is not borne out by SCC's surveys. Based on this, I am satisfied that the action that SCC has suggested taking in reviewing the need for a controlled crossing, together with the facilities that it would provide on the scheme for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians, would ensure that this concern would be adequately addressed. Consequently, I conclude that the remaining objections raised do not outweigh the public benefit that has been shown to result from the scheme. **[2.2, 4.29 to 4.31, 5.18 to 5.20 and 5.22]**

Overall Conclusions

- 7.29 I am satisfied that there is a strong case for the scheme to be implemented. For these reasons, and having regard to the benefits of the scheme, I find that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the land's compulsory purchase which justifies interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land. Loss of any interest could be met by compensation. Therefore, I conclude that the Side Roads Order and Compulsory Purchase Order should be modified in accordance with Documents SCC/PI/08, SCC/PI/25, SCC/PI/26, SCC/PI/23 and SCC/PI/24 and the Orders so modified be confirmed. I have had regard to all other matters raised, but they do not outweigh the conclusions I have reached and the recommendations that I make. **[4.37, 4.38 and 4.40]**

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 I recommend that:

The Suffolk County Council (Beccles Southern Relief Road Scheme - Classified Road) (Side Roads) Order 2015 be modified in accordance with Documents SCC/PI/08, SCC/PI/25 and SCC/PI/26 and thereafter confirmed; and

The Suffolk County Council (Beccles Southern Relief Road) Compulsory Purchase Order 2015 be modified in accordance with Documents SCC/PI/23 and SCC/PI/24 and thereafter confirmed.

M J Whitehead

INSPECTOR

APPENDIX A: APPEARANCES**FOR THE ACQUIRING AUTHORITY (SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL)**

Michael Bedford	QC, instructed by Timothy Earl, Legal Services to Suffolk County Council
He called	
Paget Fulcher BSc(Eng) CEng MICE MCIHT	Technical Director, AECOM Infrastructure & Environment Ltd
Edward Evans BSc(Eng) CEng MICE	Regional Director, AECOM Strategic Highways
Clive Wilkinson BSc(Hons) CEng MICE MIHT	Transport Major Schemes Manager, Suffolk County Council
Simon Neesam BA DipLA MLI	Technical Director, The Landscape Partnership Ltd
Anita Seymour BA(Hons) MRTPI	Development Manager, Strategic Development Resource Management, Suffolk County Council

FOR THE OBJECTORS**Objector 3: Mr William L Hall**

Satnam Choongh	Of Counsel, instructed by Aardvark Planning Law
He called	
Jonathan Cage CEng MICE MCIHT	Create Consulting Engineers Ltd

Objector 7: Ms Gill Griffiths

Annette Stannard	Solicitor
------------------	-----------

Objector 8: The British Horse Society (BHS)

Sadie Tattershall	Local horse rider
Jean Lywood	Suffolk County Access Officer, the BHS

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS

Gina Boltwood	Owner and Occupant of Chenery's Farm
---------------	--------------------------------------

APPENDIX B: DOCUMENTS LIST***CORE DOCUMENTS***

SCC 1	The Suffolk County Council (Beccles Southern Relief Road) Compulsory Purchase Order 2015
SCC 2	The Suffolk County Council (Beccles Southern Relief Road Scheme – Classified Road) (Side Roads) Order 2015
SCC 3	Statement of Reasons Accompanying the making of the Suffolk County Council (Beccles Southern Relief Road) Compulsory Purchase Order 2015
SCC 4	Waveney District Council Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document January 2011
SCC 5	Extract from Waveney District Core Strategy Development Plan Document January 2009
SCC 6	Beccles Area Inset Map
SCC 7	Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft Enterprise Zone Local Development Order: Benacre Road, Ellough, Beccles
SCC 8	Waveney District Council Development Management Policies Development Plan Document January 2011
SCC 9	National Planning Policy Framework
SCC 10	Planning Permission for Construction of Beccles Southern Relief Road
SCC 10A	Environmental Statement: Beccles Southern Relief Road Volume 1
SCC 10B	Environmental Statement Chapter 1: Introduction
SCC 10C	Environmental Statement Chapter 4: Alternatives considered
SCC 10D	Environmental Statement Chapter 5: Planning policy context
SCC 10E	Environmental Statement Chapter 6: Consultation
SCC 10F	Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Topography
SCC 10G	Environmental Statement Chapter 11: Arboriculture
SCC 10H	Environmental Statement Chapter 12: Land condition (contamination)
SCC 10I	Environmental Statement Chapter 13: Hydrology, water quality and drainage
SCC 10J	Environmental Statement Chapter 14: traffic- pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians
SCC 10K	Environmental Statement Chapter 16: Noise and vibration
SCC 10L	Environmental Statement Chapter 17: Air quality
SCC 10M	Environmental Statement Chapter 18: Archaeology

SCC 10N	Environmental Statement Chapter 19: Ecology and nature conservation
SCC 100	Environmental Statement Chapter 20: Landscape and visual impacts
SCC 10P	Environmental Statement Chapter 21: Summary of impacts, mitigation measures and monitoring
SCC 11	Suffolk County Council Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 27 January 2015
SCC 12A	Suffolk Local Transport Plan 2011-2031 Part 1- Transport Strategy
SCC 12B	Suffolk Local Transport Plan 2011-2031 Part 2- Implementation Plan
SCC 13	Environmental Statement Volume II
SCC 14	Environmental Statement Volume III
SCC 14A	Beccles Southern Relief Road Consultation 2011 Report
SCC 14B	11.1 Tree Survey, Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement
SCC 14C	13.1 Hydrology- Relevant Legislation and Policy
SCC 14D	13.2 Water Quality and Drainage Chapter Terms
SCC 14E	14.1 Non-Motor-Vehicle User Survey Results
SCC 14F	16.2.1 Glossary of terms and abbreviations for noise
SCC 14G	16.3.1 Baseline Noise Surveys
SCC 14H	16.5.1: Table of noise levels at dwellings most affected by Beccles Southern Relief Road
SCC 14I	16.5.2: DMRB Assessment based on the façade with the least beneficial change in noise level
SCC 14J	16.5.3: DMRB Assessment based on the maximum façade noise level
SCC 14K	16.6.1: Input Data to TAG Assessment
SCC 14L	17.1: Air quality objectives and limit values
SCC 14M	17.2: Traffic data & 17.3 Significance criteria
SCC 14N	17.4 Mitigation measures for construction dust
SCC 14O	17.5 Figures
SCC 14P	18.1 Archaeological desk-based assessment
SCC 14Q	19.1 Wildlife legislation
SCC 14R	19.2 Wildlife Sites
SCC 14S	19.3 Table of rare, scarce and/or protected species

SCC 14T	19.4 Target Notes for ecology & 19.5 Ecology impact assessment methodology
SCC 14U	Suffolk Wildlife Trust Consultation
SCC 14V	Beccles Southern Relief Road Design and Access Statement
SCC 14W	Environmental Statement Volume IV: Non Technical Summary
SCC 14X	Great Crested Newt Survey
SCC 14Y	Beccles Southern Relief Road- The approved plans

EVIDENCE

Suffolk County Council

SCC/00/01	Statement of Case for Suffolk County Council
SCC/00/02	Rebuttal Proof of Evidence to Alternative Scheme
SCC/01/01	Proof of Evidence of Clive Wilkinson
SCC/01/02	Appendices to Proof of Evidence of Clive Wilkinson
SCC/01/03	Summary Proof of Evidence of Clive Wilkinson
SCC/01/04	Rebuttal Proof of Evidence of Clive Wilkinson
SCC/02/01	Highways Proof of Evidence of Edward Evans Volume 1
SCC/02/02	Highways Proof of Evidence of Edward Evans Volume 2: Appendices
SCC/02/03	Highways Summary Proof of Evidence of Edward Evans
SCC/02/04	Rebuttal Proof of Evidence and Appendices of Edward Evans
SCC/02/05	Rebuttal Proof of Evidence of Edward Evans to Gillian Griffiths
SCC/03/01	Proof of Evidence of Anita Seymour
SCC/03/02	Appendices 1 to 8 to Proof of Evidence of Anita Seymour
SCC/03/03	Summary Proof of Evidence of Anita Seymour
SCC/04/01	Proof of Evidence of Simon Neesam
SCC/04/02	Appendices to Proof of Evidence of Simon Neesam
SCC/04/03	Rebuttal Proof of Evidence of Simon Neesam
SCC/05/01	Proof of Evidence of Paget Fulcher
SCC/05/02	Appendices to Proof of Evidence of Paget Fulcher
SCC/05/03	Summary Proof of Evidence of Paget Fulcher
SCC/05/04	Rebuttal Proof of Evidence and Appendices of Paget Fulcher
	<i>Objector 3: Mr William L Hall</i>
OBJ3/01/01	Proof of Evidence of Jonathan Cage and Appendices A and B

- OBJ3/01/02A** Proof of Evidence of Jonathan Cage Volume 2 Appendices C to E
- OBJ3/01/02B** Proof of Evidence of Jonathan Cage Volume 3 Appendices F and G
- OBJ3/01/02C** Proof of Evidence of Jonathan Cage Volume 4 Appendices H and I
- OBJ3/01/02D** Proof of Evidence of Jonathan Cage Volume 5 Appendix J
- OBJ3/01/02E** Proof of Evidence of Jonathan Cage Volume 6 Appendix K
- OBJ3/01/03** Summary Proof of Evidence of Jonathan Cage

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

Submitted by Suffolk County Council

- SCC/PI/01** Opening Statement on behalf of Suffolk County Council, submitted on 16 August
- SCC/PI/02** Drawing No WSP-5406-HML-0101D: Layout & Long Section Sheet 1 of 2, submitted on 16 August
- SCC/PI/03** E-mail from Savills, dated 15 August 2016 regarding withdrawal of objection by Mr Steve Earl, submitted on 16 August
- SCC/PI/04** E-mail from Savills, dated 15 August 2016 regarding withdrawal of objection by Seppings, submitted on 16 August
- SCC/PI/05** E-mail from Savills, dated 15 August 2016 regarding withdrawal of objection of Collen, submitted on 16 August
- SCC/PI/06** Evidence of Paget Fulcher Errata, submitted on 16 August
- SCC/PI/07** Plans showing the location of photographs in appendix to Proof of Evidence of Paget Fulcher, submitted on 16 August
- SCC/PI/08** Modified Side Roads Order and Schedule, submitted on 16 August
- SCC/PI/09** Modified Side Roads Order Plan, submitted on 16 August
- SCC/PI/10** Equestrian Routes & Facilities Map, submitted on 16 August
- SCC/PI/11** Copy of Licence between Beccles Townlands Charity and Suffolk County Council relating to permissive bridleway use by the public of Public Footpath 3, dated 15 August 2016, submitted on 16 August
- SCC/PI/12** Letter, dated 16 August 2016 confirming compliance with statutory requirements in respect of the Orders, submitted on 16 August
- SCC/PI/13** Extract from Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 10 Part 2 HA 59/92: Mitigating Against Effects on Badgers, submitted on 17 August
- SCC/PI/14** Extract from Options for the new Waveney Local Plan, April 2016-Infrastructure and Transport, submitted on 17 August
- SCC/PI/15** Record of Accident Ref SCEA6922314 on the A145 London Road, submitted on 17 August

- SCC/PI/16** Extract from Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 6 TD 42/95: Geometric Design of Major/Minor Priority Junctions, submitted on 17 August
- SCC/PI/17** Plan of alternative route roundabout and Chenery's farm access, submitted on 17 August
- SCC/PI/18** Copy of General Certificate in Support of Order Submission, dated 8 December 2015, submitted on 18 August
- SCC/PI/19** Letter, from Savills, dated 18 August 2016 confirming withdrawal of objection by Mr Steve Earl, submitted on 18 August
- SCC/PI/20** Letter, from Savills, dated 18 August 2016 confirming withdrawal of objection by Mr and Mrs Seppings and Mrs Seppings, submitted on 18 August
- SCC/PI/21** Letter, from Savills, dated 18 August 2016 confirming withdrawal of objection by Mr and Mrs B Collen, Mr and Mrs N Collen and H J Collen & Sons, submitted on 18 August
- SCC/PI/22** Letter from Gillian Griffiths and Annette Stannard, dated 17 August 2016, confirming withdrawal of objection by Gillian Griffiths, submitted on 18 August
- SCC/PI/23** Amended CPO Plan Sheet Number 60282184-SKE-00-BECC-C-0021, submitted on 18 August
- SCC/PI/24** Extract from amended CPO Plan giving area of rights parcels in square metres, submitted on 18 August
- SCC/PI/25** Amended SRO Plan Sheet Number 60282184-SKE-00-BECC-C-0012, submitted on 18 August
- SCC/PI/26** Amended SRO Plan Sheet Number 60282184-SKE-00-BECC-C-0014, submitted on 18 August
- SCC/PI/27** Site Visit Itinerary, submitted on 18 August
- SCC/PI/28** Closing Submissions on behalf of Suffolk County Council, submitted on 18 August

Submitted for Objector 3: Mr William L Hall

- OBJ3/PI/01** Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 6 Section 2 Part 3 TD 16/07: Geometric Design of Roundabouts
- OBJ3/PI/02** Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 6 Section 1 Part 1 TD 9/93 – Amendment 1: Highway Link Design
- OBJ3/PI/03** Drawing No 01/101: Indicative Route of Southern Dev/Relief Road
- OBJ3/PI/04** Closing Submissions on Behalf of Mr William L Hall (Plot 6; Objector No 3)

Submitted by Objector 8: British Horse Society

- OBJ8/PI/01** Copy of Statement given orally at the Inquiry by Mrs Sadie Tattershall

OBJ8/PI/02 Copies of e-mails, dated 17 August 2016 and 16 August 2016 from Jean Lywood, British Horse Society, with details of the statement given orally at the Inquiry by Jean Lywood

GENERAL INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

X/01 Inspector's Dossier

X/02 Statutory Tests

X/03 Records of Attendance