

REPORT ON THE HEARING OF MILTON PARISH COUNCIL'S OBJECTION ON -
JULY 5th., and 7th., 1972; OBJECTION NO.74; DAYS 65 and 66.

1985 (1984) - I opened the Council's evidence at 5 p.m. on July 5th by reading the Council's Statement (approved July 4th.) and Counsel for the Secretary of State then questioned me until 6 p.m., mainly on the alternative route H1.

As the Parish Council met to review the situation on Thursday July 6th (see Minute 1984) I report as from 10.30 a.m. July 7th. I commenced the day's proceedings by stating the Council could at their discretion, withdraw the route H1 if the three concessions asked for were granted.

Mr. Forbes, Mr. Nurse and Mr. Summerfield were present to support the Council's objection.

The Engineer, Mr. Lawrence read his rebuttal evidence and from his answers to several questions I put we learnt the following:

The first two conditions are met (i.e. ground-level road and interchange, and the latter to the west of the A.10)

He regretted it was not possible to give an undertaking on the third - to build both by-passes together; the Northern By-Pass being the Dept. of the Environment's concern but a Milton By-Pass being that of the Regional Controller (Divisional Engineer).

Route H1. The extra cost would be some £455,000 as it necessitated a viaduct 790 feet long to cross Chesterton junction rail sidings; a small saving in length had been credited. The route would run alongside the proposed Science Park and cut the proposed Market area in two - both, he thought, undesirable effects. The City Sewage Farm are also pressing for land on its southern boundaries, where the route H1 would pass. It is also closer to Fen Ditten than the published route.

After pressing him with questions about an interchange and pointing out to the Inspector the complete lack of any details allowed to the Parish Council, the Dept. of the Environment provided us with a sketch map. This showed an interchange sited on the old Military Camp to the west; a Milton By-Pass would be carried over the Northern By-Pass and slip roads connected to the A.10 near Bene't Farm (and near King's Hedges). The present A.10 would be cut and abandoned for a length from near Bene't Farm to King's Hedges. Mr. Lawrence also replied that the cost of building both together would be 'marginal' and would give no opinion when a Milton By-Pass would get into the programme.

The Dept. had withdrawn and revised the original traffic figures and now it appeared that the increase in traffic through Milton would be about 18% due to the Western and Northern By-Passes.

Asked for publication date of detailed interchange proposals he said they would be included in the Draft Side Road Orders to be published on a date now revised to March, 1973. Further revision of this date was now likely pending the publication of the Inspector's Report on this Inquiry (originally due in September). The Inspector thought March was very 'optimistic' for the publication of his Report !

Mr. Lacey (County Surveyor) then questioned Mr. Lawrence. Likely cost of a Milton By-Pass would be about £250,000. The saving on the Northern By-Pass by being at ground-level was some £200,000. Mr. Lacey suggested this sum could be used to build a Milton By-Pass. Mr. Lawrence thought that the Dept. of the Environment would consider savings on trunk road construction to be used for general road works and not for local benefit.

Replying to Mr. Lacey, Mr. Lawrence denied it had been revised to ground-level to avoid steep slip-roads but had been done to avoid cost of infill and improve amenity.

I then questioned Mr. Lacey and sought assurance that we should be kept informed of progress in the planning of a Milton By-Pass, which he gave. He could give us no date of publication.

Mr. Lacey then made a statement. He said the County Council would support the view that the construction of the Northern By-Pass and the Milton By-Pass concurrently is sensible and would ask that this narrow accounting approach does not serve best the overall or national interest. The revised proposals saved enough to pay for the Milton By-Pass. He considered the Milton By-Pass an accommodation made highly desirable, if not essential, by the construction of the Northern By-Pass.

He thought the link road (near Bene't Farm) barely adequate and there could be a more satisfactory alignment at Bene't Farm without a sharp bend. In reply to this Mr. Lawrence suggested a T-junction just south of Bene't Farm, and in reply to the Inspector said a T-junction would save several thousand pounds.

I then thanked the Inspector for his very fair and patient hearing, and Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Lacey, and rested the case.

I attended the final days of the Inquiry to hear the closing speeches and to take the opportunity of having a final discussion with Mr. Lawrence.

He agreed to keep in consultation with the Council and also readily volunteered to address another Public Meeting, if one were held, when the final interchange and side road plans are published.

K.P.Humphries 7th., July 1972.

• + •

The Clerk is indebted to Mr. Nurse for the following Report to whom he wishes to express his thanks.

PARISH COUNCIL MEETING, 25/7/72, in the VILLAGE HALL, at 7.45p.m.

1986 - WASTE LAND
COLES RD. (1969)

Present: Mr. L.M. Forbes (in the Chair);
Mrs. M. Jones, Mrs. B. Waterson, Mr. H. Easy,
Mr. P. Kiddle, Mr. R.T. Summerfield, Mr.
M.J.D. Nurse. The Clerk sent apology for
absence due to illness.

Mr. Summerfield presented the account of a meeting between Mr. Cockerall and Mr. Mantz of Cooper Brothers & Co, and Mr. Nurse and himself from the Parish Council. The following points were made on behalf of the Parish Council.

(i) That the area marked (c) on the map, ref. G.C.8 and forming the gift of land from Cooper Brothers should include the access area to the road in Coles road. Mr. Cockerall promised to discuss this with Mr. Cooper and report back on this point.

(ii) That the areas marked (a) and (b) on the map should be sold to the Parish Council for £250 plus legal fees. This was unlikely to be accepted because as Receivers they were bound to accept the highest offer which was the earlier offer of £360.

(iii) If the above was not acceptable that area (b) should be sold to the Parish Council for £150 plus legal fees. Mr. Cockerall agreed to forward this proposal to the Receiver and suggested that this should be formally proposed as an offer for areas (b) and (c)