Correction to INQ/081 - RVR Note on Proposed Mill Stream Footpath Crossing

- 1. INQ/081 comprises the following:
 - Capita Technical Note: Flooding to footpath SAL/31/1 ("FP31") diversion
 - Note dated 17 July from RVR (Gardner Crawley) entitled "Footpath Diversion S&R 31 including drawing entitled Mill Stream Bridge Site Plan RVR UB12 001 FP dated 10 October 2013
 - Technical note from RVR (John Sreeves) entitled "Footpath Diversion S&R31" dated 10 July 2021
 - Extract from Planning Inspectorate Order Decision on the Suffolk County Council (Parishes of Creeting St Mary and Needham Market) (Creeting St Mary Footpath 39 (Part) (Gypsy Lane Crossing) Rail Crossing Diversion Order 2018.
- 2. With regard to the Capita note, in Table 1 (Frequency of flooding), column 4 in line 3 should read 51 (rather than 57). This is corrected below. It has no effect on the average number of times the footpath flooded per year and thus column 5 remains correct and the conclusions of the report have not changed.

Location	Footpath Elevation, mAOD	Derived threshold flow at Udiam, m ³ /s	Estimated number of times water levels exceeded footpath elevation since 1977	Average number of times footpath flooded per year ^[1]
Mill Stream Railway Bridge, lower section of diverted footpath	8.618	28.0	114	Two to three
Mill Stream Railway Bridge, upper ledge section of diverted footpath	9.118	39.4	57	One to two
Existing footpath, level at which assumed to flood based on bank levels	9.2	41.0	51	One to two

- 3. The RVR note dated 17 July explained that, following consultation at the planning permission stage, RVR proposed that FP31 should be diverted using a new bridge No 12 over the Mill Stream and under the railway, as shown on drawing RVR-UB12-001 FP appended to the note.
- 4. The note stated that in its grant of planning permission Rother DC included a list of approved drawings including RVR-UB12-001 FP.
- 5. In fact, planning permission RR/2014/1608/P does not refer to this drawing, although the list of approved drawings includes plan B-2 (copy attached) which shows the diversion of FP31 by means of Under Bridge 12.
- 6. It is worth noting that condition 8 (Bridge design condition) of the planning permission requires detailed drawings of the siting, design and external appearance of all bridges (including mammal paths or tunnels) to be submitted to and approved by the local planning

^[1] The frequency of flooding was sensitivity tested using flows within +/- 5% of the threshold flow specified.

authority and also that the bridges are to be constructed in accordance with the approved drawings.

Winckworth Sherwood LLP

22 July 2021

