

**Anglian Water Works – Shotesham Road Junction, Poringland  
November 2015**

**The following update has been received from Norfolk County Council which explains the necessity for the works.**

\*\*\*\*\*

This has been a problematic job from day one. You are of course aware of the water issues throughout Poringland and this particular one was a visible leak that, despite the upcoming major replacement programme, was deemed sufficiently severe that a resolve was required prior to that work commencing.

In general Anglian Water are able to repair a water leak within three to five working days, however when works commenced on this they initially had problems locating the leak so required further excavation. Following this they found that the area of pipe that required a repair was beneath some BT services, and in order to access this they needed BT on site so were somewhat at their mercy in terms of dates of attendance. Whilst waiting the site was “mothballed” until such time as they could effect a repair.

When BT attended they decided that they were unable to move their service so this further complicated the repair and now necessitates Anglian Water re-aligning their service.

In respect of the traffic management, the early stages were carried out without positive TM but as the leak proved both complex and hard to locate the site has expanded and deepened.

Norfolk County Council initially approved this stage of works to take place with the 4-way signals in place between 0900hrs and 1600hrs and this is one of the permit conditions. When we became aware of the issues on Tuesday evening, I immediately contacted Anglian Water and had further discussion with their contractor to establish what had happened and what could be put in place to minimise the ongoing impact. It appears that the traffic signal application and associated condition should have indicated that they were required 24 hours and, had it done so, we would have coordinated on that basis, this was clearly an error on the part of Anglian Water and one they freely admit. That said we had a lengthy discussion and I was assured that the signals were required for safety reasons, for the crews involved, the travelling public and pedestrians. This insistence is something we have queried on a number of occasions since and on each occasion have received assurances that the risk assessments indicate the necessity of the traffic signals. With that in mind we would be wrong to request/demand their removal which I am sure you will understand. However in order to try and mitigate the inevitable congestion on this busy road we have insisted that the traffic signals be manually controlled between 0730hrs to 0900hrs and 1630 to 1830hrs-1900hrs which is in line with the traffic sensitivity banding for this road.

The inspector for the area has attended site on two occasions this week, once as part of his inspection regime and once accompanied by the NCC senior inspector

and on both occasions has been happy with the Traffic Management set up. One thing we did query and, this has been picked up on in another thread, was questioning the need for the temporary pedestrian crossings. Whilst AW have made the rear of the footway available during the day there are numerous occasions when this will not be possible because of the various operations taking place and they have an obligation to ensure the safety of any member of the public approaching the site so this falls in line with national guidelines and our inspectors agree this was the case.

To date we have had to further extend the permit to tomorrow, and the ongoing issues engineering, caused by an aging service and the BT plant at that location, means that even that date is unlikely to be met and a further extension has been requested. We are currently in discussions with AW on how and when these works will be further progressed and as ever this will have done this in consideration of the network impact, potential water damage to the highway and maintaining a continuous water supply to individuals and businesses.

It is unfortunate, and frustrating, that Anglian Water have not amended their permit conditions to reflect the actual occupation times and we will be seeking to fine them for this lapse, obviously misinformation only goes to exacerbate an already difficult situation.

Obviously when anyone drives or walks through a site they do so as a "moment in time" and whilst the necessity for safety measures not be immediately obvious I would not wish to compromise the safety of the site or any member of the travelling public.

Whilst I understand the frustrations that this works is causing, and has caused, please be assured that we are continuing to do what we can to expedite the works and also reduce the impact.

\*\*\*\*\*

**5<sup>th</sup> November 2015**