

# A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction

**Scheme Number: TR010037**

**Volume 5**

## **5.2 Annex M: Table Evidencing Regard had to Statutory Consultation Responses**

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed  
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

March 2021

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning  
(Applications: Prescribed Forms  
and Procedure) Regulations 2009**

The A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction  
Development Consent Order 202[X]

---

**5.2 CONSULTATION REPORT ANNEX M  
ANNEX N: TABLE EVIDENCING REGARD HAD TO STATUTORY  
CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

---

<b>Regulation Number:</b>	5(2)(q)
<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b>	TR010037
<b>Application Document Reference</b>	TR010037/APP/5.2
<b>BIM Document Reference</b>	HE551492-GTY-LSI-000-RP-ZH-31014
<b>Author:</b>	A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction Project Team, Highways England

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
Rev.1	March 2021	Application Issue

## CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>OVERVIEW.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>TABLES EVIDENCING REGARD HAD TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES.....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Statutory consultation under Section 42(1)(a) of the Planning Act 2008 .....	2
2.2	Statutory consultation under Section 42(1)(b) of the Planning Act 2008 .....	37
2.3	Statutory consultation under Section 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008 .....	72
2.4	Statutory consultation under Section 47 and Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008 .....	111

## 1 OVERVIEW

- 1.1.1 The tables provided below evidence the regard had to responses received to the Applicant's statutory consultation (3 June 2019 to 11 July 2019) and targeted statutory consultation (3 August 2020 to 3 September 2020) for the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction scheme (the Scheme), in accordance with section 49 of Planning Act 2008.
- 1.1.2 Each table summarises responses received, sets out whether a change has been made in response to it, and details the Applicant's response, including the regard had to the consultation response.
- 1.1.3 There are three separate tables covering each individual strand of statutory consultation. The first table addresses feedback from section 42(1)(a) and (b) consultees. The second table addresses feedback from Section 42(1)(d) consultees. The third table addresses feedback from section 47 and section 48 consultees. Spelling mistakes and grammatical errors in the feedback submitted to the Applicant have not been corrected in the received comments set out below.



## 2 TABLES EVIDENCING REGARD HAD TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES

### 2.1 Statutory consultation under Section 42(1)(a) of the Planning Act 2008

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Air quality	Reducing public exposures to non-threshold pollutants (such as particulate matter and nitrogen dioxide (NO <sub>2</sub> )) below air quality standards has potential public health benefits. We support approaches which minimise or mitigate public exposure to non-threshold air pollutants, address inequalities (in exposure), and maximise co-benefits (such as physical exercise) and encourage their consideration during development design, environmental and health impact assessment, and development consent.	Public Health England	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1) contains an air quality impact assessment (see Chapter 5 - Air Quality). The air quality assessment has concluded there will be no significant effects on air quality at human health and ecological receptors as a result of the Proposed Scheme.
Air quality	It was noted that at this time detailed traffic data was not available to enable operational phase air quality assessments.	Public Health England	N	Traffic data was subsequently made available to enable operational phase air quality assessments to be undertaken. See Chapter 5 - Air Quality of The Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Air quality	We understand that a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (or similar plan) will be prepared. It is expected that this will include suitable measures for assessment, management and control of potential emissions.	Public Health England	N	Environmental Management Plan (TR010037/APP/7.4) will be included in the DCO submission.
Air quality	Consideration should also be given within the air quality assessment to the impact of any proposed road closures, traffic management, or further restrictions that may be encountered during the construction phase, both on the roads to be developed as part of the scheme and roads in the surrounding area which may be impacted.	Public Health England	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1) contains an air quality impact assessment (see Chapter 5) which contains a construction phase Air Quality Assessment.
Biodiversity	With Highways England's commitment to achieve biodiversity no net loss by 2020 and net gain by 2040, in addition to securing legally compliant mitigation, opportunities should be sought to embed biodiversity net gain as well. We refer to the	Natural England	N	Noted. Net gains/losses will be detailed in the Environmental Statement Chapter 8, Biodiversity (TR010037/APP/6.1).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	guidance produced by CIEEM/IEEMA/CIRIA (Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Guidance) for further details.			
Biodiversity	Hoary mullein and bearded fescue were noted to the west of Meadow Farm Meadow (8.5.9) and measures need to be included to conserve these plants in the ES.	Natural England	N	Noted. Ecological assessment and mitigation is considered in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity and associated appendices in the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Biodiversity	Section 8.8.7 considers potential mitigation measures arising from construction in relation to water voles. Our view is that specific mitigation will be required under a displacement licence from Natural England. Ideally water vole should be displaced to an area of suitable habitat - potentially the new re-aligned channel of the Cantley Stream. New replacement habitat should be made available before the final dewatering of the original channel. The new section of channel should be wetted and allowed to mature before any protected species are displaced and relocated. Water vole and their burrows are fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). The success of any displacement will rely on the establishment of quality alternative habitat prior to the de-watering of the old course of the stream. This could tie in with mitigation and compensation measures for other species including otter, bird and invertebrate species. Due to the difficulties associated with creating new riparian habitat, this aspect of the project will require particular attention well before the final de-watering and diversion of the Cantley Stream.	Natural England	N	We will be obtaining a licence for the displacement of water voles and are aware that their conservation is paramount in this procedure. Discussions have been held to discuss receptor sites and are reported in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Climate change	Please be aware that the next set of climate change projections (UKCP18) replacing UKCP09 came out at the end of 2018. The Environment Agency are currently assessing UKCP18 and we will be updating our guidance to reflect the new climate change projections. If this guidance is published before the FRA is finalised, you must take note of this updated guidance and discuss with us whether you need	Environment Agency	N	Current DMRB Guidance LA114 requires Chapter 14 - Climate of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1) to account for the latest climate change projections and we have used UKCP18 projections for the high emissions scenario for the 2080s in

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	to change the climate change scenarios to follow the new guidance. We have attached a brief note with more detail on UKCP18 and how the planning process needs to take account of this. For the majority of planning applications our existing guidance detailed below still applies. You must assess and determine what climate change projections you need to work to.			our assessment. Climate change allowances have been agreed through consultation with the Environment Agency.
Climate change	As the proposals will be considered as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) you should refer to the National Policy Statement for National Networks paragraphs 4.41 - 4.44. It is important that the impact of and resilience to future flooding is considered and mitigation against future flood risk elsewhere is implemented where necessary. Section 4.41 of the NPS states that if transport infrastructure has safety-critical elements and the design life of the asset is 60 years or greater, the applicant should apply the UK Climate Projections 2009 (UKCP09) high emissions scenario against the 2080 projections at the 50% probability level. UKCP09 relative sea level rise projections are available for three emission scenarios for the 10th, 50th and 90th percentiles. They are available on the UKCP09 user interface on their website. These allowances should be used to inform the design and mitigation of the crossing. You will also need to determine the lifetime of the crossing. If the lifetime is significantly beyond 2115 we recommend that mean sea level rise projections are extrapolated out to 2200 using a linear approach, based on the rate of rise between 2105 and 2115. Safety critical elements of the design should be assessed against the H++ estimates (high risk, low probability scenario) for sea level rise to assess a credible maximum scenario. We would not normally expect the design or mitigation to be provided to this level but the crossing should be assessed against this scenario to understand the picture of risk. This data is also available on the UKCP09 website.	Environment Agency	N	Appropriate 'extreme' climate change allowances have been modelled, where required, including H++ scenario. The Scheme is not subject to tidal flooding. See Chapter 14 - Climate of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).



Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Climate change	<p>UKCP18 provides sea level rise projections for 2100 - 2300. The update of Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances will include advice on using these projections. In the meantime, for development with a longer than 100 year lifetime e.g. large urban extensions, new settlements, major infrastructure, you should contact your local the Environment Agency office for advice on how to calculate such allowances. Where it is appropriate to use the sea level rise information in UKCP18 as described in this briefing note, planning decisions should do so from now onwards, in order to ensure planning decisions are in line with policies in the National Planning Policy Framework. However, where local plans or development proposals and associated flood risk assessments are well advanced, it will usually be acceptable to make decisions based on the allowances and advice in Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances (published Feb 2016) in the following circumstances: local plan has been submitted for examination (before or on the day UKCP18 is published); or - development proposals are well advanced or where a valid planning application has already been submitted to the local planning authority (before or on the day UKCP18 is published). When the climate change allowances are updated, the supporting guidance will be updated at the same time to address user feedback collated since Feb 2016. Once Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances has been updated, over time we will update our flood risk modelling to reflect the revised climate change projections. This modelling work is principally done to inform our flood risk management activities, but we will continue to share this work with planners (for SFRAs) and developers (for site-specific FRAs) when it becomes available. Where the modelling needed by planners and developers has not yet been undertaken, we may be able to work together to do this work more quickly and to share the costs. Where this is not possible, the onus will be on planners</p>	Environment Agency	N	Climate change allowances have been agreed through consultation with the Environment Agency. See Chapter 14 - Climate of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	and developers to undertake the necessary work at their own cost. Contact your local Environment Agency office to find out when they plan to update their flood risk modelling and to discuss working together.			
Project Management	NC would want to minimise the amount of construction vehicles on site, so the re-use of excavated material on site would be welcomed.	Norfolk Constabulary	N	Noted. Areas within the site have been identified for bunding/landscaping works that will use some of the material excavated as part of the Scheme works.
Cycling	Cycle Routes: These must be considered throughout the scheme to enable (where possible) cyclists to be kept away from the main trunk road carriageway. NC has noted that local cycling groups have been consulted as 'Local Interest Groups'.	Norfolk Constabulary	N	We acknowledge these comments and cyclists have and will continue to be considered throughout the Scheme.
Design	Impact on Network Rail Infrastructure Based on the enclosed plan – 'Map of the proposed scheme' (produced as part of the Highways England' A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction Improvement proposal), the proposed widening of the existing rail bridge would take place over the railway. Highways England will therefore need to engage with Network Rail with regards to the proposed scheme and associated bridge widening works.	Network Rail	N	The Scheme design does not require interference with the Network Rail infrastructure including widening of the bridge. It is therefore envisaged Network Rail engagement will not be essential at this stage, however Network Rail will be informed in regard to the Scheme in due course.
Design	In respect of existing NGET and NGG infrastructure, both will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus including compliance with relevant standards for works proposed within close proximity of its apparatus.	National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET) and National Grid Gas PLC (NGG)	N	Utilities will be diverted where it is not possible to retain the existing utilities. Works shall be carried out keeping the safe distance from over-ground and underground services. Exclusion zone with goal post or similar marking shall be provided from the utility's infrastructures. Construction drawings, Safety, Health and Environment box will be updated with any utilities (underground and overhead) in the close proximity of the proposed structure. Also, a Risk Assessment and Method Statement will

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				be prepared before carrying out the works.
Design	We welcome the proposal under 12.7.1 to connect Cantley Lane to Cantley Lane South for walkers, cyclists and horse riders as part of the scheme.	Natural England	N	We appreciate this feedback and support for the new A47 WCH overbridge.
Design	NC are in favour of the new and improved footbridge which I see will assist to encourage members of the traveling public to use alternative and more economically friendly modes of transport.	Norfolk Constabulary	N	We appreciate this feedback and support for the new A47 WCH overbridge.
Design	The residents at East Lodge near Thickthorn roundabout would be adversely affected by the proposed link road from the B1172 to Cantley Lane South. The Norwich Road B1172 is proposed to be widened and moved closer to this dwelling. As their local councillor I have visited them and taken photographs.	Cllr Phil Hardy, South Norfolk Council	N	The proposed junction has been developed as a ghost island junction based on anticipated traffic flows. The junction has been developed to the west of East Lodge and this is considered to be the optimum location for the junction. The main purpose of the proposed road from B1172 to Cantley Lane South is to replace the current junctions on the A47 diverge and A11 which are currently sub-standard and are being severed as part of the new A11-A47 connector road which is being provided as part of this Scheme.



Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design	<p>The report identifies how non-motorised user (NMU) will be impacted through the loss or change in formal Public Rights of Way (PRoW), open space and the existing road network. Active travel forms an important part in helping to promote healthy weight environments and as such it is important that any changes have a positive long-term impact where possible. Changes to NMU routes have the potential to impact on usage, create displacement to other routes and potentially lead to increased road traffic collisions. The NMU routes do not appear to have been surveyed in order to identify the nature and frequency of their use. This will help determine the potential impact on NMU but also the potential for the scheme design to contribute to improved NMU infrastructure and connectivity. This is particularly important in order to assess the impact of the loss of BR5. There are no baseline data and assessments on the impact on NMU of the existing road network as a result of construction and operation of the scheme. A scheme of this scale and nature can also provide opportunities to enhance the existing infrastructure that supports active travel and we expect the proposal to contribute to improved provision for active travel and physical activity.</p>	Public Health England	N	<p>Although the results are not presented in the PEIR, comprehensive surveys were undertaken of the key walking, cycling and horse-riding (WCH - formerly NMU) routes/facilities in the area of Thickthorn Junction, the A11/Round House Way roundabout and Cantley Lane/Cantley Lane South. These surveys were conducted during school term time [2 weekdays, a Saturday and Sunday] and during the school summer holiday period [2 weekdays, a Saturday and Sunday] in 2017 to provide information on current usage. The full results of the surveys are presented Chapter 14 – Population and Human Health of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1). With regard to bridleway BR5 and the existing Pegasus crossing facility at Thickthorn junction, which will be removed as part of the proposed Scheme, the surveys indicated that these facilities are not used. This lack of usage accords with the feedback from Norfolk County Council's (NCCs) Active Travel Officer and the Highways Manager South who confirmed that there was no evidence of either the Pegasus crossing or the adjacent bridleway ever being used. The surveys indicated that both pedestrians and cyclists make use of the existing footbridge which provides a connection between Cantley Lane and Cantley Lane South even though the overbridge only has footpath status, namely it</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>carries PRoW Cringleford FP4a. The Scheme includes the provision of a new overbridge to maintain the connection between Cantley Lane and Cantley Lane South. This new grade separated facility will be suitable for pedestrian, cyclist and equestrian use, as requested by NCC. The Scheme also includes the provision of a new shared footway/cycleway on the eastern frontage of the proposed Cantley Lane Link to provide a connection between Cantley Lane South and the existing walking and cycling facilities present on B1172 Norwich Road. A full assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on WCH routes and facilities is provided within Chapter 12 - Population and Human Health of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).</p>
Design	<p>Ground levels above our cables must not be altered in any way. Any alterations to the depth of our cables will subsequently alter the rating of the circuit and can compromise the reliability, efficiency and safety of our electricity network and requires consultation with National Grid prior to any such changes in both level and construction being implemented.</p>	<p>National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET) and National Grid Gas PLC (NGG)</p>	N	<p>This comment is noted and formal C4 requests have been submitted to each utility company impacted by the scheme to understand their affected infrastructure and what works are required to divert or protect where infrastructure is affected.</p>
Design	<p>Statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times. Any proposed buildings must not be closer than 5.3m to the lowest conductor. National Grid recommends that no permanent structures are built directly beneath overhead lines.</p>	<p>National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET) and National Grid Gas PLC (NGG)</p>	N	<p>This comment is noted and formal C4 requests have been submitted to each utility company impacted by the scheme to understand their affected infrastructure and what works are required to divert or protect where infrastructure is affected.</p>



Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design	Plant, machinery, equipment, buildings or scaffolding should not encroach within 5.3 metres of any of our high voltage conductors when those conductors are under their worse conditions of maximum 'sag' and 'swing' and overhead line profile (maximum 'sag' and 'swing') drawings should be obtained using the contact details above.	National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET) and National Grid Gas PLC (NGG)	N	This comment is noted and formal C4 requests have been submitted to each utility company impacted by the scheme to understand their affected infrastructure and what works are required to divert or protect where infrastructure is affected.
Design	An Asset Protection Agreement is required to be signed before proceeding with any design or construction work alongside, above or below Network Rail's Infrastructure. Prior to any development/construction or alterations to the site by Highways England, further site-specific safety requirements, engineering technical approval and detailed conditions will need to be sought from Network Rail's Anglia Asset Protection team (AssetProtectionAnglia@networkrail.co.uk). The process for obtaining approval is outlined on Network Rail's web page <a href="https://www.networkrail.co.uk/running-the-railway/looking-after-the-railway/asset-protection-and-optimisation/">https://www.networkrail.co.uk/running-the-railway/looking-after-the-railway/asset-protection-and-optimisation/</a> . Network Rail have standard protective provisions which will need to be included in the DCO as a minimum. Highways England should therefore contact [Editor's note: details removed] to request a copy of these and to discuss any other agreements that will need to be entered into with Network Rail. A number of legal and commercial agreements will need to be entered into, for example, asset protection agreements, method statements, connection agreements, property agreements and all other relevant legal and commercial agreements. This list is not exhaustive and will need to be reviewed once more details of the scheme are discussed between the parties. It should be acknowledged that any easement required in relation to the proposed bridge widening over the railway will need to go through Network Rail's clearance process and other rail industry processes. Highways England should be aware that they may be responsible for charges/costs associated to	Network Rail	Y	This comment is noted and where required the necessary processes and consultations will be undertaken. However, the design has since been developed to avoid impacting on the existing railway.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	Network Rail's pre-application engagement in relation to the proposed Interconnector project.			
Design	NC are generally in favour of this scheme as we see it will improve traffic flow, journey time and will in turn reduce collisions, improve driver behaviour and improve road safety.	Norfolk Constabulary	N	We appreciate this feedback and the general support for the Scheme.
EMFs	The current documentation makes no reference to EMF emissions from the development.	Public Health England	N	A proposed structure intersects the high-voltage line at a location, however the structure proposed is an under-bridge i.e. the bridge will be below the existing ground level/road level, as such electric and/or magnetic fields will not have adverse effect to the road users and public health. Where replacement over bridges are proposed, they are proposed away from the high voltage line compared to the existing bridge.
Environment	There appears to be limited scope to create new habitats or link existing ones within the footprint of the scheme boundary.	Natural England	N	This is a road scheme and the land take is being kept to a minimum. Riparian enhancements along Cantley Stream and grassland improvements to the south of the junction for invertebrates are included in the Scheme proposals. These areas are presented in the Environmental Masterplan (TR010037/APP/6.8).
Environment	NC (in serving the general public) would want to see as many natural habitats and species protected as much as is possible with such a large scheme as this construction project is.	Norfolk Constabulary	N	This is a road scheme and the land take is being kept to a minimum. There are opportunities for riparian enhancements along Cantley Stream and grassland improvements to the south of the junction for invertebrates.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Environment	With regard to the felling of the two veteran trees indicated on the Scheme Boundary Plan, veteran trees have great value because they have high biodiversity value. It is Government policy to refuse development that will result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including veteran trees and ancient woodland, unless "there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists" (National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 175). We refer you to further technical information set out in Natural England and Forestry Commission's Standing Advice on Ancient Woodland – plus supporting Assessment Guide and Case Decisions.	The Forestry Commission	N	The Scheme is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project and so the application for a Development Consent Order will be decided by the Secretary of State. We have reported that the loss of veteran trees has a residual large adverse significant effect, which has not been able to be designed out of the Scheme.  Earlier iterations of the Scheme may have impacted four veteran trees (trees 1, 2, 13, 14). Trees 1 and 2 south of the junction will now be retained. Trees 13 and 14 to the north of the A11 (11m and 9m high pedunculate oaks) will be removed (direct impact by Scheme footprint). Proposed mitigation comprising tree planting will take decades to achieve former maturity. See the Environment Masterplan for details (TR010037/APP/6.8).
Environment	If there is no alternative but to fell the two veteran trees it is suggested that the felled trees are removed to the Proposed Shared Greenspace indicated in the Plan, where the material can decay by natural processes and continue to provide valuable deadwood habitat.	The Forestry Commission	N	It can be seen as an opportunity to move the felled veteran trees to an agreed place.
Environment	Rather than hard structures such as earth banks and timber fencing to reduce injuries to road users involved in off road collisions which could lead to more injuries if hard structures are employed.	Norfolk Constabulary	N	Noted. This has been taken into account in the Environmental Masterplan (TR010037/APP/6.8).
Environment	If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the proposal, we request that only slow and low growing species of trees and shrubs are planted beneath and adjacent to the existing	National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC	N	Noted. This has been taken into account in the Environmental Masterplan (TR010037/APP/6.8).



Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	overhead line to reduce the risk of growth to a height which compromises statutory safety clearances.	(NGET) and National Grid Gas PLC (NGG)		
Environment	We would be in favour of the landscaping design.	Norfolk Constabulary	N	Noted.
Environment	NC welcome any method of reducing noise created by highways. We would be in favour of the landscaping design rather than hard structures such as earth banks and timber fencing to reduce injuries to road users involved in off road collisions which could lead to more injuries if hard structures are employed.	Norfolk Constabulary	N	Some fencing and banking is included as part of the design and landscaping will be sympathetic to the local area. This is presented in the Environmental Masterplan (TR010037/APP/6.8).
Environment	With reference to Figure B.2 Environmental Constraints Wider Context in Appendix A, it is unclear why all CWS have been omitted, given the title and purpose of the plan. We strongly recommend that all CWS are added for completeness. (We note that CWS appear separately on Figure 8.1).	Natural England	N	County Wildlife Sites are shown on the Environmental Masterplan, (TR010037/APP/6.8).
Environment	Due to the increase in the length of existing culverts, and the creation of new bridges and underpass structures over the Cantley Stream, the road scheme is likely to result in the net loss of riparian habitat. This issue doesn't yet appear to have been directly addressed in the PEIR.	Environment Agency	N	The PEIR is preliminary information only, more detailed information based on the proposed Scheme design has been used to undertake Environmental Impact Assessment of the Scheme.  A shorter length of the Cantley Stream will be impacted based on design changes and enhancements to riparian habitat are proposed. Discussions are ongoing to include otter ledges in culverts and ensure underpasses and bridges to do not impact bats mobility around the site.
Environment	The PEIR has no detail concerning the methodology to explain how the receptor sensitivity, significance and final determination of significant effects has been decided.	Public Health England	N	The PEIR is a document that details the environmental information available and the surveys that have been undertaken

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				at the time of consultation. The Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1) submitted as part of the DCO application sets out the methodology for assessing receptor sensitivity and significance of effects.
Environment	The proposed mitigation measures should be sympathetic to the local landscape character areas.	Natural England	N	Mitigation is considered in the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1). Species mixes in the Environmental Masterplan (TR010037/APP/6.8) respond to local landscape character.
Environment	Under 8.9.2, an area of this CWS will be lost and need mitigation.	Natural England	N	Impacts from drainage and air quality to the County Wildlife Site have been assessed in The Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1). See Chapter 5 – Air Quality and Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment.
Environment	In relation to County Wildlife Sites (CWS), we note that under 8.5.8: The botanical surveys have confirmed the value of the grassland of Meadow Farm Meadows CWS. This grassland is of county value, although not located within the Study Area. However, it is potentially vulnerable to surface or ground water interception and air quality impacts. Therefore, the CWS retains relevance until such time it is determined that the Proposed Scheme would be unlikely to be impacted from changes in hydrology and air quality. As part of Meadow Farm Meadows CWS lies within the scheme boundary the statement above is unclear. We welcome further investigation and information regarding potential impacts on the CWS from the issues identified above.	Natural England	N	Impacts from drainage and air quality to the County Wildlife Site have been assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1). See Chapter 5 – Air Quality and Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Project Management	I refer to your letter dated 28th May 2019 regarding the Proposed Development. Due to the close proximity of some of our assets, NGET and NGG wish to express their interest in further consultation while the impact on our assets is still being assessed.	National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET) and National Grid Gas PLC (NGG)	N	Engagement with all affected Statutory Undertakers is ongoing to assess impacted assets and identify suitable diversion routes within the Scheme boundary. GS6 survey information has been obtained from NGET and checked against the current Scheme design. There are no proposals to divert or alter NGG and NGET assets.
Project Management	Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of NGET's apparatus, we will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights.	National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET) and National Grid Gas PLC (NGG)	N	Noted. Discussions with the affected Statutory Undertakers are ongoing, to agree Protected Provisions. At current there are no proposals to divert or alter NGG and NGET assets.
Project Management	A number of legal and commercial agreements will need to be entered into, for example, asset protection agreements, method statements, connection agreements, property agreements and all other relevant legal and commercial agreements. This list is not exhaustive and will need to be reviewed once more details of the scheme are discussed between the parties. It should be acknowledged that any easement required in relation to the proposed bridge widening over the railway will need to go through Network Rail's clearance process and other rail industry processes. Highways England should be aware that they may be responsible for charges/costs associated to Network Rail's pre-application engagement in relation to the proposed Interconnector project.	Network Rail	N	The Scheme no longer includes the proposed widening of the existing Cringleford railway bridge, and therefore there are no proposed works on Network Rail owned assets.
Project Management	Network Rail have standard protective provisions which will need to be included in the DCO as a minimum. Highways England should therefore contact [Editor's note: details removed] to request a copy of these and to discuss any other	Network Rail	N	The Scheme no longer includes the proposed widening of the existing Cringleford railway bridge, and therefore there are no proposed works on Network Rail owned assets.



Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	agreements that will need to be entered into with Network Rail.			
Further engagement	We therefore expect to see and be consulted upon the results of the geophysical survey, the WSI for trial trenching, and the results of the trenching prior to the submission of the full ES, as promised by the application at our last site meeting.	Historic England	N	The programme of trial trenching, targeted to the results of the geophysical survey, was implemented in accordance with a written scheme of investigation and trial trench location plan, approved in advance of the works by the County Archaeologist at Norfolk County Council Environmental Services (NCC ES). The results of the trial trenching and recommendations for any further works required will be in accordance with a with NCC ES. Details of the Archaeological assessment can be found in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Further engagement	If this guidance is published before the FRA is finalised, you must take note of this updated guidance and discuss with us whether you need to change the climate change scenarios to follow the new guidance.	Environment Agency	N	Consultation is ongoing with the Environment Agency regarding appropriate climate change allowances.
Project Management	Anglian Water would welcome further discussions with Highways England in relation to existing water and water recycling infrastructure and the extent to which diversion(s) or mitigation will be required prior to the submission of the DCO in Winter 2019.	Anglian Water	N	Noted. The project team has been in consultation with Anglian Water regarding diversions through the NSRWA process.
Further studies	Within the forthcoming Environmental Statement (ES), the area of loss, together with those of new habitats to be created, needs to be presented clearly, together with full details of how new habitats will be created and existing ones improved.	Natural England	N	The areas of each habitat lost and each one created are calculated in Chapter 8, (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Further studies	We note the further work to be undertaken as described in 15.10.2. The ES should reflect this and identify how the development's effects on the natural environment will be influenced by climate change, and how ecological networks will be maintained. The NPPF requires that the planning system should contribute to the enhancement of the natural environment by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures (NPPF Para 109), which should be demonstrated through the ES.	Natural England	N	Noted.
Geotech	Section 9.5.19 - We agree a ground investigation (GI) will be required. It must be ensured that testing includes both soils and groundwater. An appropriate range of chemical testing will be required to reflect the former land use.	Environment Agency	N	Ground investigations have been undertaken and include testing for both groundwater and soils. Appropriate chemical testing has been undertaken.
Further studies	The potential for alterations to flow due to excavation should be assessed in addition to the creation of potential barriers during construction already noted in this section (i.e. foundations and piling). Any changes in groundwater flow should also be assessed in terms of the potential for adversely impacting local groundwater quality. We would like to see full details of dewatering proposals and accompanying monitoring strategies in due course.	Environment Agency	N	Noted, any dewatering requirements have been discussed with the Environment Agency. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Further studies	A robust assessment will be required demonstrating that sufficient treatment steps have been incorporated into the SuDS design to ensure hazardous substances are prevented from entering groundwater and surface waters. The drainage scheme should be designed in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS Manual.	Environment Agency	N	A HEWRAT assessment has been undertaken to determine highway drainage water quality mitigation and the EA Drainage team has been advised. The drainage has been designed in accordance with DMRB requirements. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Further studies	We would like to see a full list of local groundwater abstractions once this information has been compiled (section 14.5.17); groundwater monitoring may be required at	Environment Agency	N	Noted. Groundwater monitoring data is available from the 2018 GI (over the period Jul-18 to Jan-20) and this will be



Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	some sites prior to the works (to establish baseline conditions), and during and after the works to assess impacts. Monitoring data should also be used to assess aquifer surface water continuity.			used to make assessments of Surface Water – Ground Water interactions. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Further studies	More information is required to detail the total loss of riparian habitat, and what mitigation/compensation measures will be put in place along with measures to enable the delivery of biodiversity net gain. The NPPF states that developments should look to provide such net gains, and we note that an objective of this scheme (as referenced in section 3.2.8) is to seek opportunities to improve biodiversity. It may be necessary to consider the offsite provision of alternative restored habitat, or a voluntary contribution towards enhancements at Local Wildlife Sites (Marston Marshes, Eaton common etc.).	Environment Agency	N	Riparian enhancements along Cantley Stream and grassland improvements to the south of the junction for invertebrates are provided as part of the Scheme proposals. These areas are presented in the Environmental Masterplan (TR010037/APP/6.8). The areas of each habitat lost and each one created are calculated in the Chapter 8, (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Further studies	The PEIR identifies the need to assess the potential for cumulative impact from other Schemes within a 2 km radius. The final ES should include rationale for this study area.	Public Health England	N	Noted.
Further studies	We recommend that a baseline noise survey is carried out in such a way as to provide a reliable depiction of local diurnal noise variations for both weekdays and weekends, in a variety of locations, including the difference between day (07:00-19:00), evening (19:00- 23:00) and night-time (23:00-07:00) periods. This is particularly important if there are areas within the scheme assessment boundary with atypical traffic day/evening/night distributions.	Public Health England	N	Baseline noise surveys have been undertaken. See Chapter 11 – Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Further studies	We have made a number of recommendations with regards to the additional assessments which will be undertaken as part of the full ES, in particular in relation to the following: the potential for adverse health outcomes; the significance of noise impacts; the efficacy of proposed noise mitigation strategies; and the dissemination of relevant information to	Public Health England	N	Noted. Assessments undertaken are detailed in the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1). See Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration, Chapter 12 Population and Human Health. This document will be publicly available as part of the DCO submission.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	local communities. These recommendations are discussed in further detail in Appendix 1.			
Drainage	We would ask that further consideration be given to how the location of Anglian Water's existing water and water recycling infrastructure will be considered as part of the proposed junction improvements.	Anglian Water	N	Engagement with all affected Statutory Undertakers is ongoing to assess impacted assets and identify suitable diversion routes within the Scheme boundary.  The project team has undertaken several design workshops with Anglian Water to assess the impacts and identify suitable diversion routes for affected infrastructure.
Further studies	PHE expects an assessment to include consideration of the need for monitoring. It may be appropriate to undertake monitoring where: - Critical assumptions have been made - There is uncertainty about whether negative impacts are likely to occur as it may be appropriate to include planned monitoring measures to track whether impacts do occur - There is uncertainty about the potential success of mitigation measures - It is necessary to track the nature of the impact and provide useful and timely feedback that would allow action to be taken.	Public Health England	N	Each technical chapter of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) outlines any monitoring requirements, submitted as part of the DCO application.
Health and safety	Will the proposed development fall within any of HSE's consultation distances? According to HSE's records there are no major accident hazard installations or pipelines in the vicinity of this proposed Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project for the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction Improvements. Therefore, we would not wish to comment on its siting.	Health and Safety Executive	N	We acknowledge this comment and that there are no HSE records of any major accident hazard installations or pipelines in the vicinity of the junction improvements.
Health and safety	The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing overhead lines is contained within the Health and Safety Executive's ( <a href="http://www.hse.gov.uk">www.hse.gov.uk</a> ) Guidance Note GS 6 'Avoidance of Danger from Overhead Electric Lines' and all	National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET) and	N	We acknowledge this comment and the health and safety guidance which has been highlighted to us. This will be included in the Pre Construction

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance.	National Grid Gas PLC (NGG)		Information pack for any construction works.
Health and safety	Suicide Prevention: It is very important that as this scheme progresses that suicide prevention measures are built into the scheme such as: Barriers, Raised Parapets, Netting (where applicable) and welfare signage.	Norfolk Constabulary	N	The suicide prevention strategy has been developed in consultations with HE, NCC and NC. The document has considered both construction and operational stages and includes secure fencing, anti-climb parapets and intervention notices. All of which will be further developed during the detailed design stage.
Health and wellbeing	We expect within the ES, for proposals to take into consideration the evidence which suggests that quiet areas can have both a direct beneficial health effect and can also help restore or compensate for the adverse health effects of noise in the residential environment [5-7]. We expect the ES to elaborate upon potential noise related impacts to any green spaces in proximity of the scheme, bearing in mind the health and wellbeing benefits of tranquillity spaces and public amenity effects. Such areas have been identified in proximity to the site, within the wider area. Research from the Netherlands suggests that people living in noisy areas appear to have a greater need for areas offering quiet than people not exposed to noise at home. [5]	Public Health England	N	The assessment will identify all noise sensitive receptors, including non-residential receptors such as (END) quiet areas if identified within the study area, and will aim to preserve the tranquillity of these areas. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).



Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Health and wellbeing	<p>We expect to see consideration of the effect on human health of changes in environmental noise levels due to construction and operational phases of the Scheme, including health outcomes such as annoyance, sleep disturbance and cardiovascular effects, in line with the Noise Policy Statement for England aims to “avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life; mitigate and minimise adverse impacts on health and quality of life; where possible, contribute to improvement of health and quality of life. We recommend that the latest evidence published by the WHO and IGCB(N) [1, 2, 3] is taken into consideration when quantifying the effects arising from operational road traffic noise exposure. We recommend that assessments of significance are based on impacts on health and quality of life, and not around noise exposure per se (in line with the NPSE). Furthermore, significance should reflect both the severity of the different health outcomes and the size of the population affected. Other considerations to be considered include: i. The existing noise exposure of affected communities - for example we note that there are 6 designated Noise Important Areas in proximity to the scheme (11.5.8). These are areas with the highest levels of noise exposure at a national level and will require very careful consideration in terms of opportunities for improvement of health and quality of life through noise management; ii. Cumulative exposure to other environmental risk factors, including other sources of noise and air pollution; and iii. Local health needs, sensitivities, and objectives. We expect preliminary conclusions to be revisited to reflect the results from the noise survey, final traffic forecasts and any changes to the scheme as a result of the consultation.</p>	Public Health England	N	<p>The noise assessments aim to mitigate potential Significant Observed Adverse Effect Levels (SOAEL), above which significant adverse effects on health and quality of life occur. The assessments of significance have been made in accordance with the updated DMRB LA111 which sets relevant SOAEL levels for noise and vibration and encourage consideration to local circumstances. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Health and wellbeing	It is important to ensure that any impact on tranquillity in open spaces is identified and assessed within the ES. The significance of effects associated with loss of amenity and visual impact, given the proximity of the junction slip roads on properties, should be assessed and appropriate mitigation specified where necessary.	Public Health England	N	Results from the air quality, noise and visual assessments have been taken into account in the health assessment. In addition, a qualitative assessment of areas of importance to the health and wellbeing of local communities and any impacts on those areas are part of the health assessment. Appropriate mitigation has been specified where necessary. See Chapter - 12 Population and Human Health of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Health and wellbeing	The scheme may have an impact on tranquillity of public open space, which can affect amenity and usage by the local population. This needs to be considered within the ES.	Public Health England	N	Results from the air quality, noise and visual assessments will be taken into account in the health assessment. In addition, a qualitative assessment of areas of importance to the health and wellbeing of local communities and any impacts on those areas are part of the health assessment. See Chapter - 12 Population and Human Health of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Health and wellbeing	An approach to the identification of vulnerable populations has not been provided and does not make links to the list of protected characteristics within an EqlA. The impacts on health and wellbeing and health inequalities of the scheme may have particular effect on vulnerable or disadvantaged populations, including those that fall within the list of protected characteristics. The ES and any EqlA should not be completely separated. The PEIR has no population health data in relation to the wards affected, and so does not necessarily identify the key public health priorities for these	Public Health England	N	The health assessment includes identification of vulnerable populations, as per DMRB. The Population & Health chapter in the ES and the EqlA have been undertaken by the same specialist which will ensure consistency. The ES health impact assessment will follow the guidance as set out in the DMRB. See Chapter - 12 Population and Human Health of the Environmental Statement

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	areas. It is noted that the PEIR states that additional detail on human health will be added to the final ES.			(TR010037/APP/6.1) and the EQIA (TR010037/APP/7.6).
Health and wellbeing	It would be useful to define health, normally the WHO definition, in support of the Dahlgren and Whitehead model and we would expect the specific inclusion of mental health. The final ES should include suitable and sufficient data to identify the populations at risk, vulnerable populations, baseline data, assessment of significance, mitigation measures and proposals for monitoring. The assessments and findings of the ES and any EqIA should be cross referenced between the two documents, particularly to ensure the comprehensive assessment of potential impacts for health and inequalities and where resulting mitigation measures are mutually supportive. In relation to baseline data you should review, as a minimum, local data and public health reports published by the local Director of Public Health, the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA), Health and Wellbeing Board strategies or plans, Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG) / National Health Service (NHS) strategy or plans and the PHE fingertips data. This should be supported by liaison directly with the Director of Public Health, CCGs and NHS to assist in the drafting of the ES. It is also vital that information received through community engagement forms part of the assessment.	Public Health England	N	The WHO definition is included in Chapter - 12 Population and Human Health of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1). Data has been collated to identify health profiles for relevant communities/health wards. The information resources listed has been checked for relevant data. Consultation undertaken as part of the health assessment with the stakeholders as listed, along with information received from public consultation.
Health and wellbeing	We recommend that the proposer: 1. Identify if the proposed development has electricity generation and/or distribution infrastructure that may result in the emission of electric and/or magnetic fields such that there is the potential for an adverse impact on public health. Where electricity generation and/or distribution equipment is identified an assessment of potential EMF exposures should be included; 2. Should the proposer believe that EMF can be scoped out of the assessments they should clearly state their assumptions and rationale in the application for DCO submission.	Public Health England	N	A proposed structure intersects the high-voltage line at a location however the structure proposed is an under-bridge i.e. the bridge will be below the existing ground level/road level. as such electric and/or magnetic fields will not have adverse effect to the road users and public health. Where replacement over bridges are proposed, they are



Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				proposed away from the high voltage line compared to the existing bridge.
Heritage	Given that both of these prehistoric barrows survive with a high degree of integrity, we wish to reiterate our concerns about the likely harm to significance of these assets through a development within their setting.	Historic England	N	The Scheme has been designed as far away from the scheduled monument as possible. A site meeting took place with Highways England and NCC ES to discuss setting.
Heritage	It is also therefore worth re-iterating that we expect to see our concerns about the harm accurately reflected in ES. In particular, the significance and the effects of the junction improvements on these assets would need to be clearly articulated, and a clear and convincing justification needs to be set out to specifically justify the heritage impacts.	Historic England	N	The methodology for the setting assessment carried out in the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1), including viewpoints and specific visualisations, has been discussed and agreed with HE by telecon- to follow best practice Historic England guidance (GPA3), and is in accordance with the requirements of the PINS statutory consultation responses. The benefits of the Scheme will be presented in an introductory chapter of the Environmental Statement.
Heritage	We are also keen to see how the applicant will provide mitigation for these effects. This is not just about embedded mitigation (planting and landscaping), which is noted in the PIER chapter but we want to see a clearly expressed programme of mitigation for these designated heritage assets. This could include on and offsite mitigation, but the ES clearly needs to demonstrate how the mitigation will add public value to offset this harm.	Historic England	N	Offsite mitigation was discussed during July 2020 telecon with HE. A heritage interpretation board will be situated on the Cantley Lane Link overbridge, should a line of sight to the barrows be possible from a publicly accessible place. This was received favourably. Historic England requested that any such board include an interpretation of the wider landscape setting in order to deliver public benefit.
Heritage	In addition the ES will need to address cumulative impacts (particularly noise) and visual impacts (including lighting and night time views), and we expect the full ES to deliver	Historic England	N	As agreed with HE by telecon- The assessment of heritage assets can effectively be demonstrated through use

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>heritage specific viewpoints, clearly illustrated with summer and winter photomontages. We are particularly aware of noise as potential issue and would ask that a non-technical summary of the noise impacts on the designated heritage assets is provided in the heritage chapter. This would need to be aimed at helping us to interpret the technical data and assess the impact.</p>			<p>of LVIA Viewpoints 1 and 2 (Figures 7.6.1a-d and 7.6.2a-d) <b>(TR010037/APP/6.2)</b>, rather than additional heritage-specific viewpoints. There is no requirement for a viewpoint at the barrows themselves. Long-sections will be appropriate to demonstrate the landscape context. It is requested that the visualisations include both existing and mitigation planting. Assessment of setting will consider visual and other environmental factors such as noise, traffic and lighting (including night time views), where relevant. The cultural heritage chapter will be cross-referenced to other chapters or technical appendices; for example noise (including a non-technical summary of the noise impacts on the designated heritage assets provided in the heritage chapter), light, traffic and landscape. Assessment of the likely effect of the Scheme on the contribution that setting makes to the significance of heritage assets is assessed through initial screening for sensitive assets, a narrative discussion of impact is presented, and concluded as an overall magnitude of setting impact, which is also resolved in terms of significance of effect. Cumulative impact is assessed in the Chapter 15 – Cumulative Effects in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>



Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Hydrology	Please be aware that if a surface water (or treated foul water) discharge is proposed to a watercourse within the IDD (either directly or indirectly), then the proposed works may require a land drainage consent in line with the Board's Byelaws (specifically byelaw 3). Any consent granted may be conditional, pending the payment a surface water development contribution fee, calculated in line with the Board's charging policy ( <a href="https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/WMA_Table_of_Charges_and_Fees.pdf">https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/WMA_Table_of_Charges_and_Fees.pdf</a> ).	Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board	N	Noted, consultation ongoing with the IDB. See Chapter - 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Hydrology	Please be aware that the site is near to the Internal Drainage District (IDD) of the Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and so please be aware of the Board's Byelaws.	Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board	N	Noted, consultation ongoing with the IDB. See Chapter - 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Hydrology	Please be aware that if a surface water (or treated foul water) discharge is proposed to a watercourse within the IDD (either directly or indirectly), then the proposed works may require a land drainage consent in line with the Board's Byelaws (specifically byelaw 3).	Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board	N	Noted, consultation ongoing with the IDB. See Chapter - 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Drainage	There are existing water mains, foul and surface water sewers located within the boundary of the site. These assets are critical to enable us to carry out Anglian Water's duty as statutory water and sewerage undertaker. A number of existing sewers and water mains cross the existing A47 or A11 routes which are proposed to be improved as part of the above scheme particularly around the proposed link roads to connect the A147 and A11 and the B1172 to the north. Similarly, there is a foul rising main (pressurised sewer) which crosses the existing roundabout in the vicinity of the proposed fourth additional lane.	Anglian Water	N	Noted, utility companies have been consulted with regards to their existing infrastructure and any diversion / protection works which are required.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
DCO / drainage	It is considered that protective provisions specifically for the benefit of Anglian Water should be included as part of the wording of the Draft DCO. These protective provisions are in addition to that for utility companies as set out in the model provisions for DCO applications. Appendix 1 of this letter outlines the recommended wording for inclusion in the Draft DCO. As set out above there is existing water and water recycling infrastructure managed by Anglian Water within the proposed site boundary. In the event that there is a need for diversions and/or mitigation of existing water mains or sewers we would expect this to be funded by Highways England. As such the wording of the Draft DCO for this project should be drafted on this basis.	Anglian Water	N	Protective Provisions have been developed through consultation with affected utility providers and are included in the Development Consent Order. See (TR010037/APP/3.1).
Hydrology	Section 14.7.5 (and 14.9.3) highlight the potential impacts (and opportunities for enhancements) associated with the proposed new culvert, culvert extension and diversion of Cantley Stream. We understand that the scheme will require the realignment of the Cantley Stream by 550m; a culvert to carry the re-aligned Cantley Stream beneath existing Cantley Lane south carriageway and new underpasses on the A11 to A47 link roads structure SO1 and SO1a, which will require further bridges/ culverts over the Cantley Stream. Culverts and bridges modify the stream channel, and block light to the waterbody, which will impact on the morphology and ecology of the Cantley Stream. The increase in shading that will result from the extended culverts and crossings (structures SO1 and SO1a and culverts) will result in a net loss of aquatic habitat, marginal and aquatic plants and invertebrates along an affected section. Due to the increase in the length of existing culverts, and the creation of new bridges and underpass structures over the Cantley Stream, the road scheme is likely to result in the net loss of riparian habitat. This issue doesn't yet appear to have been directly addressed in the PEIR.	Environment Agency	N	Riparian enhancements along Cantley Stream are provided as part of the Scheme proposals. These areas are presented in the Environmental Masterplan (TR010037/APP/6.8). The stream realignment and culvert detailed design will be developed in consultation with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and Water Environment of the Environment Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Hydrology	<p>The CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753 2015) should be added to the list of Guidance and best practice in 14.2.1. We note the reference in sections 14.5.4 and 14.5.5 to the presence of Flood Zones 2 and 3 within the study area, and the identification of flood risk as a potential impact both during construction (section 14.9.1) and operation (14.9.3). We have therefore taken this opportunity to provide the following information in respect of fluvial flood risk. Our maps show the site lies partly within Fluvial Flood Zone 3a and 2 defined by the Planning Practice Guidance: Flood Risk and Coastal Change as having a high probability of flooding. A proposal such as this for a significant alteration to the A47 / A11 Junction and bridge crossings may be classed in terms of flood risk by the decision maker as Essential Infrastructure, specifically essential transport infrastructure (including mass evacuation routes) which has to cross the area at risk. This is defined in Table 2: Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification of the Planning Practice Guidance.</p>	Environment Agency	N	<p>Noted. This has been considered in the Flood Risk Assessment. Consultation has been undertaken with the LLFA and EA. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).</p>
Hydrology	<p>Section 14.7.4 states that SuDS measures will be used to protect the water quality of Cantley Stream. Currently, the PEIR contains little information about the proposed mitigation of pollutants.</p>	Environment Agency	N	<p>HEWRAT assessment has been undertaken to determine highway drainage water quality mitigation. Drainage designed in accordance with DMRB. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).</p>



Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Drainage	<p>Appropriate SuDS treatment, together with emergency shut-off provision will be required prior to run-off entering the soakaway or discharge to surface waters. In respect of the proposed soakaway, to meet our requirements groundwater level information will be required and the soakaway should be constructed no deeper than 2m. Our infiltration SuDS requirements are provided below: 1. Infiltration sustainable drainage systems such as soakaways, unsealed porous pavement systems or infiltration basins shall only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to the water environment. 2. Infiltration SuDS have the potential to provide a pathway for pollutants and must not be constructed in contaminated ground. They would only be acceptable if a phased site investigation showed the presence of no significant contamination. 3. Only clean water from roofs can be directly discharged to any soakaway or watercourse. Systems for the discharge of surface water from associated hardstanding, roads and impermeable vehicle parking areas shall incorporate appropriate pollution prevention measures and a suitable number of SuDS treatment train components appropriate to the environmental sensitivity of the receiving waters (see comments under section 14.7.4 for further detail). 4. The maximum acceptable depth for infiltration SuDS is 2.0 m below ground level, with a minimum of 1.2 m clearance between the base of infiltration SuDS and peak seasonal groundwater levels.</p>	Environment Agency	N	<p>The comment is noted and the Scheme design incorporates SuDS drainage as required to ensure appropriate and acceptable water quality at outfall. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).</p>
Drainage	<p>For discharges to both surface and groundwater it must be ensured that adequate pollution prevention and control mitigation measures are incorporated into the design of SuDS systems. We would also recommend the addition of a penstock to any design which can contain pollution in the event of a spillage.</p>	Environment Agency	N	<p>The design will incorporate pollution prevention measures such as penstocks. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Drainage	A robust assessment will be required demonstrating that sufficient treatment steps have been incorporated into the SuDS design to ensure hazardous substances are prevented from entering groundwater and surface waters. The drainage scheme should be designed in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS Manual.	Environment Agency	N	Noted. The Scheme drainage has been designed in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS Manual. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Hydrology	In our previous comments on the Scoping Report (letter dated 2 March 2018) for the above project we had asked that consideration be given to all potential risks of flooding including sewer flooding. The PEIR does not refer to sewer flooding (if relevant) or how this would be considered as part of the PEIR and Flood Risk Assessment.	Anglian Water	N	Flood Risk Assessment for the Scheme will include consideration of sewer flooding. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Project Management	At this stage it is unclear whether there is a requirement for wastewater services for the above site. Similarly, it is not made clear whether a potable (clean) water supply is required. We would welcome confirmation whether a connection(s) to the water supply and public sewerage water networks are expected to be required as part of the development.	Anglian Water	N	The project team has been in consultation with Anglian Water regarding diversions through the NSRWA process.
Drainage	The proposed scheme plan and Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEIR) itself does not refer to the existing water and water recycling infrastructure or state whether there it is intended to divert any existing infrastructure or provide mitigation as appropriate.	Anglian Water	N	There is no proposal to incorporate water recycling infrastructure. The Scheme incorporates drainage infrastructure works, diversion of sewers and water course.
Hydrology	It is considered that protective provisions specifically for the benefit of Anglian Water should be included as part of the wording of the Draft DCO. These protective provisions are in addition to that for utility companies as set out in the model provisions for DCO applications. Appendix 1 of this letter outlines the recommended wording for inclusion in the Draft DCO.	Anglian Water	N	Protective Provisions have been developed through consultation with affected utility providers and included in the Development Consent Order. See (TR010037/APP/3.1).

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Hydrology	As the culvert and temporary bridges are considered in, over or under an ordinary watercourse, we recommend that you have discussions with Norfolk County Council Lead Local Flood Authority to see whether an Ordinary Watercourse Consent is required. Any works in the floodplain will potentially need the Environment Agency's permission and more detail on the works and their location would need to be provided to fully assess whether the works need our permission. The Environmental Permitting Regulations take a risk-based approach that enables us to focus regulatory effort towards activities with highest flood or environmental risk. Lower risk activities can be excluded or exempt and only higher risk activities will require a permit. The bridge crossing itself will require a bespoke permit.	Environment Agency	N	Consultation has been undertaken with Norfolk County Council LLFA and the Environment Agency regarding all aspects of the drainage design and flood modelling. See the Flood Risk Assessment contained within Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Project Management	The letter received by the Forestry Commission included a USB memory stick, which had the response form, but the Civil Service is unable to add text to the form because it was in Adobe Acrobat format.	The Forestry Commission		This will be noted for future consultations. Responses to the consultation response form could be emailed or returned via the project's freepost address.
Materials	As no draft is included with the current documentation it is not possible for us to comment on the scope, adequacy or content of the CEMP.	Public Health England	N	The Environmental Management Plan (First Iteration) (TR010037/APP/7.4) is included within the DCO submission.
Materials	Section 10.2.1 - Guidance and best practice requires updating. The reference to Environment Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 (as amended 2011 and 2012) should be amended to the following: - The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 (as amended 2018).	Environment Agency	N	Noted. Updated policy reference has been used.
Noise	We expect decisions about noise mitigation measures to be underpinned by good quality evidence, in particular whether mitigation measures are proven to reduce adverse impacts on health and quality of life [4]. For interventions where evidence is weak or lacking, PHE expects a proposed	Public Health England	N	Noted. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).



Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	strategy for monitoring and evaluating their effectiveness during construction and operation of the Scheme.			
Noise	We note the reference to noise in the Statutory Consultation Brochure, which recognises the potential need for noise mitigation strategies to address noise associated with the construction and operational phases of the Scheme. We encourage the scheme promoter to use best practice techniques to communicate changes in the acoustic environment as a result of the scheme to local communities. For example, immersive sound demonstrations can help make noise and visual impacts intuitive to understand and accessible to a wider demographic and have already been used in major road and rail infrastructure projects.	Public Health England	N	The potential noise impacts are reported in Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1) and graphically presented in the form of noise contours. Best practice during construction will be included in the Environmental Management Plan (TR010037/APP/7.4).
Noise	We expect the Consultation Report to explain how stakeholder responses have influenced the development of the proposal, including any mitigation measures (Statutory Consultation Brochure p9). We also expect the applicant to propose a suitable strategy to ensure the dissemination of findings regarding the effects of noise on health to relevant stakeholders, including noise sensitive receptors impacted by the scheme.	Public Health England	N	Noted, please see Consultation Report (TR010037/APP/5.1) for details.
Noise	One of the residents has [REDACTED] and is distraught by the matter. He is anxious and worries about the adverse noise issues they will suffer as a result.	1027 1072	N	An assessment of operational noise has been carried out and demonstrates that there are no significant adverse or significant beneficial noise effects expected due to changes in road traffic noise. Construction phase noise assessments have been carried out, and areas requiring mitigation have been identified. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Noise	Could a redesign be considered to minimise as far as possible adverse noises impacts from the development on the residents of East Lodge?	1072 1027	N	An assessment of operational noise has been carried out and demonstrates that there are no significant adverse or significant beneficial noise effects expected due to changes in road traffic noise. Construction phase noise assessments have been carried out, and areas requiring mitigation have been identified. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Noise	The existing ambient noise climate at the site has been determined through reference to Defra strategic noise mapping and daytime only historic monitoring data from 2016 (11.5.5). We do not consider these methods to be sufficient to adequately capture the existing local sound environment. We welcome the scheme promoter's commitment to conduct further noise surveys.	Public Health England	N	Noise surveys have been undertaken and are detailed in the Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Noise	We welcome the inclusion of low-noise road surfaces (11.7.1) and the consideration of acoustic barriers. Other mitigation measures may also be considered, such as traffic management.	Public Health England	N	Noted. An assessment of operational noise has been carried out and demonstrates that there are no significant adverse or significant beneficial noise effects expected due to changes in road traffic noise. Construction phase noise assessments have been carried out, and areas requiring mitigation have been identified. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).



Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Property prices	Future occupiers would also have this problem and it would likely affect the house price as demand would like drop for it.	1027	N	<p>Financial compensation under Part I of Land Compensation Act 1973 (a Part I claim) may be claimed in certain circumstances by people who own and also occupy property that has been reduced in value by more than £50 by physical factors caused by the use of a new or altered road.</p> <p>These factors :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noise</li> <li>- Vibration</li> <li>- Smell</li> <li>- Fumes</li> <li>- Smoke</li> <li>- Artificial lighting</li> <li>- Discharge of any solid or liquid substance on to the land.</li> </ul> <p>Such claims may be made one year after the Scheme opens for traffic (estimated for Thickthorn as early 2025) and can be submitted to Highways England for consideration. Each case will be treated on its own circumstances and mitigation evidence will be needed to provide support of any claim.</p>
Protected species	Natural England has reviewed the information contained in the PEIR about the various protected species affected by the proposal and note that further surveys are ongoing and will be used to inform mitigation measures. As a result, we are unable to offer detailed comments at this stage about either construction or operational impacts, although we note there are likely to be severance issues for bats, badgers and otters	Natural England	N	Wildlife surveys have been undertaken. The Habitat Regulation Assessment and Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1) assesses the potential impact to the sensitive areas.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	which will need to be addressed through effective mitigation measures to maintain or create connectivity.			
Project Management	Drilling or excavation works should not be undertaken if they have the potential to disturb or adversely affect the foundations or 'pillars of support' of any existing tower. These foundations always extend beyond the base area of the existing tower and foundation ('pillar of support') drawings can be obtained using the contact details above.	National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET) and National Grid Gas PLC (NGG)	N	Noted. Drawings have been obtained from Statutory Undertaker company.
Traffic management	The overall risk to NMU and impact on active travel should be considered on a case-by case basis, taking into account, the number and type of users and the effect that the temporary traffic management system will have on their journey and safety. Baseline data is required on the nature and frequency of NMU use of the existing NMU routes and the local road network that may be affected by the construction or operation of the scheme. This will inform an assessment using the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) / Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) guidelines regarding NMU amenity, safety and severance issues. Any traffic counts and assessment should also, as far as reasonably practicable, identify informal routes used by NMU or potential routes used due to displacement. The scheme should continue to identify any additional opportunities to contribute to improved infrastructure provision for active travel and physical activity. The opportunity to contribute to NMU infrastructure should be discussed with the local Transport and Highways Departments. The final ES should identify the temporary traffic management system design principles or standards that will be maintained with specific reference to NMU. This may be incorporated within the Code of Construction Practice.	Public Health England	N	<p>The provision of permanent WCH (formerly NMU) routes as part of the Scheme have been defined in Chapter 12 Population and Human Health of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1) and includes identification and assessment of opportunities to improve WCH connectivity in the area of the scheme, and in accordance with DMRB requirements. See Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010037/APP/7.1).</p> <p>During the construction of the Scheme, and where feasible to do so, the connectivity of existing WCH routes will be maintained by either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constructing the permanent WCH routes prior to removing existing ones in the same area.</li> <li>• Providing temporary WCH routes.</li> </ul> <p>Specific measures to achieve these requirements will be detailed in the PCF Stage 5 Traffic Management plan for the scheme.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Traffic management	We are concerned over driver stress levels therefore it is important to ensure these are kept to a minimum by ensuring (during the works) that traffic is allowed to free flow as much as is possible.	Norfolk Constabulary	N	Measures to ensure the free flow of traffic during the works are set out in the scheme Outline Traffic Management Plan (TR010037/APP/7.5) and include consideration of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compliance with the principles set out in Highways England's 'Roadworks: A Customer View' guide.</li> <li>• Implementation of the highest safe speed within roadworks, in accordance with HE guidance.</li> <li>• Selection of construction methodologies to minimise overall disruption to the road user.</li> </ul>
Visual impact	Several properties, particularly along the Cantley Lane South are likely to have effects associated with loss of amenity and visual impact given the proximity of the junction slip roads.	Public Health England	N	The visual effects on these properties will be assessed in Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Waste	We also recommend that the following guidance is added to ensure the appropriate regulation of waste during the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DEFRA's Guidance on the legal definition of waste and its application. Currently dated August 2012</li> <li>- The Environment Agency's Waste Classification - Guidance on the classification and assessment of waste, currently Technical Guidance WM3</li> </ul> To ensure waste is classified correctly, the Environment Agency's Waste Classification Guidance WM3 is to be used as waste should not just be assessed against landfill waste acceptance criteria during ground investigation work. In the event of onwards treatment/recovery/disposal of waste this should allow waste to be taken to the sites holding the appropriate permits and this correct classification will also ensure, if necessary, appropriate permits are in place for any on site treatment of waste.	Environment Agency	N	Noted - this is the methodology and process undertaken.

## 2.2 Statutory consultation under Section 42(1)(b) of the Planning Act 2008

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Environment - ecology	The PEIR states that two transects routes were undertaken between April and October 2017. With static detectors at two locations per transect route. It is not clear from the report how surveys will identify important linear landscape elements. Transect surveys have limited ability to identify spatial and temporal variations in bat activity as they are biased towards the dusk period, and where the surveyor is when the encounter a bat.	Norfolk County Council	N	Ecological assessment and mitigation including details of the bat surveys undertaken is considered in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity and associated appendices in the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Environment - ecology	We recommend that there is greater use of static bat detectors to record bat activity within the site/along linear landscape features (see Stahlscmidt & Bruhl, 2012[1]). We also recommend consideration is given to evaluating bat activity in sub-optimal conditions as this will affect the distribution of prey and affect bat activity patterns. We recommend the use of infra-red/thermal imaging equipment when undertaking emergence surveys of the trees to obtain more accurate population counts, and the use of IR/TI is also important for identifying the height that bats cross the landscape and collision risk modelling. No collision surveys have been undertaken to-date. We would recommend such surveys are undertaken to provide a baseline against which changes post - construction can be measured. We would recommend the use of detector dogs, as these have been shown to be significantly more effective at searching for animals than human surveyors.	Norfolk County Council	N	Ecological assessment and mitigation including details of the bat surveys undertaken is considered in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity and associated appendices in the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).



Environment - ecology	We would recommend that Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is considered that this stage so as to maximise opportunities.	Norfolk County Council	N	Noted. Net gains/losses will be detailed in the Environment Statement Chapter 8, Biodiversity ( <b>TR010037/APP/6.1</b> ).
Hydrology / Drainage	<p>We suggest the following with regard to information requirements for all sources of flooding: If you intend to carry out a river survey to inform the hydraulic modelling of Cantley Stream, any collected data and model produced should include all tributaries.</p> <p>We have included provided information on the flowlines of surface water which may help identify these on the ground if not shown on the Ordnance Survey or Environment Agency Fluvial Flood Map.</p> <p>Any collected topographic survey data should extend across the watercourse and any likely flood plain to enable modelling to accurately represent pre and post development scenarios.</p> <p>New culverts across the tributaries should be designed to an appropriate size to pass the 100 year plus climate change allowance. Any upgrades of culverts should aim to allow the flow of 1 in 100 year plus climate change design event but must also include an assessment to show how passing any additional flow downstream will not adversely increase the current flood risk scenario.</p> <p>If there are any surface water flow paths identified crossing the development area, dry culverts may need to be provide up to the 1 in 100 year plus climate change design event. This would prevent ponding against infrastructure and prevent an increase of flood risk elsewhere. Any new drainage infrastructure should</p>	Norfolk County Council	N	<p>All relevant watercourses are included in the survey/ model and adequately covers the floodplain.</p> <p>Design of culverts is to the 1 in 100 year event plus climate change. The model shows no adverse effect on flood risk downstream.</p> <p>'Dry culverts' are being assessed as part of the proposed Scheme and will be designed to convey the 1 in 100 year flow plus an allowance for climate change.</p> <p>SuDS measures have been incorporated as part of the drainage design.</p> <p>SuDS attenuation features have been located outside the Flood Zones.</p> <p>Details can be found in the Drainage Strategy report which forms part of Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010037/APP/6.1</b>) which has been reviewed by the EA and LLFA (NCC).</p>

	<p>include appropriate sustainable drainage design to address the appropriate flood risk and water quality mitigation requirements.</p> <p>New drainage infrastructure that is designed to attenuate any additional surface water runoff should remain outside the 1 in100 year plus climate change flood areas for any source of flooding. This is to prevent the drainage becoming overwhelmed by flood water prior to being available for the runoff from the development. Upgrade of any small link roads or existing roundabouts e.g. Cantley Lane or Roundhouse Way roundabout should consider upgrading the existing drainage infrastructure. It is particularly important at the north of Cantley Lane close to the recent flooding, that the flood risk associated with overland flow paths is not made any worse, the highways drainage scheme is not overwhelmed by overland flow paths and opportunities to improve existing flooding problems are considered.</p>			
Hydrology / Drainage	<p>Multifunctional SuDS to be provided where possible, linking to landscape and biodiversity benefits as there is the opportunity to mitigate other impacts of the development.</p> <p>=Details of any temporary works to mitigate additional runoff e.g. through the removal of topsoil.</p> <p>We would like to see that adequate measures are put in place to minimise temporary additional runoff which may cause flooding and that this is diverted away from or pre-treated before discharge to a final drainage scheme. This would be to minimise siltation and blockage of newly created drainage infrastructure and ensure it performs as</p>	Norfolk County Council	N	<p>Multifunctional SuDS (e.g. SuDS features that provide both a sustainable drainage benefit with benefits to biodiversity/ecology and landscape) are considered as part of the Scheme drainage design. Attenuation features such as basins will be vegetated with suitable local species mix.</p> <p>Mitigation of temporary changes to flood risk (during construction) will be outlined in the Flood Risk Assessment see Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental</p>

	<p>designed.</p> <p>We would like to highlight that; the drainage strategy should also contain a maintenance and management plan detailing the activities required and details of who will adopt and maintain the all the surface water drainage features for the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>Any formal or informal drainage associated with existing developments or farmland should be maintained or diverted by the scheme to avoid future ponding against any embankments or within cuttings that may be created.</p>			<p>Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> and, in more detail, in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b>.</p> <p>Details of the Maintenance and Management of the Scheme drainage (including SuDS features) is outlined in the Drainage Strategy and Flood Risk Assessment reports.</p> <p>Informal/formal existing drainage has been considered and accommodated by the Scheme drainage design. 'Dry culverts' will be provided, where required, to avoid ponding of overland flow adjacent to the Scheme.</p>
Landscape	<p>It is not clear from the report how surveys will identify important linear landscape elements.</p>	Norfolk County Council	N	<p>Ecological assessment and mitigation is considered in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity and associated appendices of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b>. Landscape and visual assessment and mitigation is considered in Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual and associated appendices of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
Access	<p>The Council wishes to ensure that the proposed scheme maintains and improves pedestrian and cycle connectivity across the junction.</p>	South Norfolk Council	N	<p>Connectivity through the junction will be maintained. The Cantley Lane Link will provide additional connectivity between the B1172 and the areas to the south of the A11 and the east of the A47.</p>

Air quality	There is a lack of data and proposed solutions for air quality for the homes nearest to the junction in Cantley Lane South.	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	N	The air quality impact assessment is included in considered in Chapter 5 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010037/APP/6.1</b> ) The air quality assessment has concluded there will be no significant effects on air quality at human health and ecological receptors as a result of the Proposed Scheme.
Construction	All concerned road users and local residents etc will have a lot of inconvenience to put up during the construction.	Cringleford Parish Council	N	The Traffic Management Plan will be developed in consultation with Local Authorities and key stakeholders.
Construction	A commitment should be made that there will be no evening or weekend during construction when working close to homes in Cantley Lane South.	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	N	Construction works will take place mainly during the daytime. Construction works outside of normal construction hours of 07:00-19:00 weekdays and 07:00-19:00 on Saturdays shall be minimised as far as practicable. Where works outside of these hours are unavoidable, the Contractor will consult with the local planning authority, and agree appropriate methods of mitigation that account for the location of works, hours of work and expected duration.
Construction	As construction period of the junction improvements are likely to overlap with construction of our transforming cities programme of schemes, we will need to coordinate our approach to street works and clearly this may impact on the preferred approach to options for road closures. Again as our respective work on scheme development continues we will want to keep up ongoing dialogue on street works.	Norfolk County Council	N	Noted, engagement with NCC will be ongoing throughout the development of the Scheme.
Consultation	A major concern that the parish council had was that the initial consultation on the Thickthorn junction improvements had excluded East Carleton and	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	N	Highways England acknowledge that regrettably East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council were omitted from the



	<p>Ketteringham Parish Council at a time the development boundary was discussed and set.</p>		<p>Non-Statutory Consultation in March 2017. However, they were included in the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options was considered and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017, a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018, a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented and confirmation given that the Side Road Strategy Options report would be available at the Statutory</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, shows that consideration was given to the proposals made by East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council and also details the assessment criteria and scores for each of side road options assessed. The Scheme update was issued in July 2020 and then further meetings with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish have taken place on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.</p>
Consultation	The online response form was not suitable to respond to as it was asking questions aimed at individuals rather than an organisation, so could you confirm that you will accept this response via email please?	Cringleford Parish Council	N	Consultation responses received via email were also reviewed and considered in the development of the Scheme design.
Consultation	The consultation for the extent of the boundary for the A47/A11 interchanges should be reopened, as it is believed that this was never completed.	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	N	The consultation for the Scheme has been undertaken in accordance with Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008, as detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation which as published as part of the consultation literature. Please see the main body of the Consultation Report for details. <b>(TR010037/APP/5.1)</b> .

<p>Design</p>	<p>The Cantley Lane link has the possibility of both changing the routeing of trips on the wider network and opening up land for development. The evidence and assumptions used to develop the scheme are not apparent in the consultation material.</p>	<p>Norfolk County Council</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The results of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATs) Model indicate that the Scheme has a relatively minor impact on traffic flows on Cantley Lane South and Station Lane. Cantley Lane South experiences a minor traffic flow increase of around 40 to 140 PCUs in the AM and PM peaks in year 2040 but would not attract any significant rat running movements between B1172 and Cantley Lane South. A majority of the traffic appearing on Cantley Lane South (then Cantley Lane Link) is the north bound traffic originating from Ketteringham, East Carleton and Mulbarton while the south bound traffic destined for those areas would use A11 south bound then turn left into the Station Lane South. Along Station Road south of the A11 the Scheme will result in an increase in traffic of approximately 60 PCUs in the 2040 PM peak scenario. Traffic flows along the B1172 are forecaste to decrease by around 40-350 PCUs, this is due to traffic diverting on to the A11. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme for details of traffic modelling. <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1)</b>.</p>
---------------	--	-------------------------------	----------	--

Design	We have concerns about the logistics of delivering the scheme since the plans include the use of Big Sky development, St Giles Park, south of the A11 and east of the A47. Despite HE being informed on several occasions, the scheme at the consultations unfortunately was based on out of date drawings and needs to be reconsidered.	Cringleford Parish Council	N	The project team has engaged with the developers of the site west of Cringleford (south of A11) (St Giles Gate) throughout the design process, and up to date drawings have been supplied to the developer. Discussions are ongoing between the developer and the project team regarding land take/ and use required for the Scheme within the development land.
Design	There are existing condition requirements for a number of residential development sites in the area for improvements to the Thickthorn junction (1). Evidence is needed to demonstrate how the proposed Highways England junction improvement scheme takes account of these existing commitments in its design and delivery.	South Norfolk Council	N	The traffic model takes account of all committed and planned developments as provided by NCC including the developments along B1172 and the planned Park & Ride expansion for its forecast opening year of 2025 and the design year of 2040. The list of all developments provided by NCC is included in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme ( <b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b> ). The traffic growth associated with these developments and the background growth are all reported in the TFP report and if required further information can be provided. In summary, with the introduction of the Scheme, a high proportion of the forecast traffic will be removed from the Thickthorn junction due to the proposed opening of the A11/A47 Connector Road and as a result the Thickthorn junction is expected to operate significantly better than without the proposed connector road.



Design	Express their concerns about the proposals particularly about the proposed link road from Cantley Lane South to the B1172 and the impact on homes in Cantley Lane South both during and post construction.	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	Y	The junction for the Cantley Lane Link/Cantley Lane South has been realigned post Consultation so that the junction is further away from the properties located on the north side of Cantley Lane South in the vicinity of the junction. The project team has consulted further with the residents, and visual screening will be provided between the property and the new link road and junction.
Design	If the link road to the B1172 was built there was no mention of any screening for 128 Cantley Lane South and the impact on the residents would be very detrimental.	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	N	The Environmental Masterplan <b>(TR010037/APP/6.8)</b> will detail what the proposed landscaping will be in the Cantley Lane South area. Since statutory consultation, the junction between the Cantley Lane Link and Cantley Lane South has been pulled further away from the properties on the northside of Cantley Lane South. The Project team has had further engagement with the residents, and visual screening in the form of new trees/planting will be provided along the new Cantley Lane Link and at the new junction.
Design	We are broadly in agreement with the proposals however we have serious reservations about the proposed link road from Cantley Lane South to the B1172. This new route will cut through farm and meadow land and requires the removal of some mature trees, it also disturbs Cantley Stream and requires two new bridges over the A11.	Hethersett Parish Council	N	Noted. Arboricultural surveys have been undertaken as part of the overall environmental impact assessment, the results of which will be included in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, which is presented in Chapter 7- Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> . Impact

				on existing trees/hedgerows and meadows within the scheme limits has been minimised as much as practicable.
Design	The Ketteringham link road to Hethersett is lengthy and involves crossing the A11 and its new free-flow links, probably at considerable expense. We wish to query its cost-effectiveness. About two dozen dwellings will be affected if it were not put in place and business/HGV traffic from Station Road already travels via alternative routes to Cantley Lane South to access the A11.	Cringleford Parish Council	N	Access to the properties on Cantley Lane south is currently from the A11, which is being terminated, and Cantley Lane South under the existing railway bridge which has height restrictions. An additional access point is required without restrictions for emergency vehicles and the like.
Design	Traffic from the proposed link road into the B1172 would struggle to join the northbound carriageway in peak times as there is often a constant stream of traffic on this busy road and the volumes are rapidly increasing due to the number of new homes being built in Hethersett and Wymondham. It was agreed that the proposed solution to this would be inadequate.	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	N	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction". This is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension has been taken into account within the traffic assessments. Through dialogue, the proposed scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the Scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for details of the traffic modelling.</p>

				<p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the Scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p> <p>Therefore, there is no requirement for a roundabout or signalised junction based on the current development assumptions. However, if additional developments would take place in future, then the operation of the junction may be reviewed by the authority.</p>
Design	<p>Given the recent investment by the County Council through the DfT's Transforming Cities and Cycle Ambition Grant to create a continuous walking/cycle link between the residential growth areas in Wymondham and Hethersett to the centre of Norwich, the lack of improvements to the existing NMU provision at the Thickthorn junction represents a missed opportunity to build on the recent investment in the area and encourage growth in Walking and Cycling.</p>	Norfolk County Council	N	<p>No specific improvements are proposed at Thickthorn Junction for walking and cycling, however, a new WCH overbridge suitable for use by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians is to be provided to link Cantley Lane to Cantley Lane South. A new combined footway/cycleway will also be provided alongside the new Cantley Lane Link to provide a connection between the overbridge, Cantley Lane South and existing pedestrian and cyclist facilities on Norwich Road. This infrastructure will provide an alternative grade separate crossing of the A47 for cyclists.</p>

Design	We have concerns about the new junction with B1172 and hope that Traffic Lights will be installed. The B1172 is a busy road carrying traffic between Wymondham , Hethersett and Norwich. The junction will undoubtedly become an accident black spot without some measures of control.	Hethersett Parish Council	N	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension has been taken into account within the traffic assessments. Through dialogue, the proposed scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the Scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p>
Design	This paired down version of the improvement scheme will only provide short term relief to the junction since the slip roads are now single carriageway. Furthermore, once the Western link of the Northern Distributor Road is in place,	Cringleford Parish Council	N	Our traffic forecast indicates that having one lane would provide adequate capacity to accommodate future year traffic even in the design year of 2040.



	additional pressure will be placed on the junction from traffic arriving via the northern section of A47.			The presence of the Norwich Western Link and its impact on the Thickthorn Scheme has also been taken into account in the traffic model
Design	The parish council objects to the creation of the proposed link road from Cantley Lane South to the B1172 as it was to be built it would have a significant detrimental impact on wildlife and the loss of 500-year-old oak trees. It would also have a negative visual impact on this quiet country lane and the introduction of a bridge across the A11 would also be unsightly.	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	N	Arboricultural surveys have been undertaken as part of the overall environmental impact assessment, the results of which will be included in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, which is presented in Chapter 7- Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010037/APP/6.1</b> ). Impact on existing trees/hedgerows and meadows within the Scheme limits has been minimised as much as practicable. The Scheme will achieve Net Biodiversity gain through new planting and environmental mitigation measures as noted in Chapter 8, Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement. Landscaping is shown on the Environmental Masterplan ( <b>TR010037/APP/6.1</b> ).

Design	We also wonder whether reinstating the broken route from Cantley Lane to the B1172 along Station Lane might have been a better choice.	Hethersett Parish Council	N	<p>The proposed link is designed to maintain access from Cantley Lane South to A47/A11 Thickthorn junction. If a connection was to be made to Station Lane as suggested, this would only provide links to the A11 westbound away from the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction. Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report, available on the Scheme website:  <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p> <p>This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified. The criteria included biodiversity, land use and safety considerations.</p>
Design	Removal of the link road would still permit the main scheme to go ahead but would save money, and inconvenience relatively few, especially since the recycling plant at Ketteringham is scheduled to be relocated. Its removal would prevent disturbance to parkland, residents and the Cringleford/Cantley Lane stream. Cantley Lane would become a quiet lane, but this is not a precedent in Cringleford as the same occurred when Colney Lane was closed off to through traffic.	Cringleford Parish Council	N	Access to the properties on Cantley Lane south is currently from the A11 which is being terminated and Cantley Lane South under the existing railway bridge which has height restrictions. An additional access point is required without restrictions for emergency vehicles and the like.

Design	The parish council has undertaken a survey of the local businesses most affected by the closure of this junction and that would significantly benefit from this being resolved using the funding that is proposed to provide a link road from Cantley Lane South to the B1172. Cantley Lane could then become a quiet lane, befitting of the small narrow lane with the very tight turning under the low railway bridge. This would avoid all of the issues with flooding issues, the diversion of Cantley stream and the destruction of flora and fauna. The cost of the proposed work to deliver the link road would be far better used to solve the highways problem caused by the closure of the Station Lane junction.	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	N	<p>The Project Team reviewed five proposed options for the sideroad link, of which the Cantley Lane Link to the B1172 was the best performing option.</p> <p>The appraisal of all five options is contained within the Sideroad Options Report available on the HE website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p> <p>This Report provides the full assessment criteria.</p>
Design	This has effectively ruled out solutions that included the Station Lane junction with the A11. The improvements at Thickthorn are considered to be an ideal opportunity to address the very real problem created by the closure of the A11 Station Lane crossing and moreover to provide an acceptable and sensible solution to the Cantley Lane South issues with the new junction. The closure of the Station Lane junction for northbound traffic to the A11 has led to higher costs for businesses and both South Norfolk District and Norfolk County Councils. It is a major inconvenience for local people extending vehicle movements and increasing pollution for the extra miles northbound traffic has to make, due being diverted southbound to Wymondham to access Norwich or the A47.	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	N	<p>The Project Team analysed the proposed options put forward by the Parish Council. These were fully assessed, with the detailed outcomes presented in the Sideroads Options Report: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p> <p>The best performing option was selected and validated by the Project Team.</p>
Design	We have concerns about the new junction with B1172 and hope that Traffic Lights will be installed. The B1172 is a busy road carrying traffic between Wymondham, Hethersett and Norwich. The junction will undoubtedly	Hethersett Parish Council	N	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p>

	<p>become an accident black spot without some measures of control.</p>		<p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension has been taken into account within the traffic assessments. Through dialogue, the proposed scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the Scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p> <p>Therefore, there is no requirement for a roundabout or signalised junction based on the current development assumptions. However, if additional developments would take place in future, then the operation of the junction may be reviewed by the authority.</p>
--	--	--	---



<p>Design</p>	<p>if Option a link road proceeds, the junction from Ketteringham to Hethersett needs reconsidering as at peak times traffic will have great difficulty exiting safely onto B1172 in the absence of traffic signals.</p>	<p>Cringleford Parish Council</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension has been taken into account within the traffic assessments. Through dialogue, the proposed scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the Scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p> <p>Therefore, there is no requirement for a roundabout or signalised junction based on the current development</p>
---------------	--	-----------------------------------	----------	--

				assumptions. However, if additional developments would take place in future, then the operation of the junction may be reviewed by the authority.
Design	The evidence needed to demonstrate that the existing planned committed growth in the area has been accommodated in the assessment and design; the Park and Ride expansion (as set out above) and the impacts this has on the committed slip road; and the wider distributional effects of the proposal on the local minor road network including that from the Cantley Lane link.	South Norfolk Council	N	The traffic model takes account of all committed and planned developments as provided by NCC including the developments along B1172 and the planned Park & Ride expansion for its forecast opening year of 2025 and the design year of 2040. The list of all developments provided by NCC are included in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme ( <b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b> ). The traffic growth associated with these developments and the background growth are all reported in the TFP report plus a separate technical note on the proposed Park & Ride expansion which can be made available if required. In summary, with the introduction of the Scheme, a high proportion of the forecast traffic will be removed from the Thickthorn junction due to the proposed opening of the A11/A47 Connector Road and as a result the Thickthorn junction is expected to operate significantly better than without the proposed connector road.
Design	We are broadly in agreement with the proposals however we have serious reservations about the proposed link road from Cantley Lane South to the B1172.	Hethersett Parish Council	N	Noted. The Project Team reviewed five proposed options for the sideroad link, of which the Cantley Lane Link to the B1172 was the best performing option.

				The appraisal of all five options is contained within the Sideroad Options Report available on the HE Website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a> This Report provides the full assessment criteria.
Environment	The PEIR Chapter sets out proposed mitigation measures identified to date and acknowledges that details of other measures are still under discussion. Of particular importance, in this respect, is the archaeological trial trenching proposed throughout the scheme area. The results of this phase of evaluation need to be considered and submitted with the DCO application in order for a fully informed decision about the historic environment impact of the scheme to be reached and for appropriate mitigation measures to be developed. In order for this process to be completed prior to the submission of the DCO application, we recommend that the trial trenching is undertaken as soon as practically possible.	Norfolk County Council	N	Findings from the archaeological trial trenching undertaken in 2020 are presented in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Environment	We understand that at this stage the proposed layout does not accommodate or include any specific landscape or design proposals and will be presented in the ES. It will be important that these design interventions consider advance planting to limit views during construction, as well as long term landscape and ecological benefits that can be obtained from the scheme, especially noting its location within the Norwich Southern Bypass Protection Zone.	Norfolk County Council	N	An Environmental Masterplan which details landscaping and planting is included in the DCO submission <b>(TR010037/APP/6.8)</b> .
Footbridge	Whilst it would be preferable to have the new route in place before extinguishing the old, we understand this may not be possible. Therefore, relevant temporary closures and/or diversion orders will be required.	Norfolk County Council	N	Noted. Diversions and temporary closures will be discussed with key stakeholders when the construction phasing is developed.

Footbridge	The planned footbridge across the A47 is too far away from the homes in Cantley Lane South, it would extend the walk to services by 10 - 15 minutes.	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	Y	The new WCH overbridge connecting to Cantley Lane South is approximately 45m to the south of the existing footbridge and would result in only a small increase in walking distance between Cantley Lane South and Cantley Lane.
Footbridge	Residents were concerned that the proposed pathway and bridge would be very isolated and were also worried that pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders would all have to use the same footpath.	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	N	The new overbridge has been designed to current design standards and is of sufficient width to enable it to be used by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. Following Statutory Consultation, the location of the WCH overbridge has been moved so that it is just 45m south of the existing footbridge, reducing the lengths of the approach paths/ramps.
Footbridge	We note the realignment of Cringleford FP4a, and broadly support the proposed route via the new bridge.	Norfolk County Council	N	Noted.
Further studies	No further survey recommendations have been made for - flora, - hedgerows, - reptiles, and - great crested newts. There is no mention of additional surveys for: - aquatic invertebrate surveys - over-wintering birds - terrestrial invertebrates.	Norfolk County Council	N	Wintering birds, aquatic and terrestrial invertebrate surveys have been undertaken late 2019, and 2020. See Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Further studies	We note that a Construction Environmental Management Plan is recommended.	Norfolk County Council	N	An Environmental Management Plan is included with the DCO application <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> . This will form the basis of the Construction Environmental Management Plan for when construction commences.



Further studies	Consideration should be given now to the post-construction monitoring strategy, to ensure that pre-construction surveys and post construction monitoring are comparable.	Norfolk County Council	N	Within the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> , requirements for post-construction monitoring are detailed. This principally relates to monitoring of mitigation measures and enhancements provided to ensure that they are functioning as proposed. For example, long-term monitoring of planting and habitats is required to ensure that they establish.
Further studies	We recommend that surveys are undertaken following best practice (e.g. CIEEM technical guidance and specific species techniques as summarised on Gov.uk website) and in line with British Standards.	Norfolk County Council	N	Environmental surveys have been undertaken in line with the relevant standards and guidelines where required.
Further studies	We recommend that surveys are undertaken following best practice (e.g. CIEEM technical guidance and specific species techniques as summarised on Gov.uk website) and in line with British Standards.	Norfolk County Council	N	Environmental surveys have been undertaken in line with the relevant standards and guidelines where required.
Heritage	A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction Improvement Scheme S42 - PIER Historic Environment comments. Chapter 6 of the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction Improvement Scheme PEIR considers the Cultural Heritage implications of the proposed scheme. The chapter provides a baseline summary of the known heritage assets within the study area. However, the chapter does not really consider the potential for previously unidentified heritage assets with archaeological interest to be present within the proposed DCO application boundary. This information may be articulated more clearly in the archaeological desk-based assessment, but that document has not been submitted in support of the PEIR.	Norfolk County Council	N	A desk-based assessment will be presented in an appendix to the Chapter 6 - Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .

Heritage	The proposed scheme has potential to impact on both designated and nondesignated heritage assets. The potential impacts (both direct and indirect) are set out in the Chapter. However, we note that the Scheduled Monument of two Bronze Age round barrows (NHLE 1003977) is not clearly depicted on Figure B.2 in Appendix A.	Norfolk County Council	N	The scheduled monument will be shown on the relevant plans to be produced as part of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Hydrology	The diversion of the stream for this proposed link road is a cause for concern. It rises in Thickthorn Hall grounds and flows to the River Yare, which is a tidal river and it often backflows up the stream causing flooding.	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	N	A flood risk assessment has been undertaken and the Scheme design discussed with the Environment Agency. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
PM / Drainage	We are aware from media reports that Thickthorn Roundabout flooded under the flyover in June 2017 but this has not formally been investigated by the LLFA. The Highways Local Area office at Ketteringham may have further information (0344 800 8020) on highways flooding incidences on surrounding minor roads. We also have informal reports of historical flooding on Cantley Lane near to Cantley stream where surface water runoff is channelled by the road towards the bridge and flood plain. There is also mention of high groundwater levels near the watercourse.	Norfolk County Council	N	A scheme was undertaken by Highways England under their East Capital Delivery maintenance projects to alleviate the flooding of Thickthorn Junction. Flood modelling has been undertaken for the area surrounding Cantley Stream and the drainage has been designed accordingly. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Drainage	Inclusion of appropriate climate change allowances, for rainfall calculations this would include 40% climate change (whilst 20% can be modelled, 40% climate change must not leave the applicant site boundary or adverse flooding impacts. Particular regard should be given to the drainage from the embanked carriageway and toe of the embankment where it meets Cantley lane due to the mapped and historical accounts of flooding at this location.	Norfolk County Council	N	The Flood Risk Assessment and culvert sizing has been discussed with the EA and the LLFA. This document is contained within Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> . The drainage strategy has been reviewed by the LLFA and includes the required allowances for

				climate change within the drainage design calculations. Drainage Strategy report will be included in Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Hydrology / Drainage	For information the LLFA have produced a flood investigation report of historical flooding off Cantley Lane, north of the A47 around Cringleford including Langley Close and Brettingham Avenue. This flooding occurred on the 23 June 2016 where we received 19 reports of flooding. We have identified 8 properties that flooded internally. The report can be found at <a href="https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/rubbish-recycling-and-planning/flood-and-watermanagement/flood-investigations">https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/rubbish-recycling-and-planning/flood-and-watermanagement/flood-investigations</a> . It has identified that significant runoff from adjacent fields and the highway affected properties on Cantley Lane. There is an unknown impact from the Roundhouse Way roundabout and it has been suggested by local residents that raising of this feature may have altered natural drainage patterns. It should also be noted that many properties thresholds are lower than the highways in this area. Any improvements to the Cantley Lane or connection to Roundhouse Roundabout must consider the recent flooding and improvements to highways drainage proposed where possible. We note that the proposed DCO boundary shown in the EIA scoping report includes this area although may not be progressed as part of this application.	Norfolk County Council	N	A drainage strategy and flood risk assessment for the scheme has been undertaken and the scheme discussed with the Environment Agency and the LLFA. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Hydrology / Drainage	The NSIP National Policy Statement for National Networks (Dec 2014) with regard to Flood Risk (Section 5.90 to 5.115) will need to be considered. These policies are aligned with the new National Planning Policy Framework	Norfolk County Council	N	A drainage strategy and flood risk assessment for the scheme has been undertaken and the Scheme discussed with the Environment Agency and the

	(NPPF) when considering all sources of flooding (section 5.92, 5.93, 5.97, 5.102 to 5.104) and technical standards for SuDS (section 5.100, 5.110 to 5.115) . Due to the history of flooding in the area we would expect that options for improvement to local flood risk and existing runoff rates can be made. We would suggest that the NSIP policy statement, updated NPPF (and PPG), SuDS technical standards and LLFA guidance are used by consultants in the review and design of the scheme. Some of these are not currently mentioned in the PEIR document.			LLFA See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Highways England	The creation of ponds would create a maintenance issue and experience shows these ponds are never adequately maintained. They require emptying on a regular basis as the water quickly becomes polluted and overgrown and stop being effective in preventing flooding.	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	N	Maintenance of the drainage basins will be the responsibility of the maintaining agent, Highways England.
Hydrology	Please note, as there are works proposed as part of this application that are likely to affect flows in an ordinary watercourse, then the applicant will need the approval of LLFA as Norfolk County Council. It should be noted that this approval is separate from planning approval. We would expect to be consulted on both the temporary works and permanent works required. Any ordinary watercourse consent application would need to show how the flow in the watercourse will be maintained and how flood risk will not be increased elsewhere. It would be supported by the relevant documents and technical drawings. We do not have detailed guidance on information required for consenting, however, the LLFA guidance on development (as a statutory consultee) with regard to the prevention of the increase in flood risk can be used as a general guide. This can be found on our website <a href="https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/rubbish-recycling-and-">https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/rubbish-recycling-and-</a>	Norfolk County Council	N	A flood risk assessment for the Scheme has been undertaken and the Scheme discussed with the Environment Agency and the LLFA. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .



	planning/flood-and-watermanagement/ information-for-developers.			
Hydrology	With regard to the PEIR document, we would expect the following to be included in future assessments as discussed within our meeting with Highways England /SWECO 24 May 2018. -A flood risk assessment that assess all sources of flooding (e.g. Fluvial flood risk on Cantley stream or tributaries, surface water flooding overland joining Cantley stream, any groundwater or sewer flooding potential).	Norfolk County Council	N	A flood risk assessment for the Scheme has been undertaken and the Scheme discussed with the Environment Agency and the LLFA. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Hydrology	Appropriate mitigation for any works occurring in areas at risk of flooding, including compensatory storage for fluvial flooding or additional attenuation for surface water flooding originating offsite or ensuring that surface water flooding / drainage channels are routed through/around the development without adverse impacts (e.g. dry culverts). Drainage strategy and subsequent detailed information that includes: Evidence that the SuDS hierarchy has been followed i.e. infiltration testing to confirm if infiltration drainage is favourable or not, prior to assuming connection to the watercourse is suitable. SuDS hierarchy has been followed to install small source control SuDS over large site or regional based SuDS attenuation for runoff and volume equivalent to greenfield predevelopment, to prevent an increase of flood risk post development. If any brownfield drainage is assumed this must return as close	Norfolk County Council	N	A drainage strategy and flood risk assessment for the Scheme has been undertaken and the scheme discussed with the Environment Agency and the LLFA. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .

	to greenfield as possible and be evidenced as to why this is not possible (considering the size and nature of the scheme we would expect any brownfield runoff to be returned to pre-development greenfield runoff).			
Hydrology / Drainage	Where possible within the management train (source, site and regional control) to address flood risk and water quality mitigation required from the new development. We would not advise the reliance on proprietary treatment systems (some consideration could be used where an additional step of treatment may be required for sensitive receptors).	Norfolk County Council	N	A drainage strategy and flood risk assessment for the Scheme has been undertaken which will detail the methods used and the Scheme has been discussed with the Environment Agency and the LLFA. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Landscape	This new route will cut through farm and meadow land and requires the removal of some mature trees.	Hethersett Parish Council	N	Arboricultural surveys have been undertaken as part of the overall environmental impact assessment, the results of which are included in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, which is presented in Chapter 7- Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> . Impact on existing trees/hedgerows and meadows within the Scheme limits has been minimised as much as practicable. The Scheme will achieve Net Biodiversity gain through new planting and environmental mitigation measures as noted in Chapter 8, Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement. <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> Landscaping is shown on the Environmental Masterplan <b>(TR010037/APP/6.8)</b> .

Lighting	The need for lighting should be carefully considered. Where it is required the lighting design should be informed by current best practice guidelines Institute of Lighting Engineers.	Norfolk County Council	N	Lighting is only being provide where necessary. A lighting assessment has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB TA 501 Road lighting appraisal and is included in the appendices of Chapter 7, Landscape and visual of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.3)</b> .
Project Management	The parish council is disappointed that Highways England has consistently failed to share requested data, particularly with the county council that would have to adopt the local roads. Repeated requests for costs and volumetrics data have been ignored.	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	N	Engagement and information sharing with the County Council and the Parish Councils has been undertaken throughout autumn/winter of 2020. This information is presented in Annex N 'Engagement with Stakeholders' of the Consultation Report <b>(TR010037/APP/5.2)</b> . Traffic data has been shared with the County Council (NCC) however costs have not been shared as this is commercially sensitive.
DCO	I would be grateful if you could provide a copy of a decision notice for our records.	East Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Authority	N	All notices will be sent out to the relevant parties in line with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008 following submission of the Development Consent Order.
Project Management	The County Council requests that the evidence to support the scheme and address all the issues raised is made available to enable a constructive dialogue on these specific points and the general development of the scheme.	Norfolk County Council	N	Engagement and information sharing with the County Council has been undertaken throughout autumn/winter of 2020. This information is presented in Annex N 'Engagement with Stakeholders' of the Consultation Report. <b>(TR010037/APP/5.2)</b> .

Heritage	The full geophysical survey report has not been submitted with the PEIR, nor are the relevant figures included in Appendix A as stated in paragraph 6.5.4.	Norfolk County Council	N	Noted. Geophysical Survey results are presented in the appendices of Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Heritage	A geophysical survey has already been carried out and the results are summarised in Chapter 6 of the PEIR. Confusingly Areas 1 and 2 referred to in paragraphs 6.5.5 - 6.5.7 do not correlate with Areas 1-8 in the 2018 geophysical survey report.	Norfolk County Council	N	Noted. Geophysical Survey results are presented in the appendices of Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Mitigation	The Council acknowledges the detailed work undertaken by Highways England in the design of the scheme and seeks to ensure that due consideration continues to be had to mitigate the impacts of the proposal as far as practicable on veteran trees; landscape and visual impact; and heritage assets.	South Norfolk Council	N	Noted. The Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) contained in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> identifies the environmental commitments included within the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> to address the potential environmental effects of the Scheme.
Mitigation	We support the potential mitigation measures mentioned and will be able to provide further specific comments on these when viewing the environmental masterplan and detailed planting design.	Norfolk County Council	N	Noted. The Environmental Masterplan <b>(TR010037/APP/6.8)</b> , will be presented as part of the DCO submission.
Mitigation	We would like to see mitigation planting and baffling put in place to cut down the noise and air pollution. We would like to see a coordinated approach between Highways England and the developers of the site to ensure the best possible landscaping and environmental outcomes for parishioners.	Cringleford Parish Council	N	Planting is considered in the Environmental Masterplan <b>(TR010037/APP/6.8)</b> . Noise surveys and modelling have been undertaken for the Scheme. The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the



				Scheme. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> . The air quality assessment has concluded there will be no significant effects on air quality at human health and ecological receptors as a result of the Proposed Scheme. See Chapter 5 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Noise	There is no clarity on what noise screening will be for resident as they will be very close to the proposed carriageway carrying traffic from the A47 southbound to the A11.	East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council	N	This comment refers to a previous iteration of the Scheme - the link road from the A47 to the A11 has since been removed from the design.
Noise	the new slip roads will create additional Noise for the residents on the Big Sky development.	Cringleford Parish Council	N	The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Other proposals	South Norfolk Council supports the planned improvements to the Thickthorn junction. It however also seeks assurance that the committed growth in the greater Norwich area and the obligations already required at the junction to support the growth have been factored into the design and delivery of the proposed works. (1) Planning permissions 2011/0505 Wymondham; 2012/0371 Wymondham; 2011/1804 Hethersett; 2013/1793 Cringleford; 2013/1494 Cringleford (2) Planning permission 2011/1804 Hethersett.	South Norfolk Council	N	The traffic model takes account of all committed and planned developments as provided by NCC including the developments along B1172 and the planned Park & Ride expansion for its forecast opening year of 2025 and the design year of 2040. The list of all developments provided by NCC are included in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1)</b> . The traffic growth associated with these

				developments and the background growth are all reported in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1)</b> . A summary of the permitted developments can be found in the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1)</b> DCO document.
Park and Ride	The expansion of the park and ride site is a key part of Transforming Cites and an important element to support longer term growth. The scheme prevents the ability to provide a slip road to an expanded park and ride site. The county can agree to this situation provided assurances are given that proposals to expand the park and ride site can be accommodated by the proposed junction improvement. Evidence is needed to demonstrate how the proposed junction improvement scheme takes account of the existing planning commitments and the expansion of the park and ride site. We need to know the growth and park and ride assumptions factored into the assessment of the Thickthorn improvement scheme.	Norfolk County Council	N	The Project Team held workshops with NCC to demonstrate that the Traffic Modelling reflected the proposed Park & Ride extension and catered for this growth.  The strategic transport model used for the A47 Thickthorn Scheme replicates the relative growth on the Park & Ride from 2015 to the design year of 2040.
Park and Ride	As you will be aware there have been a number of development proposals that have been granted with obligations to mitigate longer term impact on the junction. One such obligation is the securing of land to expand the existing park and ride site and for construction of a slip road from the A11 to reduce the impact of park and ride traffic on the existing Thickthorn Junction. The improvement proposals prevent construction of a slip road access to an expanded park and ride site across land transferred to the County Council through a planning agreement. The current proposal neither provides for any alternative or gives conclusive evidence that the proposed junction improvement scheme provides the capacity for an	Norfolk County Council	N	The Project Team held workshops with NCC to demonstrate that the Traffic Modelling reflected the proposed Park & Ride extension and catered for this growth.  The strategic transport model used for the A47 Thickthorn Scheme replicates the relative growth on Park & Ride from 2015 to the design year of 2040.

	extended park and ride site. Highways England will need to review the existing planning and associated land agreements and regularise the situation to be compatible with the junction improvement proposed.			
Park and Ride	The proposals to the Thickthorn junction prevent construction of a slip road access to an expanded Park and Ride site. The Council has no objection to the loss of the slip road provided that assurances are given that the proposed scheme has been designed to create the capacity to service the committed larger Park and Ride site.	South Norfolk Council	N	The traffic model takes account of all committed and planned developments as provided by NCC including the developments along B1172 and the planned Park & Ride expansion for its forecast opening year of 2025 and the design year of 2040. The list of all developments provided by NCC are included in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme ( <b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b> ). The traffic growth associated with these developments and the background growth are all reported in the in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme ( <b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b> ) plus a separate technical note on the proposed Park & Ride expansion. In summary, with the introduction of the Scheme, a high proportion of the forecast traffic will be removed from the Thickthorn junction due to the proposed opening of the A11/A47 Connector Road and as a result the Thickthorn junction is expected to operate significantly better than without the proposed connector road.

<p>Park and Ride</p>	<p>There are existing S106 obligations from the Hethersett residential development (2) which secure land for a Park and Ride expansion and a dedicated slip from the A11 into the Park and Ride site and this was to reduce the impact of park and ride traffic on the existing Thickthorn junction.</p>	<p>South Norfolk Council</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The Project Team held workshops with the Local Authority to demonstrate that the Traffic Modelling reflected the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension and catered for this growth.</p> <p>The strategic transport model used for the A47 Thickthorn Scheme replicates the relative growth on Park &amp; Ride from 2015 to the design year of 2040.</p> <p>After the engagement to validate the traffic modelling, NCC were content the slip road could be removed.</p>
----------------------	--	------------------------------	----------	---

<p>Park and Ride</p>	<p>It is clear that traffic modelling work has been undertaken and it would be helpful to understand how this work has considered the points made regarding the allowances for the expanded park and ride, consideration of the emerging development plan, the development of other land in the vicinity of the junction and any wider distributional effects including the impacts of the Cantley Lane link. We have already made a request for this information.</p>	<p>Norfolk County Council</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The traffic model takes account of all committed and planned developments as provided by NCC including the developments along B1172 and the planned Park &amp; Ride expansion for its forecast opening year of 2025 and the design year of 2040. The list of all developments provided by NCC is included in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>). The traffic growth associated with these developments and the background growth are all reported in in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) plus a separate technical note on the proposed Park &amp; Ride expansion. In summary, with the introduction of the Scheme, a high proportion of the forecast traffic will be removed from the Thickthorn junction due to the proposed opening of the A11/A47 Connector Road and as a result the Thickthorn junction is expected to operate significantly better than without the proposed connector road.</p>
----------------------	--	-------------------------------	----------	---



Public transport	In addition we would expect the minimum disruption to the Ely to Norwich line.	East Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Authority	N	The current design will not affect the Ely to Norwich railway line. There are no works to the existing Cringleford Railway Bridge, which is within the Scheme limits, or the Cantley Lane South Railway bridge which is just outside the Scheme limits. There are no additional interfaces with the railway line. The project team have liaised with Network Rail (meeting 03/12/2020) and no issues have been raised by Network Rail with regards to the current proposals.
Wildlife	The applicant has identified the need for further surveys for bats, badgers, otters, water voles, and polecats and we broadly support this.	Norfolk County Council	N	Noted. Wildlife surveys have been undertaken. The Habitat Regulation Assessment and Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> assess the potential impact to the sensitive areas.

### 2.3 Statutory consultation under Section 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Air quality	Has an air quality survey been carried out from A47 to A11 down ramp to adjacent houses at top of CLS?	182	N	Air quality assessments have been undertaken and conclude there will be no significant effects on air quality at human health and ecological receptors as a result of the Proposed Scheme. See Chapter 5 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Air quality	Concern about pollution from perceived increase in traffic to local area.	1051	N	Air quality assessments have been undertaken and conclude there will be no significant effects on air quality at human health and ecological receptors as a result of the Proposed Scheme. See Chapter 5 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Community	Request for improvements to historic parkland to reduce the anticipated impacts of the proposed scheme.	1061	N	Mitigation for the Scheme will be discussed in the ES (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Community	Request to maintain existing mature trees which screen a property, with the road realignment to be moved 5-6 metres to the west.	1065	Y	Design has been updated to move the Cantley Lane South/Canley Link junction further away from the properties located north of the existing Cantley Lane. Hedgerow and tree planting will be provided to screen property, details are presented in the Environmental Masterplan (TR010037/APP/6.8).
Consultation	Request for The Drainage Board to be consulted.	182	N	Noted, IDB has been sent the Drainage Strategy Report. The Project Team has also consulted with the LLFA (NCC) and the Environment Agency in the development of the drainage strategy and Flood Risk Assessment. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Consultation	Request for further consultation with councils.	1051	N	Noted. Engagement with Parish Councils has been ongoing throughout 2020 and early 2021

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation	Residents, Parish Councils and The Office of Richard Bacon MP have voiced many objections but included proposals to consider making the whole of CLS a Cul de Sac residential road to mitigate danger and eliminate the ultra expensive Option A but instead of sensibly working together to find a compromise solution HE undemocratically came up with every reason to oppose whilst finding every justification to endorse their own folly.	1061	N	<p>Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.</p> <p>This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified.</p> <p>The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE project website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-iunction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-iunction/#documents</a></p>
Consultation	Recent letters to residents from Highways England dated 28th May 2019 regarding Statutory Consultation were incorrectly addressed to Cantley Lane, instead of Cantley Lane South. If after two years HE still do not know the difference, think we live in Cringleford and that East Carleton and Ketteringham is non existent, how can the statement above that the same opportunities to influence the scheme as the other parish councils be considered valid.	181	N	<p>Highways England acknowledge that regrettably East Carleton &amp; Ketteringham Parish Council were omitted from the Non-Statutory Consultation in March 2017. However they were included in the statutory consultation. Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with the East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options was subsequently undertaken and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England provided an update on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>rationale for not progressing the proposed Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented with confirmation that the Side Road Strategy Options Report would be available at the Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, details that consideration was given to the proposals made by the Parish Councils and sets out the assessment criteria and scores for each of the side road options assessed. The Scheme update was issued in July 2020 and further meetings have taken place with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17<sup>th</sup> of March.</p>
<p>Consultation</p>	<p>██████████ and his assistant ██████████ have received numerous complaints from worried residents over the last two years about improper consultation and commented on the HE technique of evasion and avoidance in reply to perfectly reasonable questions and worrying comments. Your few sentences in reply below on 28th June are generalised and I politely feel do acknowledge the dangerous issues raised in my correspondence. When a factual document such as a proper traffic survey is presented directly opposed to a completely inaccurate, unresearched Highways England official document statement lacking in local knowledge I politely think it incorrect to reply thanking me without recognition for "informing you of my views."</p>	<p>183</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation included an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with the Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options were considered and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed</p>



Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 where the updated proposals were presented. It was confirmed that the Side Road Strategy Options Report would be available at the Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, details that consideration was given to the proposals made by the Parish Councils and sets out the assessment criteria and scores for each of the side road options assessed. The Scheme update was issued in July 2020 and further Parish Council meetings have taken place with them on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 <sup>th</sup> of March.
Consultation	There is also the manner in which we were informed of the current consultation phase. On the day of my fathers funeral (15th May 2019) or possibly the day before, a sign was put on the fence to the front garden of REDACTED (our property). The individual responsible (tasked to ensure appropriate persons were aware of this information) had been advised by our next door neighbour that this was not advisable given what was to be a stressful and emotional day as it was. A letter was also posted through the letter box and this would have been sufficient on its own. My family and I turned up to the property on the day of the funeral to find this notice attached to our property and as such caused further distress on this difficult day.	1047	N	Noted. We are very sorry for any additional stress caused at a very difficult time for the family involved.
Consultation	About a year ago we filled in an intrusive survey to [REDACTED] for HE, why have Carter Jonas recently asked the same questions. What happened to previous information, who now holds it without my permission. Data Protection Act etc.	182	N	Noted. The [REDACTED] survey was undertaken at a previous stage in the project. Personal data is held in accordance with the below statement, which was included on the Consultation Response form: "On 25 May 2018,



Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p><i>the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) came into force. This legislation requires Highways England to explain to consultees, stakeholders and customers how their personal data will be used and stored. Highways England adheres to the Government's Consultation Principles, the Planning Act 2008 and the Highways Act 1980 as required, and may collect personal data to help shape development of highways schemes. Personal data collected for the A47/A11 Thickthorn junction scheme will be processed and retained by Highways England and its appointed contractors until the scheme is complete.</i></p> <p><i>Under the GDPR regulations you have the right to request the following information from us:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Right of access to the data (Subject Access Request)</i></li> <li><i>2. Right for the rectification of errors</i></li> <li><i>3. Right to erasure of personal data – this is not an absolute right under the legislation</i></li> <li><i>4. Right to restrict processing or to object to processing</i></li> <li><i>5. Right to data portability</i></li> </ol> <p><i>If, at any point, Highways England plans to process the personal data we hold for a purpose other than that for which it was originally collected, we will provide you with information about what that other purpose is. This will be done prior to any further processing taking place. The extra information will include any relevant further information as referred to above, including the right to object to that further</i></p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<i>processing. You have the right to lodge a complaint with the supervisory authority, the Information Commissioners Office. If you'd like more information about how we manage data, or a copy of our privacy notice, please contact <a href="mailto:DataProtectionAdvice@highwaysengland.co.uk">DataProtectionAdvice@highwaysengland.co.uk</a>".</i>
Consultation events	The consultation materials said that there were three methods to respond to the proposals, which included visiting one of the public consultation exhibitions. The attendee expected officers would write down visitors views for the record but saw no Highways England officers making notes.	183	N	Consultation response forms were provided at the public consultation events to be filled in by attendees.
Consultation events	Highways England officers remain intent on telling and selling to the community how self-opinionated and clever they are	140	N	Noted, statutory consultation is undertaken to seek views from stakeholders and the public in relation to the scheme and that the public events are an opportunity for members of the public to speak directly to HE and consultants about the proposals.
Consultation events	Concern from the Hethersett or Ketteringham events that Highways England officers hadn't driven down CLS and there was misunderstanding of the single track section.	182	N	Project Team members have been on site visits throughout the development of the design including driving along Cantley Lane South and the wider road network in this area to gain a better understanding of the issues road users face.
Cost	Is there funding in place already for the scheme?	1049	N	Yes, the Scheme is to be funded through Highways England Road Investment Strategy (RIS2). See Funding Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/4.2)</b> .
Cost	What is the cost of building Option A?	182	N	Costing of construction options will be explored throughout the development of the design. Funding is in place for the Scheme through Highways England Road Investment Strategy

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				(RIS2). See Funding Statement (TR010037/APP/4.2).
Design	These proposals do not take into consideration the impact this proposed New part of Cantley Lane South on closely affected residents. After 50years of being able to access the other side of the estate along existing farm tracks this will end and add a 2mile detour including traversing the Thickthorn Junction to get to work.	1051	N	A new private access track is being provided to the west of the existing track that is being removed as part of the Cantley Lane Link works, which will maintain the access to the lands to the north of the A11 via the existing underpass.
Design	Concern regarding increase in traffic on Cantley Lane South.	1047	N	The results of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATs) Model indicate that the Scheme has a relatively minor impact on traffic flows on Cantley Lane South. Cantley Lane South experiences a minor traffic flow increase of around 40 to 140 PCUs in the AM and PM peaks in year 2040 but would not attract any significant rat running movements between B1172 and Cantley Lane South. A majority of the traffic appearing on Cantley Lane South (then Cantley Lane Link) is the north bound traffic originating from Ketteringham, East Carleton and Mulbarton while the south bound traffic destined for those areas would use A11 south bound then turn left into the Station Lane South. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme for details of traffic modelling. (TR010037/APP/7.1).
Design	Risk to cyclists and walkers on Cantley Lane South.	1047	N	The Scheme takes into consideration risk to cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed junction between Cantley lane South and Cantley Lane link incorporates points at which cyclists can diverge of Cantley Lane South onto the new unsegregated footway / cycleway along the new Cantley lane Link. The section of Cantley Lane South between the new Cantley Lane South / Cantley Lane Link Junction and the new Cantley

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				Lane WCH overbridge becomes effectively a cul-de-sac and will be subject to a reduced speed limit of 20mph which is a significant safety improvement to the existing situation.
Design	Of the three options for the construction of the three underpasses, proposed within the Highways England Consultation Response Form, our preference is Option B; Partial closure of the A47/A11 carriageways (in one direction at a time) for example, A47 eastbound closure whilst the A47 westbound remains open and similar for the A11.	1061	N	Noted. Preferences of construction options expressed through Consultation will be taken into consideration when Traffic Management/Construction methods are finalised.
Design	How will traffic from CLS and the proposed Option A new road turn right onto the B1172 at Hethersett near the Park and Ride. Residents have been separately informed traffic lights or some sort of strange 'twin roundabout'. Neither will work as it will hinder further journey times in the morning from Wymondham by stopping and starting the already very slow traffic flow.	182	N	The proposed junction form connecting the proposed Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.  The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters. Therefore, there is no requirement for a roundabout or signalised junction.
Design	Members of the community of Cantley Lane South have asked for clearer road markings before this consultation started, so we could see where the Option A junction would start.	1049	N	The Scheme plans were available during the consultation events, and online on the Scheme website. The plans showed the proposed locations of new infrastructure associated with the Scheme. Following the consultation feedback the Cantley Link Road/Cantley Lane South junction has been realigned further away from the properties located on Cantley Lane South in the vicinity of the junction.



Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design	Request for Cantley Lane South to be closed off at the end nearest the A47 and not linked through to the B1172.	1047	N	<p>Primary access to the properties on Cantley Lane south is currently taken from the A11 carriageway via a direct access immediately after departing the junction. This access is being closed off as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>This would leave only one access point which would be via the existing Cantley Lane railway bridge which is subject to a height clearance restriction.</p> <p>An additional access point is required without height restrictions for the properties along the section of Cantley Lane South north of the Cantley Lane railway bridge which is provided in the Scheme proposals by linking Cantley Lane South with the B1172 via the Cantley Lane Link road.</p>
Design	Request to build a junction at Station Lane, like Wymondham's junction, or a bridge/underpass to rebuild back the road once there before.	1049	N	<p>The Project Team reviewed all feedback from the options consultation and also the proposals tabled by the Parish Council. Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report (available on the Scheme's website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a>).</p> <p>This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified.</p>
Design	Request for the boundaries of the proposed Cantley Lane link road with the specific landowner's retained land, should be defined with timber post and rail fencing with gated accesses.	1061	N	<p>The proposed detailed design will incorporate fencing and gates as required and agreed via consultation with landowners.</p>



Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design	Request for a roundabout, rather than a T junction at Cantley Lane link road.	1061	N	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the Scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010037/APP/7.1) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p> <p>Therefore, there is no requirement for a roundabout or signalised junction based on the current development assumptions. However, if additional developments would take place in future, then the operation of the junction may be reviewed by the authority.</p>
Design	Requests for traffic control measures, including, traffic lights on the B1172, at the point where we have to exit/enter the	162 63	N	The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>new road that goes from Cantley Lane South to the B1172 is essential. At peak times the B1172 is very busy and it will be very difficult to cross the road at this point when turning right.</p>			<p>junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the Scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010037/APP/7.1) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p>
Design	How high is the bridge over the A11 going to be?	1049	N	<p>The proposed structure over the A11 will be designed in accordance with the network requirements and provide a vehicle clearance of 5.3m from A11 road surface to the underside of the structure, the finished road surface will be approximately 8m above the A11. Exact height will be confirmed during the detailed design stage.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design	The proposed footbridge is far too long. HE are expecting people especially older and disabled residents trying to access the drs surgery, chemist and bus stop to add at least half an hour to their journey. This will also affect children walking and biking to school.	1051	Y	The Project Team has reviewed the consultation feedback and have revisited areas of the design presented at Statutory consultation.  As a result of design development, the proposed WCH overbridge is now located 45m east of the existing bridge which offers a similar length of provision and journey time as the existing, whilst conforming to all current design standards.
Design	If Option A goes through will you be providing a footpath to the north of the CLS railway bridge. How will you mitigate the increased traffic danger to pedestrians from the Cantley Farm complex walking under the railway bridge?	182	N	A Walking, Cycling, Horse Riding Review and Assessment has been undertaken during design development. The Scheme proposes several improvements to the existing infrastructure while connecting into existing Public Rights of Way, however no additional pedestrian facilities will be provided through the Cantley lane South railway bridge.
Design	An access footpath hasn't been thought of for the properties along Cantley Lane south linking to the new bridge and if this was going to go ahead this would have to be a MUST especially with speed limit and narrow road. It is unpleasant and unsafe now for pedestrians and cyclists to walk along.	1049	Y	The section of Cantley Lane South between the new Cantley Lane South / Cantley Lane Link Junction and the proposed overbridge will be for local residential access only and is no longer a through road.  This section will be subject to a reduced speed limit of 20mph and given the reduced flows will provide a safe environment for shared access.
Design	How is the road going to be built? Route cut off where, when and how are we to get onto Thickthorn round about during the development all really important questions before work starts.	1049	N	The proposed construction methodology and Temporary Traffic Management Plan are under development and will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the DCO submission

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design	Request for further information regarding the provision for walking, cycling and horse riding proposed along the new Cantley Lane link road to provide access to local amenities as well as link to other recreational routes.	1061	N	Further information was made available through the Project Newsletter released in July 2020, and the following engagement sessions with all affected parish councils and user groups.
Design	We request additional detail regarding the construction phase of the improvement scheme for us to provide comment on. We request additional detail regarding the rerouting Of Cantley Stream, specifically the works which will be undertaken to reprofile what will then be the old course Of This Stream prior to it being handed back to the landowner.	1061	N	<p>The Project Team has engaged with the Statutory Environmental Bodies, namely the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority on the proposed stream diversion and culvert. This engagement has led to the proposed solution, which will see the diverted stream cross section returned to that of a natural chalk stream and the new culvert provided to modern standards for freeboard provision, climate change and ecology movements.</p> <p>The construction phase plan is under development but will be presented as part of our submission to the Planning Inspectorate and will be available online during the examination.</p>
Design	The two alternative proposals were shown to attendees. Option B connected an underpass to the roundhouse roundabout meaning residents could access services such as the doctors surgery more easily. Option A was to provide a new road across to the B1172 and a footbridge across the A47 Complaint: The removal of the Preferred Route meant that neither residents or East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council had the opportunity to democratically comment or influence this unexpected and unknown removal of choice and faced with Only the two new very dangerous traffic increasing Options A or B, may have wished to have influenced retaining the lesser evil of the Three Choices in the original Preferred Route. This is my complaint and that of other residents who have spoken	181	N	<p>The Project Team has reviewed five options for the sideroad connections, three of which arose from Parish Council feedback. The analysis of these options is contained within the sideroad options report, which was available in hard copy at the consultation events, available online at the project website, and available in hard copy if requested. The Report identifies the assessment criteria used to arrive the preferred option and is available online:</p> <p><a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p>



Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	at resident and parish council meetings. I therefore believe the Highways England now singular Option A is Invalid and Undemocratic.			
Design	This route is considerably longer than the existing route and will cause additional pollution, fuel consumption and wear/tear on vehicles.	162	N	Cantley lane Link Road will have a minimal increase on journey times/distances for a majority of road users and removes unsafe access points at the A47 diverge and the A11 southbound.
Design	Cantley Lane South is a very busy dangerous rat run Country Lane. Completely unsuitable for the present volume of Traffic. I believe your Option A will greatly increase Morning rat run Traffic coming from the Bunwell direction through East Carleton and cutting through here along your new road.	155	N	The Project Team has undertaken extensive operational traffic modelling of the Scheme and undertook further local network traffic surveys in October 2019 in response to consultee feedback. The survey data confirmed the model findings, and these models have since been reviewed and validated by the required specialist consultees. The results indicate that the Scheme has a relatively minor impact on traffic flows on Cantley Lane South. Cantley Lane South experiences a minor traffic flow increase of around 40 to 140 PCUs in the AM and PM peaks in year 2040 but would not attract any significant rat running movements between B1172 and Cantley Lane South. A majority of the traffic appearing on Cantley Lane South (then Cantley Lane Link) is the north bound traffic originating from Ketteringham, East Carleton and Mulbarton while the south bound traffic destined for those areas would use A11 south bound then turn left into the Station Lane South. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme for details of traffic modelling. (TR010037/APP/7.1).
Environment	There has been no mention of the two 500-year old oak trees situated on the route of the proposed Cantley Lane South.	1051	N	The impact of the Scheme on the environment will be discussed within the Environmental Statement. (TR010037/APP/6.1).



Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Environment	Concern about the environmental destruction of a set aside meadow.	181	N	The Scheme will deliver a biodiversity net gain, the calculations are included in Chapter 8, Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement. <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Health and wellbeing	My husband is [REDACTED] as such any changes can be extremely distressing and unsettling for him. Under normal circumstances he would find a quiet room to rest in until the situation passes however, I feel that the conditions imposed by the construction of the new road together with the inherent increase in noise once complete, will prove extremely detrimental to his wellbeing and overall health.	1083	N	Baseline noise surveys have been undertaken and noise modelling for both the construction and operational phases of the project have been developed. Noise mitigation during the construction phase will be put in place to minimise the disruption to local residents. Noise impact once operational will be minimal.
Heritage	The driveway is framed by brickwork, columns, railings and gate from this period. At the consultation meeting we were advised that the right side would need to be demolished to accommodate the beginning of the junction which will result in the destruction of both a historical element together with the entrance and border to our land	1083	N	The Project Team has been engaged with all landowners affected by the Scheme proposals following the consultation meetings regarding land take and property affected by the Scheme design.
Design	Who will be responsible for the management and upkeep of the Lagoon and Pump?	182	N	Highways England will be responsible for the maintenance of the drainage basins and the pumping station.
Hydrology	Concerns as to how realignment of the Cantley stream and managing the flood plain which consists of virtually the entire field next to 1 bridge cottages, as building a new road there to join the B1172 will undoubtedly cross the flood plan and therefore would be affected by flooding and potentially completing closing of the inhabitants of Cantley Lane South who live close to the A47, should insufficient mitigation be put into place.	1047	N	Flood modelling has been undertaken for the proposed scheme and has been included in the Flood Risk Assessment. The Project Team has consulted with the Environment Agency and the Lead local Flood Authority. The drainage within this area has been designed accordingly. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Hydrology	The water table is high in this area and residents are concerned that with more water running from A11 and	1051 1047 1049	N	No additional runoff from the A11 is proposed, the systems are attenuated to existing or greenfield flows. See Chapter 13 - Road

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	proposed new roads this would exacerbate the flooding problem.	181 182 1049		Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Hydrology	We request that the proposed drainage attenuation pond be relocated...we request that any access required to the attenuation pond should be provided from the proposed Cantley Lane link road.	1061	Y	Drainage attenuation basin locations are positioned as per consultation requirements with access gained via the Cantley Lane Link Road.
Project Management	HE have supplied no details of drainage plans to deal with constant flooding both on Cantley Lane South and the water meadow where the proposed Lane is planned to be constructed.	1051	N	The Project Team has engaged with the statutory environmental bodies, namely the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority on the proposed stream diversion and culvert. This engagement has led to the proposed solution, which will see the diverted stream cross section returned to that of a natural chalk stream and the new culvert provided to modern standards for freeboard provision, climate change and ecology movements. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Land use	I would request that we are made aware what exactly is planned for this plot after construction and the condition it will be left in as the trees in this area would soften the impact of the new road.	1083	N	The project team has consulted with the landowner of this property throughout the development of the design. Works adjacent to the property will be kept to a minimum, existing trees to be retained where possible, replacement hedgerow to be planted. Please see the Environmental Masterplan (TR010037/APP/6.8) for details.
Land use	Concern about loss of existing Victorian railings in front of property, as well as loss of access to existing septic tank and drainage.	1065	N	The project team has consulted with the landowner of this property to minimise land take and loss of railings, access to septic tank and drainage will not be affected.

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Land use	At the consultation meeting we were advised that the right side would need to be demolished to accommodate the beginning of the junction which will result in the destruction of both a historical element together with the entrance and border to our land.	1083	N	The project team has consulted with the landowner of this property throughout the development of the design. The entrance into the property will be unaffected by the Scheme proposals.
Land use	We are a landowner directly affected by the scheme and the plans submitted as part of the public consultation do not properly reflect the proposed development of our site for 350 homes and are based upon out of date layout plans used support the original outline planning approval. We are now at the stage of detailed design and the reserved matters approvals for the site with construction of the first houses due to commence in the next few months. The area of land shown as being required for temporary access is not feasible as it will impact on our own development programme and prevent the construction of the strategic open space and recreation areas as well as encroaching on land now proposed to have houses built upon it.	1034	N	Consultation/engagement with the developers of the Cringleford housing development (St Giles Gate) has been ongoing throughout the design process. Meetings have been held on a regular basis. Specific areas that have been discussed are Recreational/Public Open Space, utility diversions, landscaping, DCO boundary extents.
Land use	So that the impact of the scheme is mitigated to enable our development to continue with the minimum of disruption from the proposed works as well ensuring that the temporary access rights sought fairly reflect what is the absolute minimum required. We wish to avoid undertaking work that will be 'undone' by the works required for the scheme and then need to be re-instated. Our land is not a suitable location for a contractors compound.	1034	N	Consultation/engagement with the developers of the Cringleford housing development have been ongoing throughout the design process. Meetings have been held on a regular basis. Specific areas that have been discussed are Recreational/Public Open Space, utility diversions, landscaping, DCO boundary extents.
Land use	We have the land at Cantley Lane and you are moving the river in the middle of our land or underneath which affects our entrance. Though we are in negotiations with developers to develop the site. It will affect the construction / hut on my land and my entrance is a concern as you intend to move it.	135	N	The landowner has been consulted with during the development of the Scheme proposals. The existing entrance will be replaced with a relocated entrance. The Project Team is in discussions with the landowner regarding the loss of the work shed/hut.
Lighting	Request of a Lighting Environmental Impact Assessment to be agreed with specific landowners.	1061		A lighting impact assessment has been undertaken and is included in the appendices of



Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				Chapter 7, Landscape and visual of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.3).
Lighting	We request that the light pollution associated with the improvement scheme is reduced through the rejection Of any new street lighting. Where new lighting is unavoidable, it should be the minimum required and designed with the appropriate screening in place to ensure the lowest possible impact upon the surrounding property and local environment.	1061	N	Lighting is only being provide where necessary. A lighting assessment has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB TA 501 Road lighting appraisal and is included in the appendices of Chapter 7, Landscape and visual of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.3).
Lighting	Request for adequate lighting on both sections leading to new footbridge, for security and safety of any users, particularly in winter evenings.	63 1049	N	The Project Team has consulted with NCC with regards to the lighting requirements of the new bridge. As the roads either side of the WCH overbridge are unlit, there is not a requirement for the bridge to be lit.
Light pollution	Concern regarding headlights from oncoming vehicles affecting and disrupting residents.	1051	N	Visual screening will be provided where appropriate on the new Cantley Lane Link road. Planting details are presented in the Environmental Masterplan (TR010037/APP/6.8).
Local businesses	What considerations have you made for the financial effect your decisions have had on the Station Lane Council and Business Park with your rejection of the residents and PC sensibly proposed plans for reopening the Station Lane / A11 Junction. Reference to a survey of businesses commission by the Parish Council showing the extreme ongoing cost both in financial and environmental terms, provided around March / April 2018.	182	N	<p>The central reserve at Station Lane was stopped up on the grounds of safety to stop motorists turning against opposite traffic. Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.</p> <p>This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified.</p> <p>The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE project website. <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Local businesses	The proposed scheme will have a serious adverse effect on the operation of the service station as its ease of accessibility to northbound/eastbound A47 traffic and to westbound A47/southbound A11 traffic will be significantly reduced as a result of the junction proposals within the scheme. As a consequence, I am of the opinion that fewer motorists would make the detour to use the facilities.	1084	N	Queuing on approach to the Thickethorn Junction on the A11 north approach will be reduced as a result of the Scheme, leading to quicker journey times through the junction. The existing access to the Services will be maintained for all routes.
Project Management	We have previously been advised that it will be possible to provide the landowner with copies Of the reports, surveys and site investigations carried out on the land both to date and in the future. We now request This information formally.	1061	N	Reports, surveys and site investigations will be contained within the technical chapters of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1) to be issued as part of the DCO submission.
Project Management	Concern that several maps on the memory stick state that CLS is unsuitable for two-way traffic in the current format whilst proposing to invite further usage with Option A.	140 182	N	The Project Team has undertaken extensive operational traffic modelling of the Scheme and undertook further local network traffic surveys in October 2019 in response to consultee feedback. The survey data confirmed the model findings, and these models have since been reviewed and validated by the required specialist consultees. The results indicate that the Scheme has a relatively minor impact on traffic flows on Cantley Lane South. Cantley Lane South experiences a minor traffic flow increase of around 40 to 140 PCUs in the AM and PM peaks in year 2040 but would not attract any significant rat running movements between B1172 and Cantley Lane South. A majority of the traffic appearing on Cantley Lane South (then Cantley Lane Link) is the north bound traffic originating from Ketteringham, East Carleton and Mulbarton while the south bound traffic destined for those areas would use A11 south bound then turn left into the Station Lane South. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme for details of traffic modelling. (TR010037/APP/7.1).



Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
traffic	Thousands of new houses are being built or have been announced at Wymondham near the B1172 and further away at Attleborough that it appears your dated, improperly researched, flawed model ignores.	182	N	The Scheme will divert A11-A47 strategic traffic away from the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction and therefore improve the operation of the junction and the B1172 approach. The B1172 and new residential developments, including those with planning permission and yet to commence construction, are included within the Scheme's traffic model. This also takes into account natural growth factors. The list of all developments provided by NCC are included in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1)</b> .
Project Management	We request a CAD or DWG drawing of the proposed works to understand their impact on the Thickthorn Estate. We have already requested This material.	1061	N	It is unclear who the respondent is. The design team has been engaged with all affected landowners throughout the design development.
Mitigation	Request to provide residents of the area high enough earth banks, landscaping design filled with lots of trees to absorb the noise & air pollution.	1049	N	Planting and bunding has been provided where necessary, all mitigation proposals will be detailed in the Environmental Statement Landscape Chapter 7 <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Mitigation	Research suggests all berms, fencing and evergreen trees are required at 3 height levels for effective reduction of noise pollution. We would expect the road to be fully screened to the full height of the tallest vehicle using all three suggested methods.	162	N	Noise surveys and modelling have been undertaken for the Scheme. The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> The air quality assessment has concluded there will be no significant effects on air quality at human health and ecological receptors as a result of the Proposed Scheme. See Chapter 5 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Mitigation	Request for further mitigation measures to reduce the impact of the anticipated increase in carbon emissions during the construction and operational phases.	1061	N	Best practice construction methods will be undertaken during construction as detailed within the Environmental Management Plan. <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> .
Mitigation	Suggestion for maintainable vegetation as it is overgrown currently.	1049	N	Where possible, vegetation will be retained however it is accepted that some vegetation removal will be required to construct the Scheme. Maintenance of vegetation will be the duty of the maintaining agent which is Highways England for the strategic road network and Norfolk County Council for the local road network.
Mitigation	Request for a planting and acoustic fencing scheme to be agreed with specific landowners.	1061	N	The design team has engaged with all affected landowners throughout the development of the Scheme design. Noise surveys and modelling have been undertaken for the Scheme. The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Noise	Concern about an increase in noise levels from perceived additional traffic, particularly in relation to specific properties.	1051 1047 63 162 1034	N	Noise surveys and modelling has been undertaken, the results of which are included in the Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11) of the ES <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> . The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme.
Noise	Request for any new roads to be constructed using low noise tarmac or similar, rather than concrete.	1061	N	Noted, concrete road surfacing will not be used on the new A11-A47 Connector road or the new

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				Cantley Lane link road as part of the scheme proposals.
Noise	I would note that a lot of the effort to previously reduce the noise (i.e. lining of trees on earth banking) will have to be removed in order to perform this upgrade. The replacement of any such trees will be a long term project that will be significantly less effective for a number of years before any potential tree planting could be deemed to impact on noise reduction.	1047	N	Noise and Air Quality surveys and modelling has been undertaken, the results of which are included in the Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11) and Air Quality (Chapter 5) Chapters of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1). The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme.
Noise	Concern that the work will increase the noise levels for a considerable amount of time, that there isn't sufficient noise mitigation and that the proposed noise mitigation won't be effective.	1047 1061 1083 1049 63	N	Noise surveys and modelling have been undertaken for the Scheme. The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1) Best practice construction methods will be undertaken during construction and detailed within the environmental management plan.
Noise	Request for restricted working hours and monitored noise levels during construction.	1083	N	Working hours and details of noise monitoring will be noted in the Environmental Management Plan (TR010037/APP/7.4), which will be included in the DCO submission.
Park and Ride	Highways England are aware of the existence of planning obligations in respect of a previously approved development proposal which were required to mitigate the impact of traffic upon the Thickthorn Junction. These obligations can be summarised as the securing of land to expand the existing Park and Ride site and for construction of a new slip road from. The A11 to the Park and Ride to	1061	N	The Project Team has engaged with Norfolk County Council throughout the design process and are fully aware of the proposed Park & Ride extension.  At no point was there a plan submitted to Highways England for review showing a



Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>reduce the impact of Park and Ride traffic on the Thickthorn Junction. Highways England have confirmed that their current improvement proposals do not include any provision for the envisaged Park and Ride slip road to be delivered. Furthermore, Highways England have advised us that the design of their improvement proposals means the future delivery of a differently designed Park and Ride slip road will be rendered impossible because of the constraints imposed by the improvement proposals. If, as stated above, the improvement proposals make it impossible to implement the terms of the legally binding planning obligations, Highways England should be responsible for the costs and liabilities associated with varying the terms of the planning obligations in relation to the Park and Ride slip road and unpicking the land agreements related to that now undeliverable obligation. Given an extension to the Park and Ride remains a key objective of Norfolk County Council, if Highways England are unable to redesign their improvement proposals to make the Park and Ride slip road deliverable in some form, they should provide evidence that the improvement proposals will free up the requisite capacity at the Thickthorn Junction and connected network for the Park and Ride extension to go ahead with access via the existing Park and Ride access route.</p>			<p>compliant slip road arrangement from the A11.</p> <p>The Project Team has, through collaboration with NCC, assessed the proposed expansion of the Park &amp; Ride and included within the Scheme traffic model and operational modelling.</p> <p>The NCC delivery team has reviewed and validated the traffic modelling and are satisfied that the Scheme does not restrict the expansion of the Park &amp; Ride.</p>
Process	<p>The following list of Parish Councils is copied and pasted from the very latest documents on the memory stick delivered with the letter mentioned above. It is extracted from a Very long, wide ranging list of diverse organisations consulted prior to publication. This appears to confirm directly by omission from Highways England that East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council still fails to exist positively implying they also fail to recognise us in Cantley Lane South as the population most effected by their intransigent, dangerous, Option A folly and why they have failed to take our views into account. Local Parish Councils:</p>	181 183 1049	N	<p>Highways England acknowledge that regrettably East Carleton &amp; Ketteringham Parish Council were omitted from the Non-Statutory Consultation in March 2017. However, they were included in the statutory consultation. Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>Little Melton Parish Council Colney Parish Council            Swardeston Parish Council Wymondham Parish Council            Mulbarton Parish Council Bracon Ash Parish Council Great            Melton Parish Council.</p>			<p>made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options was undertaken and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented and it was confirmed that the Side Road Strategy Options report would be available at the Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, shows that consideration was given to the proposals made by the Parish Councils and also details the assessment criteria and scores for each of side road options assessed. The Scheme update was issued in July 2020 and then further meetings have taken place with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council on 27 August ,8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.</p>



Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Process	Undemocratic Invalid Consultation by Highways England over the Thickthorn Interchange. You have received very large amounts of correspondence at your constituency office over the last two years from the concerned residents of Cantley Lane South about the overall Thickthorn scheme and that Highways England have ignored, evaded or failed to listen and take into account our views.	181	N	All consultation received by Highways England have been reviewed and considered during the development of the scheme design. Further to the Scheme update, issued in July 2020, meetings with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council have taken place on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.
Process	You wrote at the time regarding this lack of consultation to Mr Jesse Norman, Minister of State responsible for Highways England, might you please consider bringing this to the attention of the new Minister Michael Ellis.	181	N	Highways England acknowledge that regrettably East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council were omitted from the Non-Statutory Consultation in March 2017. However, they were included in the statutory consultation. Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options was undertaken and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented and it was confirmed that the Side Road Strategy Options report would be available at the

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, shows that consideration was given to the proposals made by the Parish Councils and also details the assessment criteria and scores for each of side road options assessed. The Scheme update was issued in July 2020 and then further meetings have taken place with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.</p>
Process	<p>You should also please carefully take into account that residents of Cantley Lane South, East Carleton &amp; Ketteringham Parish and the EC&amp;K PC were treated undemocratically by HE and Not consulted until After the meeting with other Parish Council when the re-joined route had already been blocked as I understand both Highways England and indeed Cringleford PC wrongly thought that Cantley Lane South still formed part of Cringleford PC, so presumed we had been included in unknown to us consultations.</p>	181	N	<p>Highways England acknowledge that regrettably East Carleton &amp; Ketteringham Parish Council were omitted from the Non-Statutory Consultation in March 2017. However, they were included in the statutory consultation. Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with the Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options was undertaken and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented and it was confirmed that the Side Road Strategy Options report would be available at the Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, shows that consideration was given to the proposals made by the Parish Councils and also details the assessment criteria and scores for each of side road options assessed. The Scheme update was issued in July 2020 and then further Parish Council meetings have taken place with them on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.</p>
Process	<p>I note from your memory stick data there is no mention of consultation with the council organisations and businesses located there despite their involvement with the Parish Council and enthusiasm for reopening the Station Lane / A11 Junction to their advantage.</p>	182	N	<p>The Project Team reviewed all feedback from the Non-Statutory consultation and also the proposals tabled by the Parish Council.</p> <p>Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.</p> <p>This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified.</p> <p>The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE Scheme website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p>
Process	<p>Potentially Highways has unlooked the local committee involved who haven't disapproved the improvement scheme</p>	1049	N	<p>The Project Team reviewed all feedback from the Non-Statutory consultation and also the</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>roads linking A11 &amp; A47 actually understandable and willing for these changes. Sadly residents haven't felt listen to or be given any compromise solution to Option A , surely out of respect we deserve this when you have spend years working and living in such a beautiful area that's going to have extreme development changes. Not enough research and studies has been given to the Cantley Lane south Residents. The manner Highways have dismiss the knowledge and wishes of locals when we have made good valid points and more cost effective solutions being Station Road.</p>			<p>proposals tabled by the Parish Council.</p> <p>Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.</p> <p>This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified.</p> <p>The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE Scheme website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p>
Process	No option to opt out for Option A, meaning Cantley Lane South to become a cul-de-sac.	1049	N	Noted.



Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Property prices	Concern about a devaluation in property prices due to proposals.	1051 155 182 1047	N	<p>Financial compensation under the Part I of the Land Compensation Act 1973 (a Part I claim) may be claimed in certain circumstances by people who own and also occupy property that has been reduced in value by more than £50 by physical factors caused by the use of a new or altered road.</p> <p>These factors include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noise</li> <li>- Vibration</li> <li>- Smell</li> <li>- Fumes</li> <li>- Smoke</li> <li>- Artificial lighting</li> <li>- Discharge of any solid or liquid substance on to the land.</li> </ul> <p>Such claims may be made one year after the Scheme opens for traffic estimated for Thickthorn as early 2025 and can be submitted to Highways England for consideration. Each case will be treated on its own circumstances and mitigation evidence will be needed to provide support of any claim.</p>
Publicity	Delay of information to Cantley Lane South community, hearing from word of mouth. HE assumed we belonged to Cringleford Parish.	1049 1047	N	<p>Highways England acknowledge that regrettably East Carleton &amp; Ketteringham Parish Council were omitted from the Non-Statutory Consultation in March 2017. However, they were included in the statutory consultation. Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options was undertaken and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented and it was confirmed that the Side Road Strategy Options report would be available at the Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, shows that consideration was given to the proposals made by the Parish Councils and also details the assessment criteria and scores for each of side road options assessed. The Scheme update was issued in July 2020 and then further meetings have taken place with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Safety	Why has the railway bridge underpass been allowed unrestricted safe usage by emergency vehicles all the time I have lived her but suddenly when it suits an HE argument it is unsuitable in the future? Are there very many full length articulated 44 tonne GVW police, fire or ambulance vehicles intending using CLS?	140	N	<p>The Project Team engaged with all Blue Light providers to ascertain feedback on the proposed sideroad options.</p> <p>The resulting feedback was that a singular access route that was subject to height restrictions was not preferred and could limit attendance.</p> <p>The sideroads options report contains the full assessment criteria used to validate the preferred option selection.</p>
Safety	The joining of Cantley Lane South to the B1172 would become a troublesome and difficult junction. Noting the speed and volumes of vehicles using the B1172, I can only see how this will be a difficult and potentially dangerous junction to turn right, when exiting Cantley Lane South on to the B1172, when heading to Norwich/Cringleford. When combined with the notion of an expanded park and ride which in my opinion/experience will attract further traffic cutting cross country from the south east/east direction, I can only see how this will decrease safety on both the B1172 and Cantley Lane South.	1047 63 140 162 1083	N	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the Scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010037/APP/7.1) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p> <p>The results of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATs) Model indicate that the Scheme has a relatively minor impact on traffic flows on Cantley Lane South. Cantley Lane South experiences a minor traffic flow increase of around 40 to 140 PCUs in the AM and PM peaks in year 2040 but would not attract any significant rat running movements between B1172 and Cantley Lane South. A majority of the traffic appearing on Cantley Lane South (then Cantley Lane Link) is the north bound traffic originating from Ketteringham, East Carleton and Mulbarton while the south bound traffic destined for those areas would use A11 south bound then turn left into the Station Lane South. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme for details of traffic modelling. (TR010037/APP/7.1).</p>
Safety	<p>Plus T- Junction on the Canley Lane South coming from over the bridge onto single country Lane, how can you design two lane bridge heading straight into a narrow country Lane Vehicle Users driving at 60mphs with extra concern no pathway for properties owners to walk safely to the bridge. Surely Highways have to address health and safety to future development plans yet no research done here. When I take my children round to Cantley Lane Property I have to remind them constantly of the speed of vehicle users and not to step off the drive away, its that dangerous my family and late father have always had to check for oncoming traffic while pulling out of the driveway. Standing across the road to wave out friends and family</p>	1049	N	<p>Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.</p> <p>This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified. The criteria considered environmental and traffic impacts.</p> <p>The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE Scheme website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p>



Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>from the driveway. We have had guest round and cars packed on the road and they have lost wind mirrors off vehicles. As a kid I watched many accidents out of my lounge window. The memory of a car turning onto its side and people climbing out of the window of the drivers door. This just highlights some of the incidents for other day my friend visited me at my Father's property and had to slam on her brakes and nearly hitting the little bridge as a on coming vehicle was driving too fast and narrow part of the road. Its always been a dangerous and unpleasant driving around the blind corners and walking down Cantley Lane South, I wouldn't advise it or allow my own children walk it Especially when option A will increase levels of traffic.</p>			<p>The Project Team have engaged with NCC and highlighted concerns raised in consultation feedback on the speed of vehicles using the B1172. Through dialogue, the Scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the Scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010037/APP/7.1) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the Scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p> <p>Therefore, there is no requirement for a roundabout or signalised junction.</p>
Safety	<p>The Option A junction from Cantley Lane South onto Norwich Road (B1172) also is under scrutiny how would anyone coming from Cantley Lane South get onto the road on a chaotic normal morning day of the week. Pulling out off a T-Junction, this would need to be advised again surely Highways England can they see this a Death waiting to</p>	1049	N	<p>Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.</p> <p>This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>happen pulling out onto a 60mph road it's a hazard waiting to happen, how is that keeping people safe.</p>			<p>option was identified. The criteria considered environmental and traffic impacts.</p> <p>The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE Scheme website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p> <p>The Project Team has engaged with NCC and highlighted concerns raised in consultation feedback on the speed of vehicles using the B1172. Through dialogue, the proposed scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010037/APP/7.1) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the Scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				Therefore, there is no requirement for a roundabout or signalised junction.
Safety	Accessing a footbridge while a horse and rider are in use of the footbridge with the style planned, doesn't look designed spacious enough to accommodate passing at the same time with any other type of user.	1049	N	The proposed WCH overbridge will be constructed to current design guidelines and be suitable for use by walkers, cyclists and horse riders.
Safety	The entrance and exit to this footbridge would be to pass through a very secluded area not safe for adults or children walking alone particularly on dark mornings and afternoons.	1051	Y	The proposed WCH overbridge is located 45m east of the existing structure and Public Right of Way route.  The Project Team would point out that this network will tie into the Cringleford Residential development which is currently under construction and into an area of public greenspace, comprising football pitches and open greenspace.
Safety	HE have not supplied residents with the width and length of proposed footbridge. Will it be adequate to accommodate a mother pushing a pram to pass a cyclist or horse rider safely?	1051	N	The proposed WCH overbridge will be constructed to current design guidelines and be suitable for use by walkers, cyclists and horse riders.
Safety	This will increase when accidents happen and used as a diversions route for A11 & A47 and surrounding villages. This in mind a single country lane width with a blind bend, downhill and speeds of 60mph and under a low weight railway bridge limit. Deems an inappropriate unsafe conclusion and a death waiting to happen, especially with the current speed, vehicles users use.	1049	N	The Network is operated and maintained by Highways England Operations Department and is not under the remit of the Major Projects Delivery Team.  Feedback has been passed onto the Operations team.
Safety	I am also aware that when RTA's will occur on the A11, this will cause further increases in rat running leading from Wymondham and will continue to pose a safety risk as peak flow of traffic will spike considerably for these instances.	1047	N	The Network is operated and maintained by Highways England Operations Department and is not under the remit of the Major Projects Delivery Team.  Feedback has been passed onto the Operations team.

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Safety	My concerns include the number of blind corners and the excessive speeds taken round these by motorists. The corner of where Cantley Lane South bisects the stream is just one prime example of where excessive driving has been seen and in my opinion proven dangerous innumerable times.	1047	Y	<p>The Scheme will see the section of Cantley Lane over the existing stream closed to through traffic and becoming local residential access only. The Scheme has addressed the existing bend at the connection with the proposed Cantley Lane Link by realigning this section of carriageway to increase forward visibility.</p> <p>Cantley Lane South will also be subject to a 40mph speed limit as part of the Scheme, with the section east of the proposed junction providing local access only subject to a 20mph restriction.</p>
Safety	As per your map there is a slight turn in the road just before the roundabout it will be difficult to see oncoming traffic approaching from the right making it dangerous to cross the road, at this point. I believe there is a speed limit of 50 mph coming from the Hethersett direction on this section of road although it does drop to 40mph on the approach to the roundabout.	63	N	<p>The Scheme will implement a 40mph speed restriction on the B1172 from the existing roundabout at McDonalds through to Hethersett.</p> <p>The junction and pedestrian / cycling crossing point are designed in accordance with current design standards and provide full junction visibility requirements for users.</p>



Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Safety	I have very serious concerns about the ability to turn safely on to the B1172 and the extended delays at this point.	162	N	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the Scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010037/APP/7.1) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p>
Speed limits	Why do you propose a 30mph limit to the north of CLS and not the entire length?	182	N	<p>The section of road becomes effectively a cul-de-sac with access to properties, business and land only. The project team have consulted extensively with Norfolk County Council on the speed limits for roads that are within the Scheme extents. Changing speed limits outside the scheme extents are not within the remit of the Scheme.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Speed limits	Will there be speed limit enforced on the A11 heading to Station Lane Area?	1049	N	The existing speed limits associated with the A11 will be maintained in the Scheme.
Speed limits	<p>Suggestions: The road speed on the Cantley Lane link road should be a maximum of 30 mph. -</p> <p>The road speed on the existing A11 between Station Lane and the Thickthorn roundabout, in both directions, should be restricted to a maximum of 50 mph.</p> <p>The road speed on the new northern and southern free flow links should be restricted to a maximum of 50 mph.</p>	1061	N	<p>The existing speed limits associated with the A11 will be maintained in the Scheme.</p> <p>The Project Team has engaged with NCC and presented the public feedback received during consultation. Through dialogue, we have agreed that the following speed limits will be in place as part of the Scheme:</p> <p>Cantley Lane South, Cantley lane Link and the B1172 are proposed to be reduced to 40mph.</p> <p>Cantley Lane South, from the junction with the proposed Cantley Lane Link to the proposed WCH overbridge will be reduced to a 20mph zone.</p>
Traffic	Concern that traffic survey at the Thickthorn end of CLS was only carried out at the quietest time of the day and reports that the survey was not in place at either 8.15am or 1.30pm.	140	N	An additional traffic survey was carried out in October 2019 for 12 hours (0700-1900) over 2 days. This is detailed in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010037/APP/7.1).
Traffic	When separate residents E Mailed this to HE it was further explained that our research demonstrated that the source of this dangerously high volume of vehicles was not parochial Mulbarton / Ketteringham vehicles as HE now ignorantly state in their latest documentation but coming from the south of Mulbarton on the B1113 road from the Tacolneston / Bunwell direction, turning left into East Carleton then along the Hethersett Road to the Station Lane junction with Cantley Lane South and turning right to reach the Thickthorn Interchange.	140	N	Our base year traffic model indicates that majority of the traffic appearing on Cantley Lane South is associated with local traffic mainly from Ketteringham/Mulbarton/East Carleton.

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Safety	I have considered the Non-Technical Summary dated May 2019 and also the Public Consultation document and noted that the scheme will save 16,000 vehicles per day from entering the existing roundabout by the opening year of 2022. Nevertheless, neither document addresses the importance of service area facilities to the travelling public in terms of road safety and welfare.	1084	N	Access to the existing service area will not be affected by the current proposals. Queuing on approach to the Thickthorn junction from the A11 South and the A47 west will be reduced during peak hours, meaning journey times the service station facilities are improved.
Wildlife	Concern about settling of wildlife. References to several species of wildlife being present including owls, foxes, rabbits and bats. Request for more robust mitigation.	1083 1049 1047 1051	N	Ecology mitigation is considered in Chapter 8 – Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement (TR010037/APP/6.1).
Design	The type of road surface is just as important in reducing noise.	Targeted statutory consultation comment	N	The surface course proposed for the project in new pavement construction and in areas or inlay or overlay design is Thin Surface to Clause 942, and it is expected to be a product which complies with Level 2 with a Road Surface Influence (RSI) of -2.5 db(A) which is categorised as quieter than HRA surfacing materials.

## 2.4 Statutory consultation under Section 47 and Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
3D flythrough	There were some amazing computer generated images of the junction as it would be on completion, however with no labelling whatsoever it proved to be almost impossible to work out exactly what they were showing.	N	<p>The 3D flythrough presented during consultation events and hosted on the HE project website (<a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a>) contained digital call outs which highlighted which section of the scheme the flythrough was going through next.</p> <p>During consultation events we also provided a series of rendered still images which were annotated and labelled to highlight the viewpoint location.</p> <p>We will endeavour to make this clearer in the future.</p>
Air quality	This scheme should not go ahead, as it is about making the private car more attractive as a transport choice. We now have a political consensus around concern about climate emissions and with 24% of emissions in the UK coming from transport, it would seem this scheme is out of step with national policy. The scheme will increase the total capacity of the Norfolk road network which will increase carbon emissions by transport.	N	<p>Current DMRB Guidance LA114 requires the climate chapter to account for the latest climate change projections and we have used UKCP18 projections for the high emissions scenario for the 2080s in our assessment. Climate change allowances are being agreed through consultation with the Environment Agency. See Chapter 14 - Climate of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
Air quality	There are some other matters which we would like to monitor as the plans progress. Please refer to the following document: <a href="https://laqm.defra.gov.uk/assets/63091defraairqualityguide9web.pdf">https://laqm.defra.gov.uk/assets/63091defraairqualityguide9web.pdf</a> 'There is no evidence of a safe level of exposure to PM or a threshold below which no adverse health effects occur'. Negative health impacts have been found well below current EU & UK limits.' P13 Air Quality. A Briefing for Directors of Public Health. March 2017 This suggests that the usual systems used to control levels of PM during construction may not be adequate.	N	<p>Please refer to the Chapter 5 - Air Quality chapter in the of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> which outlines the proposed methodology for the assessment and mitigation of PM concentrations.</p>



<p>Air quality</p>	<p>The houses on Cantley Lane South are very close to this road so it's not possible to mitigate noise, or in fact deadly pollution. According to GOV.UK air pollution is the largest environmental risk to public health as exposure can cause chronic conditions.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Noise surveys and modelling have been undertaken for the Scheme. The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b>. The air quality assessment has concluded there will be no significant effects on air quality at human health and ecological receptors as a result of the Proposed Scheme. See Chapter 5 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
<p>Cantley Lane link road</p>	<p>Our objection is based upon the Cantley Lane South to B1172 road, which is not needed. It benefits a very small number of houses and the environmental cost for that project is much to high.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The existing connection between the A11 and A47 is sub-standard and is being severed and removed as part of the Scheme. The only other access to the existing properties is under the existing railway bridge on Cantley Lane south which has an associated height restriction. To maintain non restricted access to these properties and to maintain access from Cantley Lane South to the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction, the proposed Cantley Lane Link is necessary.</p>
<p>Cantley Lane link road</p>	<p>The construction of a new road from Cantley Lane to B1172 cannot be justified. It is a total waste of taxpayers money for limited benefit to a very small number of residents on Cantley Lane. It will destroy farmland and woodland and animal habitats. The junction with B1172 will become a major accident blackspot.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The existing connection between the A11 and A47 is sub-standard and is being severed and removed as part of the Scheme. The only other access to the existing properties is under the existing railway bridge on Cantley Lane south which has an associated height restriction. To maintain non restricted access to these properties and to maintain access from Cantley Lane South to the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction, the proposed Cantley Lane Link is required.</p> <p>Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.</p> <p>This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified. The criteria included biodiversity, land use and safety considerations.</p> <p>The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE project website:</p>

			<a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a>
Cantley Lane link road	I do not feel there needs to be a 'solution' to Cantley lane at all, because both proposed solutions will increase distances cars have to travel and therefore be environmentally damaging. Of the solutions proposed I feel that 'Option B' is far better. There is already a considerable increase in traffic along the B1172 due to massive house building in Hethersett and Option A will make the traffic along this road worse.	N	<p>The existing connection between the A11 and A47 is sub-standard and is being severed and removed as part of the Scheme. The only other access to the existing properties is under the existing railway bridge on Cantley Lane south which has an associated height restriction. To maintain non restricted access to these properties and to maintain access from Cantley Lane South to the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction, the proposed Cantley Lane Link is required.</p> <p>Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.</p> <p>This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified. The criteria considered environmental and traffic impacts.</p> <p>The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE project website:  <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p>
Cantley Lane link road	Cantley Lane crossing over A11 to Hethersett is utter madness, firstly coming from E Carleton we will never get access on to Hethersett / Norwich Road as it always has a lot of traffic, and it is completely out of our way.	N	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the Scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the Scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for details of the traffic modelling.</p>

			<p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the Scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p>
Cantley Lane link road	<p>Having looked at the 2 proposal to accommodate Cantley Lane South and stop it being used as a rat run I feel that neither options are giving what is required to stop the rat run scenario.</p>	N	<p>With the Scheme in place, the existing Cantley Lane South (CLS) at Thickthorn junction end will be closed. The northern part of CLS will become a local resident access only as such there will be no through traffic.</p> <p>Furthermore, the traffic model does not predict any rat running traffic or any significant additional traffic along CLS between Hethersett and Mulbarton via the new flyover link.</p>
Cantley Lane link road	<p>At the very heart of the matter is the fact that the lane is not big enough for the traffic flow it has now and this has not been taken into consideration either,</p>	N	<p>With the scheme in place, the existing Cantley Lane South (CLS) at Thickthorn junction end will be closed. The northern part of CLS will become a local resident access only and as such there will be no through traffic;</p> <p>Furthermore, the traffic model does not predict any rat running traffic or any significant additional traffic along CLS between Hethersett and Mulbarton via the new flyover link.</p> <p>Widening Cantley Lane South does not form part of the Scheme.</p>
Cantley Lane link road	<p>The mitigation measures will simply not remove the impact the new road will have on the residents of Cantley Lane South. The law says the residents must not be negatively affected by the new road. This is impossible to achieve and therefore an alternative should be properly investigated. The road South Cantley Lane is simply not suitable for two way traffic. This is even stated in your own documentation. The road is only 5.5m wide which is not wide enough for two way traffic. The new scheme will create two way traffic which you recognise in your own documents.</p>	N	<p>With the Scheme in place, the existing Cantley Lane South (CLS) at Thickthorn junction end will be closed. The northern part of CLS will become a local resident access only and as such there will be no through traffic.</p> <p>The results of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATs) Model indicate that the Scheme has a relatively minor impact on traffic flows on Cantley Lane South. Cantley Lane South experiences a minor traffic flow increase of around 40 to 140 PCUs in the AM and PM peaks in year 2040 but would not attract any significant rat running movements between B1172 and Cantley Lane South. A majority of the traffic appearing on Cantley Lane South (then Cantley Lane</p>

			<p>Link) are the north bound traffic originated from Ketteringham, East Carleton and Mulbarton while the south bound traffic destined at those areas would use A11 south bound then turn left into the Station Lane South. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme for details of traffic modelling. <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1)</b>.</p> <p>Widening Cantley Lane South south of the Cantley Lane Railway Bridge does not form part of the Scheme.</p>
Cantley Lane link road	<p>We strongly oppose the proposal to bring traffic from Cantley Lane South on a new slip road (which crosses the A11 and both new slip roads on a very costly flyover) to join the B1172, The B1172 is already a very busy road and is due to become much busier with traffic from new housing in Hethersett and Wymondham. To add the 900 or so vehicles each day from Cantley Lane South that we were told of adds an unreasonable additional load to that road. At one meeting we were told that Highways England might decide that that road was too costly and of advantage to such a small number of homes that it might never go ahead. Frankly, that would be our preferred option. We were not convinced by the reasons given for abandoning the original plans to link Cantley Lane South with the original Cantley Lane route in Cringleford, believing that concerns of residents about heavy vehicles could have been alleviated by imposing weight restrictions upon that part of the road. in any event, Norfolk County Council have already announced that the existing Recycling Centre in Ketteringham is to close, so some of that traffic will divert to other parts and well away from this area.</p>	N	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the Scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the Scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1)</b> for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the Scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p>
Cantley Lane link road	<p>The proposed Link Road Option 4 is environmentally destructive. It would: - fragment countryside and wildlife habitats and remove feeding grounds for bats and barn owls. - result in damaging physical changes to Cantley Stream and floodplain with the connection</p>	N	<p>A flood risk assessment has been undertaken and will be reported in the ES in consultation with the Environment Agency and the LLFA. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b></p>



	between Cantley Lane South and the Link road to B1172 built across the stream and floodplain.		Ecology surveys have been undertaken as part of the environmental impact assessment to determine species present and any mitigation where necessary. See Chapter 8 – Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Cantley Lane link road	There needs to be a roundabout at the junction of the new Cantley Lane link road and the B1172. The traffic joining the B1172 will otherwise be held up for a long time at peak periods, especially since a lot of it is construction traffic from the depots on Station Road.	N	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the Scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the Scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1)</b> for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the Scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p> <p>Therefore, there is no requirement for a roundabout or signalised junction based on the current development assumptions. However, if additional developments would take place in future, then the operation of the junction may be reviewed by the authority.</p>

Cantley Lane link road	I would like to suggest that the existing Station Lane route be used as part of the link road. The current Station Lane (south of the A11) route could have a junction to the west side of the road, just south of the Breckland Railway Line. The road from this junction could then pass over the rail line and A11, to the east of Station House and Farm buildings, then join up with the existing Station Road (North).	N	The sideroad options report (available on the Scheme website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a> ) details five options that were considered and assessed by the Project Team. The report outlines the appraisal methodology and how the preferred option was validated.
Cantley Lane link road	Heavy goods vehicles can only access these sites from the A11. However, there is now no access from the Northbound carriageway. Northbound vehicles have to travel to the Thickthorn junction and then return on the Southbound carriage to the Station Lane exit. Likewise, any vehicle wishing to exit to the North, has to first travel down the Southbound carriageway to Wymondham and then return along the Northbound carriageway to Thickthorn. This adds considerable time, fuel consumption and vehicle emissions. In addition smaller vehicles wishing to access the NCC Recycling Centre from the South travel through the village of Ketteringham, adding considerable to the volume of traffic along these narrow roads. The NCC Recycling Centre is immensely and increasingly popular, due to the ever increasing housing developments in Wymondham and Hethersett. The proposed link road could alleviate the heavy goods vehicle problems if they could access it, either by upgrading Cantley Lane South or creating an additional link directly to the link road.	N	<p>With the Scheme in place, northbound vehicles from the recycle centre including small vehicles could access Thickthorn junction via new Cantley Lane link and B1172;</p> <p>Traffic from the south (Wymondham and Hethersett) could either using the existing route via the village of Ketteringham or via B1172 and the Cantley link.</p> <p>Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.</p> <p>This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified. It is available to view on the Scheme website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p>
Cantley Lane link road	This proposal should NOT be allowed to proceed until there is a commitment from Norfolk County Council to upgrade the southern part of Cantley Lane South so that it IS suitable for two-way traffic.	N	<p>With the Scheme in place, the existing Cantley Lane South (CLS) at Thickthorn junction end will be closed. The northern part of CLS will become a local resident access only and as such there will be no through traffic;</p> <p>Furthermore, the traffic model does not predict any rat running traffic or any significant additional traffic along CLS between Hethersett and Mulbarton via the new Cantley Lane Link road.</p>

			Widening Cantley Lane South does not form part of the Scheme.
Cantley Lane link road	Cantley Lane South has an environment weight limit (NB. NOT a structural one) which does not have to be observed by council vehicles leaving the Norfolk County Council highways depot on Station Lane. I have followed convoys of gritting lorries down this road. If this scheme goes ahead, then a proper, structural weight limit MUST be placed on Cantley Lane South to ensure that all council vehicles have to join the A11 south.	N	The current weight limit on Cantley Lane South will be retained.
Cantley Lane link road	Surely the way forward is to build one road bridge between the Cantley roads over the A47 with provision for cyclists, pedestrians and horses. Failing that, a road bridge at the Hethersett Station lane junction crossing the A11 at the Kettringham turn off. The roads are already there.	N	Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report. This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified. The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE project website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a>
Cantley Lane link road	Link Road Cantley Lane to B1172. I believe that a better solution is possible and at lower cost. This is to construct the New Link road over the A11 as an extension of Station Road rather than from Cantley Lane. This would be a simpler bridge over the A11 and would enable the link to re-join the A11 by a slip road or if this is considered unsuitable then the traffic could be routed to the B1172 by improving that part of Station Road. This will be more environmentally beneficial as it is a much shorter route and also High Vehicles and HGV's leaving Kettringham will be able access the A47 without going to Wymondham.	N	A similar option to this was considered as part of the Sideroad Options Report, however this would mean that access to the existing properties on Cantley Lane is under the existing railway bridge on Cantley Lane south, which has an associated height restriction. To maintain non restricted access to these properties and to maintain access from Cantley Lane South to the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction, the proposed Cantley Lane Link is required. Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroad Option Report. This Report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified. The Report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE project website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a>

Cantley Lane link road	It would be better to spend some of the money linking the roundabout near the park and ride to the A47 heading NW, using the slip road entrance provided. Without a slip road and now Goodbridge road you could cut costs and save time on the project.	N	The Scheme proposals will improve capacity, reduce queuing and improve safety at the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction by removing the traffic going from the A11 onto the A47 from the gyratory. It includes signalling the B1172 arm onto the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction which will improve connectivity onto the NW merge onto the A47. This is detailed in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1)</b> .
Cantley Lane link road	The most cost effective solution of access to the Thickthorn junction from Ketteringham or East Carleton would be to provide a bridge (one not two as the proposed in the B1172 road link ) linking Ketteringham Road and Station Road Hethersett thus not having to provide an additional road ,only some upgrading.	N	Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.  This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified.  The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE project website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a>



<p>Cantley Lane link road</p>	<p>The main concern is the ease of access from the Cantley Lane diversion onto the B1172, particularly at peak times which would benefit from a mini roundabout to favour the few vehicles wishing to make a right turn.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>HE has also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the Scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the Scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the Scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p> <p>Therefore, there is no requirement for a roundabout or signalised junction based on the current development assumptions. However, if additional developments would take place in future, then the operation of the junction may be reviewed by the local highway authority.</p>
<p>Cantley Lane link road</p>	<p>The option suggested by local residents to create a new access road to a roundabout and then onto the A11 either direction seems to have been thought about far more carefully than what HE have put on the table. The HE options will not have the longevity to cater for traffic increases from either Hethersett or Cringleford onto Thickthorn roundabout whereas the residents option will take traffic heading towards Wymondham straight down to the A11 for this route but will send the traffic heading to Gt Yarmouth onto the A11 to connect with the new</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.</p> <p>This Report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified.</p> <p>The Report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE project website:  <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p>

	slip road which is being implemented to take traffic away from Thickthorn is it not? It will also keep traffic off the smaller access roads to Thickthorn which are heading to the A47 Dereham side or into Norwich and in doing this it will help the hospital roundabout stay less congested which allows for clearer routes for the emergency services.		
Cantley Lane link road	I think relooking at the proposed road for Cantley and perhaps building a better link through to Cantley lane north - perhaps as an underpass or a bridge (now there is a alternative exit being built at the Newmarket Road roundabout with Roundhouse Way) and taking the chance to future proof and add in slip lanes for West would be wise.	N	<p>Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.</p> <p>This Report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified.</p> <p>The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE project website:  <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p>
Cantley Lane link road	Cost, analysis, and design for a new proposed route at Station Lane, Ketteringham to be reconsidered and looked at with intent to serve the community instead of option A/	N	<p>The Project Team reviewed all feedback from the Non-Statutory consultation and also the proposals tabled by the Parish Council.</p> <p>Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.</p> <p>This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified.</p> <p>The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE project website:  <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p>
Cantley Lane link road	Presently the only access available to any vehicles over 3.5 ton is the unnecessary A11 7-mile southbound detour via Station Lane to Wymondham to access northbound Thickthorn Roundabout/interchange at Norwich	N	<p>Consultation response is unclear, consultee respondent might be referring to the height restriction on the Cantley Lane South railway bridge. The Project Team reviewed all feedback from the Non-Statutory consultation</p> <p>Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.</p> <p>This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to</p>

			<p>each option, and how the preferred option was identified. The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE project website:  <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p>
Cantley Lane link road	Local Business analysis report produced by the parish council environmental, cost implications on the local economy, businesses and local authority organisations such as Highways Norfolk and South Norfolk recycling depots staff journeys and associated traffic	N	<p>Consultation response is unclear. The Project Team reviewed all feedback from the Non-Statutory consultation and also the proposals tabled by the Parish Council.</p> <p>Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.</p> <p>This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified.</p> <p>The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE project website:  <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p>
Cantley Lane link road	£3 million cost to the local economy and local authorities over ten years by present road system by not upgrading Station lane. I would like to highlight these points of concern to reconsider option A and the location of severed access provision for Cantley Lane South with the benefit to cost ration of public funds to provide a real sustainable solution. To secure the future of a new and alternative access at Station Lane and for Cantley Lane South to be adopted as a quiet lane	N	<p>Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.</p> <p>This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified.</p> <p>The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE project website:  <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p>
Cantley Stream re-alignment	The river diversion will destroy the water meadow and bring the risk of flooding closer to the property at the junction of the new link road. The property frequently sees flood water on their boundary at time of heavy rain and a high tide. The re directed river will bring this threat even closer.	N	<p>A flood risk assessment has been undertaken and in consultation with the Environment Agency and the LLFA. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b>. The new culvert at Cantley Lane South has been designed to help alleviate flooding in the area.</p>

Cantley Stream re-alignment	The re directing of the stream will be an environmental disaster because it will destroy the little ecology left in the stream. Most has been polluted because existing catchment pools have never been emptied, so all the road pollution has entered the stream and destroyed what was there. If the new road is maintained as poorly as the existing A11, it will be an environmental disaster for this small river and its ecology.	N	A flood risk assessment has been undertaken and in consultation with the Environment Agency and the LLFA. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> . The maintaining agent (Highways England) will have a duty to adequately maintain the drainage infrastructure related to the highway drainage.  Impacts on ecology have been assessed and are set out in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Cantley Stream re-alignment	Cantley Stream realignment must be able to cope with huge volumes - i.e. snow melt such as in 'Beast from East' otherwise Cantley Lane residents will be cut off.	N	A flood risk assessment has been undertaken and the Environment Agency and the LLFA have been consulted during the course of the assessment. See Chapter 13 - Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Cantley Stream re-alignment	The disruption to the Cantley stream environment will be particularly severe during the construction periods with realignments and the awkwardly placed junction of the proposed link road, with ground stabilisation requirements etc. This is impacted by north bound free flow links and the rail bridge works as well.	N	Noted. A flood risk assessment has been undertaken and will be reported in Chapter 13 – Road Drainage and Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> . Construction practice will be followed to reduce impacts to the Cantley Stream environment during construction. The Scheme proposals no longer include works to the railway bridge.
Community	I write specifically about the effect of road changes on the postal service. When the A11 bypass was originally built, it split the NR9 3AY postcode in half. This now causes great difficulties for couriers and the public who find themselves on the wrong side of the A11 with a 10 minute drive to cross over the correct side of the A11. I am concerned that the building of slip roads, closure of local roads, and construction of new local roads will make this problem worse.	N	Noted. Postal service will be notified through the standard channels regarding any changes to the road infrastructure.
Community	As a resident the whole upheaval is going to be horrendous and then for it to put us in a worse position is a worry.	N	The project team will continue to engage with the local communities throughout the lifecycle of the project to minimise impact on residents.



Community	We would also be interested to see details of the transport plan when it becomes available as there are a number of large-scale construction projects planned for the greater Norwich area in the early 2020s including: - Anglia Square - St Marys Works - Barrack Street - St Crispins - Beeston Park - Rackheath New Town - Cable corridors for offshore wind farms While transport plans are considered by the individual District Planning authorities there does not appear to be any consideration being given to the cumulative effect.	N	Noted. Traffic modelling for the proposed junction has included all permitted developments within the study area. This is detailed in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1)</b>  Chapter 15 – Cumulative Effects Assessment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> considers the cumulative effects of these projects.
Community	The impact of the revised traffic arrangements has not been fully appreciated on local residents in Ketteringham Low / High Street and Church Road. The proposed access to the A47 will disadvantage these residents in these areas.	N	New Cantley Lane Link will provide safer access to the A11/A47 via the B1172, current access to the A47 is directly onto the A47 Westbound slip road which is a non standard arrangement.
Community	Having lived in this area for 35 years we have been severed twice from our local communities both Hethersett at the A11 Station Lane junction and then by the A47 at Cantley Lane South, both times our community has been poorly served by Highways England.	N	The new Cantley Lane Link will provide an additional link between the communities to the south of the existing A11 and the B1172 providing access to Hethersett.
Community	The creation of quiet lane to encourage recreation, leisure and wellbeing for the surrounding communities in walking and cycling linking to the city and local parks including East Carleton and Ketteringham 54-acre ladybelt County Park.	N	Off-road cycle facilities are provided along the Cantley Lane Link Road and will link the off road cycle facilities on the B1172 Norwich Road and new WCH overbridge that will replace the existing footbridge across the A47 to the south of the existing A47 junction.
Community	Having a cycle route to link to the local networks of cycle routes of Cringleford, Hethersett and Norwich provides a sustainable solution and should extend to make Cantley Lane south a quiet lane for recreational use and a safe access to the locality and access Ladybelt Country park a 54 acre parkland in the parish.	N	Off-road cycle facilities are provided along the Cantley Lane Link Road and will link the off road cycle facilities on the B1172 Norwich Road and new WCH overbridge that will replace the existing footbridge across the A47 to the south of the existing A47 junction.
Community business	I run a business located on Station Lane just off the northbound A11 carriageway. I directly operate LGV's and HGV's as well as having general public in cars, LGV's and HGV's visit my site on a daily basis. The new road network is of massive concern to me as I believe it	N	A merge taper will be provided for traffic entering the A11 from Station Lane North. Warning signs are provided on approach to the junction.

	is increasing the danger to an already dangerous junction.		
Community business	The alterations 8 years ago had a huge impact on my business as customers feared this junction. Now I am hearing of further hazards being added to the junction I fear for my business.	N	A merge taper will be provided for traffic entering the A11 from Station Lane North. Warning signs are provided on approach to the junction.
Construction	A full closure of either carriageway would and the resulting traffic increase on nearby roads would impact hugely on emergency services' ability to respond to towns and villages along the A11 corridor. Especially with the Acute Hospital/Emergency Department being in close proximity.	N	All emergency services will be fully consulted with during the planning and implementation of any traffic management and road closures to minimise the impact on emergency responses.
Construction	Option C will not work .. evidenced by the chaos caused when there is an accident that closes either the A11 or A47.	N	Noted. Closures will be planned to minimise impact on road network.
Construction	Option B will divert traffic on to the local road network and that has not been built/invested in to take account of all the housing development in A11 corridor.	N	Noted. Traffic management plan will be developed in consultation with the relevant stakeholders to minimise the impact on the local road network.
Construction	Please consider these commuters during these works however, as ideally I don't want my commute to get longer during the works!	N	Noted. Traffic management plan will be developed in consultation with the relevant stakeholders to minimise the impact on the local road network.
Construction	B1172 is already very busy at times. All this will not help because of the Cantley Lane people having to turn right onto the B1172.	N	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>HE has also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the Scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the Scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for details of the traffic modelling.</p>

			<p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the Scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p> <p>Therefore, there is no requirement for a roundabout or signalised junction based on the current development assumptions. However, if additional developments would take place in future, then the operation of the junction may be reviewed by the local highway authority.</p>
Construction	Concerns around level of disruption to the B1172 in the direction of Norwich during construction. At present I find this road at peak times fairly free-flowing utilising the gaps between traffic lights on the Thickthorn roundabout to join the roundabout.	N	Noted. Traffic management will be planned and implemented to minimise the impact on journey time of road users.
Construction	The construction of the three underpasses will be a major challenge at this already busy interchange. However traffic flow will need to be maintained on the existing two lane dual carriageway sections to avoid the massive disruption that occurs now when a vehicle breaks down in one of the dual carriageway sections.	N	Current proposal has reduced the number of underpasses being constructed to two. Construction methods to reduce disruption are being considered. Traffic management will be planned and implemented to minimise the impact on journey time of road users.
Construction	This construction will have a major affect on the journey to work on the west side of Norwich.	N	Noted. Traffic management will be planned and implemented to minimise the impact on journey time of road users.
Construction	It's going to be a total nightmare! I hope all diversion routes are well thought out and no weekend/nights are wasted while the roads are closed.	N	Noted. Traffic management will be planned and implemented to minimise the impact on journey time of road users.
Construction	the potential disruption of the proposed works are not worth it in the long term.	N	Noted. Traffic management will be planned and implemented to minimise the impact on journey time of road users. Long term benefits will include reduction in congestion on the A11 and A47 approaches to the Thickthorn Junction
Construction	I think those of us who live in Wymondham are impacted by this a great deal. A LOT of us work in Norwich and travel daily. I work in the centre and my husband at UEA so for us this impact will mean we	N	Noted. Traffic management will be planned and implemented to minimise the impact on journey time of road users. Long term benefits will include reduction in congestion on the A11 and A47 approaches to the Thickthorn Junction

	need to ensure we plan ahead for the foreseeable, especially as we have children.		
Construction	Biodiversity loss and harm in construction and in the area in general;	N	As part of the environmental mitigation measures the scheme will have a net biodiversity gain. Details of this will be published in the Chapter 8, Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Construction	no-one lives on Thickthorn roundabout so work could be carried out 24/7. get some night shifts in to halve the construction time	N	Noted.
Construction	we should also use the opportunity to increase travel by sustainable means in this period by. Ensuring the bus services can have priority through the roadworks ahead/instead of any car movements when the works are in place? Can Highways England investigate additional rail services between Wymondham and Norwich for the duration? This may aid behavioural change to mitigate the impact of additional car traffic.	N	The Traffic Management Plan will be developed in consultation with the local authorities, emergency services and key stakeholders. Additional railway services are not being considered. An Outline Traffic Management Plan is included in the DCO submission <b>(TR010037/APP/7.5)</b> .
Construction	Contraflow systems seem the only sensible option but even then it will be a nightmare for local people.	N	Noted.
Construction	With Option B, you could arrange 'contra-flow' traffic, and thus keep the A47 open to Dereham etc.	N	Noted.
Construction	Essential to have alternative routes during the work to avoid the total chaos that occurred when the Thickthorn lights sequence was changed.	N	Noted. Traffic management will be planned and implemented to minimise the impact on journey time of road users. An Outline Traffic Management Plan is included in the DCO submission <b>(TR010037/APP/7.5)</b> .
Construction	Option D - work to be carried out at night with minimum disruption daytime.	N	Noted.
Construction	Consider using contraflow	N	Noted.
Construction	Option C, otherwise traffic will use Ketteringham Lane as a rat run	N	Noted.
Construction	Option B or C - better to take the inconvenience & get it completed in a timely manner... with the proviso it is completed on time...	N	Noted.
Consultation	we have a number of matters which we would like to raise. Firstly, could the existing cycle routes (Blue Pedalway Wymondham to Sprowston be added to the diagram on page six.	N	Noted. This can be included in any further consultation material. The Scheme is not affecting the existing cycle route.

	<a href="https://www.norwich.gov.uk/downloads/file/3488/norwich_cycle_map">https://www.norwich.gov.uk/downloads/file/3488/norwich_cycle_map</a>		
Consultation	Emails about how you have come to the decisions you did would be useful. You need to make people aware that you are listening.	N	Consultation process is detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. A Consultation Report has been produced and will form part of the DCO examination <b>(TR010037/APP/5.1)</b> .
Consultation	It would have been useful to have a contact address for requesting further information such as the present day capital cost of building the proposed scheme.	N	Contact details were provided on the Highways England project website ( <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a> ) and in the consultation materials developed.
Consultation	The local residents of Cantley Lane South should have significantly increased weighting on their views in relation to the other 5000 letters sent.	N	Noted. All consultation responses will be taken into account.
Consultation	It would be helpful if consideration could be given to keeping the existing footbridge in place until the new NMU bridge is open.	N	Noted. This will be examined during the construction phasing for the Scheme.
Consultation event staff	No one at exhibition able to fill in the gaps or comment. Needed someone from the developers / Authority to complete the picture. Exhibition itself very good as were the various personnel on duty. Relationship and responsibilities between the various parties very confusing to the layperson.	N	Noted. The project team present at the Public consultations included Highways England and design consultant staff with knowledge of the scheme.
Consultation event staff	I feel that when holding these exhibitions it is essential that the right people are present, in answer to a couple of questions I was told that the person who could answer them was not able to be there that day.	N	Noted. The project team present at the Public consultations included Highways England and design consultant staff with knowledge of the scheme.
Consultation event staff	When you have these exhibitions (i.e. Hethersett) you need people there with knowledge about the scheme!	N	Noted. The project team present at the Public consultations included Highways England and design consultant staff with knowledge of the scheme.
Consultation event staff	It would be useful if all your consultants understood the area and were better informed as to the actual traffic that use these roads.	N	Noted. The project team present at the Public consultations included Highways England and design consultant staff with knowledge of the scheme.
Consultation events	If you want to be inclusive, do not hold exhibitions in buildings that belong to organisations that do not let women in.	N	Noted. This comment will be highlighted for future public events.



Consultation events	We would like to have attended one of the exhibitions, but only 3 dates were on offer in close succession and only one date was on offer in Norwich and that was on a Saturday.	N	Noted.
Consultation info/materials	The main report is much too long for most people to read.	N	Noted. A non-technical summary of the Preliminary Environment Information report was included in the Consultation literature. It is available to view on the Scheme website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a>
Consultation info/materials	Despite making telephone calls, asking for information on which to base any comments and leaving an email address for replies, no such information has been provided	N	Noted. Consultation literature is provided on the Highways England project website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a>
Consultation info/materials	The number of pages of the several 176 page documents that make it hard for most people with full time jobs to have to read and that the consultation is put forward in holiday time and the busiest month for the parish. The volume of information excludes general participation.	N	A non-technical summary of the Preliminary Environment Information report was included in the Consultation literature. It is available to view on the Scheme website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a>
Consultation info/materials	In April 2018 I set up a meeting for the chairman of local parish councils was set up to seek information but denied access to fundamental information such ' traffic data' which we were finally able to find out was 2015. Norfolk County Council also stated they had not received this information. This information has not been available to the public authorities to have to adopt and at an estimated cost of £66 million raises big concerns. We had also been asking for the cost of the option A, which again had been denied and we asked our MP Richard Bacon who wrote to Jesse Norman who said we would be informed but this information has still not been given.	N	Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. However they were included in the statutory consultation. A meeting was held with the Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options were considered and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented and confirmation that the Side Road Strategy

			Options report would be available at the Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report ( <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a> ), published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, shows that consideration was given to the proposals made by the Parish Councils and also details the assessment criteria and scores for each of side road options assessed. The scheme update was issued in July 2020 and then further Parish Council meetings have taken place with them on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.
Consultation info/materials	Please note that your proposed design in the Public Consultation Document shows Cantley Lane South crossing over the Breckland Railway Line - The Breckland Railway Line actually crosses over Cantley Lane South.	N	Noted.
Consultation info/materials	Infrastructure needs joining up and made easier to comprehend.	N	Noted.
Consultation info/materials	1) There appear to be no figures for origin and destination, nor turning movements, of vehicles currently travelling through the junction, and so there is no objective measure of the problem. Nor is there even a measure of the length of queues and greatest time spent in a queue, and at what times of day. It is therefore difficult to assess the severity and location of the problem, and one has to take the statement on trust that the problem is mainly the route between A11 to the south of the junction, and A47 to its east.	N	<p>The NATS model base year has been calibrated to represent a 2015 base year, utilising the data collected as part of the scheme assessment as well as SERTM network and mobile phone data.</p> <p>Mobile phone data, from SERTM, is the primary source used for deriving the distribution of trips in the base year prior demand matrices in the schemes impact area. Traffic count data is used to calibrate the model based on a matrix estimation (ME) procedure. The SATURN ME process adjusts the prior trip matrix based on the strategic traffic assignment and the observed count data.</p> <p>Subsequent to the ME process, the model has been validated against independent data sets including Trafficmaster journey time data.</p> <p>The base model was developed in accordance with the DfT's TAG Unit M3.1: Highway Assignment Modelling</p>

			<p>(2020) and has been signed off by Highways England TPG.</p> <p>Traffic modelling analysis indicates that in the existing situation large traffic flows are accessing the Thickthorn Junction on the A47 eastbound, A11 westbound and A11 eastbound approach arms. Delays are present on the A11 eastbound and B1172 approach arms, particularly in the AM peak, due to the traffic demand exceeding the available junction capacity. This is consistent with the observed Trafficmaster journey time data.</p>
Consultation info/materials	Although the consultants recommended detailed assessment of the impact on the Local Economy, the 2019 consultation does not provide this information.	N	<p>Consultation process is detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. A Consultation Report has been produced and will form part of the DCO examination <b>(TR010037/APP/5.1)</b></p> <p>The impact on the local economy is considered in Chapter 12 - Population and Human Health of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b></p>
Consultation info/materials	The forecast road traffic growth does not factor in considerable uncertainties such as changes in travel trends. For example, the report by the Commission on Travel Demand (May 2018), 'All Change? The future of travel demand and the implications for policy and planning', describes the changes in travel behaviour over the last twenty years, with fewer car trips, fewer miles travelled and fewer hours spent travelling. The Commission concludes that road traffic forecasts have been consistently over-estimated by traffic modellers resulting in overinvestment in road based solutions.	N	<p>The traffic forecast was developed in accordance with the DfT's TAG Unit M4: Forecasting and Uncertainty and has been signed off by Highways England TPG.</p> <p>This assessment involves the development of a core scenario which represents the most unbiased and realistic set of assumptions in accordance with TAG. It is intended to provide a sound basis for decision-making given current evidence. As such the focus is robust and evidence-based taking into consideration various factors and uncertainty log affecting future travel demand.</p> <p>The traffic forecasts are dependent on household and employment growth, which were derived from both local and national growth forecasts. The local growth forecasts consider the local authority growth projections and the national growth forecasts take wider anticipated growth into account.</p>

			<p>The local authority forecasts on development growth are derived from the uncertainty log. The uncertainty log details the local authority development schemes in regions which are both nearby and significant to the model. This includes assumptions on local uncertainty, which is dependent on whether developments or other planned transport schemes close to the Scheme area are proposed.</p> <p>However, it is recognised that, forecasting into the future is inherently uncertain, as unforeseen changes to key underlying assumptions can have implications for future levels of demand and supply. The DfT recommends, therefore, that scenario analysis and sensitivity tests be undertaken to allow for future uncertainty.</p> <p>Two sensitivity tests have been undertaken considering changes to traffic growth and uncertainty of assumptions as agreed with Highways England. These tests include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low growth scenario: incorporating land-use uncertainty assumptions as for the core scenario with low traffic growth</li> <li>• High growth scenario: incorporating land-use uncertainty assumptions as for the core scenario with high traffic growth.</li> </ul>
Consultation info/materials	I feel the map provided does not extend to the roads that will handle all diverted traffic. The population, especially the local residents deserve a fuller explanation of how they will be able to access alternative routes.	N	Noted, engagement with the local communities has been ongoing throughout the development of the design proposals. Updates are published on the Highways England A47 Thickthorn website. The Scheme plan shows all roads that are being amended as part of the Scheme proposals. An Outline Traffic Management Plan will be included in the DCO submission that outlines traffic management proposals during the construction phase. <b>(TR010037/APP/7.5).</b>
Consultation info/materials	Not enough consideration given to a description of the problem and the proposed solution - virtually no quantification.	N	Noted.
Consultation info/materials	someone still thinks that Hethersett Footpath is on south side of A11. Please amend map on page 7.	N	Noted. This was amended in subsequent issues of the plan.

<p>Consultation info/materials</p>	<p>No indication of the cost of this scheme is provided e.g. Â£1m to save 5 mins per day may be good value, Â£100m is not. As such, there is no context to make a considered opinion on the scheme</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Scheme costs were still being developed during the consultation period. The cost benefit ratio is acceptable for the Scheme to progress.</p>
<p>Consultation info/materials</p>	<p>At the consultation we were told there was traffic data 2018 produced but this again was denied, and Norfolk County Council had also not seen this.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Traffic Modelling and Traffic Survey data was issued to Norfolk County Council in summer 2020. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for details on the traffic data.</p> <p>The base model was developed in accordance with the DfT's TAG Unit M3.1: Highway Assignment Modelling (2020) and has been signed off by Highways England TPG.</p> <p>Traffic modelling analysis indicates that in the existing situation large traffic flows are accessing the Thickthorn Junction on the A47 eastbound, A11 westbound and A11 eastbound approach arms. Delays are present on the A11 eastbound and B1172 approach arms, particularly in the AM peak, due to the traffic demand exceeding the available junction capacity. This is consistent with the observed Trafficmaster journey time data.</p> <p>Thus the scheme provides benefits by removing congestion, which is present in the existing situation before future year developments such as Hethersett and Cringleford are taken into account.</p> <p>The Scheme supports the objectives of the various sub regional policy documents in delivering the required and supported improvements to the A47. Local planning policies support the implementation of enhancements to the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction to accommodate future planned growth, housing development, tackle congestion and improve road safety, which are consistent with the Scheme objectives.</p>
<p>Consultation info/materials</p>	<p>Although this question of the Questionnaire clearly states that "A new footbridge will be constructed " no</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Noted. A new WCH overbridge is proposed across the A47, to replace the existing footbridge.</p>



	such clear statement is made in the consultation brochure, or in other documents so far as I can see.		
Consultation info/materials	There is no discussion of the merits or otherwise of different type of noise solutions in the consultation brochure.	N	Noise surveys and modelling have been undertaken for the Scheme. The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> Chapter of the Environmental Statement. Noise mitigation during the construction phase will be required, and is detailed within the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> , which will be included in the DCO submission.
Consultation predetermination	we are still left with a clear impression that opinions sought and provided do not make any material difference to the outcomes.	N	Noted. The consultation process was detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. This is available to view on the Scheme website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a>

<p>Consultation predetermination</p>	<p>The initial consultation on the Thickthorn junction improvements had excluded East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council at a time the development boundary was discussed and set.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Highways England acknowledge that regrettably East Carleton &amp; Ketteringham Parish Council were omitted from the Non-Statutory Consultation in March 2017. However, they were included in the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options were considered and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented and confirmation that the Side Road Strategy Options report would be available at the Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, shows that consideration was given to the proposals made by the Parish Councils and also details the assessment criteria and scores for each of side road options assessed. The scheme update was issued in July 2020 and then further meetings have taken place with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.</p>
--------------------------------------	--	----------	---

<p>Consultation predetermination</p>	<p>All these solutions and benefits to all residents and to the public purse are being ignored because of the unwillingness of decision makers and the system to see a better solution.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Consultation process is detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. A Consultation Report <b>(TR010037/APP/5.1)</b> has been produced and forms part of the DCO examination.</p>
<p>Consultation predetermination</p>	<p>The quote below is from [REDACTED] from HE which does say the local residents were not consulted. Despite their renewed efforts after initial consultation, the development boundaries were set before local residents were consulted, making this consultation invalid and illegal. “”Lastly, I must clarify that East Carleton &amp; Ketteringham Parish Council and the local community it represents have had the same opportunities to influence the scheme as the other parish councils. I acknowledge that the parish council was not invited to the collective parish council meeting in early 2017, however, Highways England has since ensured that East Carleton &amp; Ketteringham Parish Council has been involved in the development of the scheme and encouraged to give feedback, which has been taken on board. Ultimately, the Planning Inspectorate must be satisfied that Highways England has engaged with local communities in an appropriate manner and this will have a bearing on the approval of the Development Consent Order.”” This e-mail therefore shows the consultation to be invalid</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Highways England acknowledge that regrettably East Carleton &amp; Ketteringham Parish Council were omitted from the Non-Statutory Consultation in March 2017. However, they were included in the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with the Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options were considered and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented and confirmation that the Side Road Strategy Options report would be available at the Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, shows that consideration was given to the proposals made by the Parish Councils and also details the assessment criteria and scores for each of side road options assessed. The scheme update was issued in July 2020 and then further Parish Council meetings have taken place with them on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.</p>

Consultation predetermination	This is not a consultation it is trying to justify an already decided proposal.	N	Consultation process is detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. A Consultation Report <b>(TR010037/APP/5.1)</b> has been produced and forms part of the DCO examination.
Consultation predetermination	It is futile to make comments as no-one is listening/cares.	N	Consultation process is detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. A Consultation Report <b>(TR010037/APP/5.1)</b> has been produced and forms part of the DCO examination.
Consultation predetermination	As with the original closure of Station Lane, Highways England will just do what their "models" and "standards" say, rather than take into account the real effect on residents of their decisions. But they'll be able to say they have "consulted", even if they haven't actually listened.	N	Consultation process is detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. A Consultation Report <b>(TR010037/APP/5.1)</b> has been produced and forms part of the DCO examination.
Consultation predetermination	Do not think you listened to concerns about the proposal to add yet more traffic on to B1172 with the Cantley Lane issue.	N	Noted. Traffic model indicates that there will be a slight reduction into the opening year traffic on the B1172 Norwich Road. This is due to the projected reduction in congestion at the Thickthorn Junction. This is detailed in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1)</b> .
Consultation predetermination	I have found the consultation process to not be a consultation at all, if you can admit that in the first instance you have put plans in place with 2 options for the works that will affect CLS and then say you did not know that the residents of CLS had not been informed or consulted on these prior to announcements in the press and did not even know there were residents on this part of the lane then you have not carried out a fair and reasonable consultation have you?	N	Consultation process is detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. A Consultation Report <b>(TR010037/APP/5.1)</b> has been produced and forms part of the DCO examination.
Consultation predetermination	I believe the consultation process to have just been a cross the I's and dot the T's exercise with no real thought given to what us the residents had to say. I would have thought that being ignorant of the fact that there were residents on CLS shows how little consideration has been shown to us and this shows the	N	The consultation process was detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. A Consultation Report <b>(TR010037/APP/5.1)</b> has been produced and forms part of the DCO examination.

	consultation in the first instance to be invalid does it not?		
Consultation predetermination	The lack of consultation with the residents most impacted by the development was a significant breach of due process therefore the consultation is illegal and no longer valid.	N	Consultation process is detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. A Consultation Report <b>(TR010037/APP/5.1)</b> has been produced and forms part of the DCO examination.
Consultation publicity	Perhaps additional advertisement through social media which may promote wider engagement	N	Noted.
Consultation publicity	Details of the consultation should have been made a viable on all public transport services that operate through the junction	N	Noted. Consultation process is detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. A Consultation Report <b>(TR010037/APP/5.1)</b> has been produced and forms part of the DCO examination.



<p>Consultation publicity</p>	<p>Ketteringham is one of the villages most affected yet we were not consulted in the first round. There needs to be more.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Highways England acknowledge that regrettably East Carleton &amp; Ketteringham Parish Council were omitted from the Non-Statutory Consultation in March 2017. However, they were included in the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options were considered and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented and confirmation that the Side Road Strategy Options report would be available at the Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, shows that consideration was given to the proposals made by the Parish Councils and also details the assessment criteria and scores for each of side road options assessed. The scheme update was issued in July 2020 and then further meetings have taken place with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.</p>
<p>Consultation publicity</p>	<p>No consultation appears to have been undertaken with other organisations, e.g. District Council, Drainage Board, Orsted Windfarm Project etc.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Engagement with these stakeholders has been ongoing throughout the Preliminary design stage and all comments have been taken into consideration.</p>

<p>Consultation publicity</p>	<p>I do not remember the Parish Council being sent brochures; that would have been a good idea.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Noted. Consultation process is detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. A Consultation Report <b>(TR010037/APP/5.1)</b> has been produced and forms part of the DCO examination.</p>
<p>Consultation publicity</p>	<p>Everyone in Wymondham should have been sent a leaflet - even if it was just advising you where to get the details from. There was a small section in EDP but nothing more. I just happened to notice it by accident in the Willow Centre</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Noted. Consultation process is detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. A Consultation Report <b>(TR010037/APP/5.1)</b> has been produced and forms part of the DCO examination.</p>
<p>Consultation publicity</p>	<p>You failed to contact any of the Ketteringham residents at the start of the process and as a result have come up with a scheme that does not meet their needs.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Highways England acknowledge that regrettably East Carleton &amp; Ketteringham Parish Council were omitted from the Non-Statutory Consultation in March 2017. However, they were included in the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options were considered and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented and confirmation that the Side Road Strategy Options report would be available at the Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, shows that consideration was given to the proposals made by the</p>

			Parish Councils and also details the assessment criteria and scores for each of side road options assessed. The scheme update was issued in July 2020 and then further meetings have taken place with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.
Consultation publicity	We are not impressed by the Highways England's failure to keep respondents informed. The Green Party group on Norwich City Council responded to the public consultation in Spring 2017 using the on-line electronic response form and we received an electronic acknowledgement. Since then, we have not received any further information from Highways England, although we note two references to the Norwich Green Party response in the Public Consultation Report (Aug 2017). We were not notified about this latest consultation and only found out about it through the local press.	N	Noted. Consultation process is detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. A Consultation Report <b>(TR010037/APP/5.1)</b> has been produced and forms part of the DCO examination.
Consultation publicity	East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish council were not consulted. The scheme is in the parish.	N	Highways England acknowledge that regrettably East Carleton & Ketteringham Parish Council were omitted from the Non-Statutory Consultation in March 2017. However, they were included in the statutory consultation.  Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options were considered and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed

		<p>Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented and confirmation that the Side Road Strategy Options report would be available at the Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, shows that consideration was given to the proposals made by the Parish Councils and also details the assessment criteria and scores for each of side road options assessed. The scheme update was issued in July 2020 and then further meetings have taken place with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.</p>
--	--	--

<p>Consultation publicity</p>	<p>In the early consultation stages our Parish council was not notified of the proposal (Ketteringham). I also believe that local businesses (particularly on Station Lane Ketteringham) were not listed as stakeholders and were therefore not consulted. These organisations include M W White (paper recycling), NR Asphalt (road resurfacing), Ketteringham recycling centre, Norfolk County Council Highway Depot, Ketteringham Depot South Norfolk, NCC highways Depot, MOT test station (South Norfolk Council), Middleton Aggregates - all of these organisations have large numbers of daily HGV movements.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Highways England acknowledge that regrettably East Carleton &amp; Ketteringham Parish Council were omitted from the Non-Statutory Consultation in March 2017. However, they were included in the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options were considered and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented and confirmation that the Side Road Strategy Options report would be available at the Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, shows that consideration was given to the proposals made by the Parish Councils and also details the assessment criteria and scores for each of side road options assessed. The scheme update was issued in July 2020 and then further meetings have taken place with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.</p>
<p>Consultation questionnaire</p>	<p>can the reference to 'footbridge' for the new bridge over the A47 be amended to 'bridge for NMUs'. The use of the term 'footbridge' may have implications for cyclists</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Noted. New bridge across the A47 will be suitable for pedestrians/cyclists and equestrian users.</p>



	at some time in the future. It may even effect the design, construction or signing in the short term.		
Consultation questionnaire	Rewrite some of these Questions to make to clearer what you are asking.	N	Noted. The consultation response form was structured to address specific questions relating feedback from previous consultations. The opportunity for consultees to raise additional comments on the scheme in general is also provided.
Consultation questionnaire	This survey is carefully worded to lead the response. At no point are we asked if we are in favour of the scheme.	N	The consultation response form was structured to address specific questions relating feedback from previous consultations. The opportunity for consultees to raise additional comments on the scheme in general is also provided.
Consultation questionnaire	I'd be interested to know what objections were received to the Environmental Impact Mitigation measure. I find it hard to believe that many people object. Such questions seem pointless.	N	A summary of the consultation responses is in this document: Annex M ( <b>TR010037/APP/5.2</b> ) of the DCO consultation report submitted with the DCO application.
Consultation questionnaire	I note that the questions here are very selective and do address the biggest concern of most local residents: the side-road option for Cantley Lane South. Highways England has selected its preferred option (option 4), but seems completely unwilling to engage in further discussion with residents around the alternatives. On this basis, I will have to limit my comments to the proposed option:	N	The consultation response form was structured to address specific questions relating feedback from previous consultations. The opportunity for consultees to raise additional comments on the scheme in general is also provided.

<p>Consultation timescale</p>	<p>This consultation process should have started earlier. Our Parish Council wasn't even consulted initially, when it covers the area most affected.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Highways England acknowledge that regrettably East Carleton &amp; Ketteringham Parish Council were omitted from the Non-Statutory Consultation in March 2017. However, they were included in the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options were considered and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented and confirmation that the Side Road Strategy Options report would be available at the Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, shows that consideration was given to the proposals made by the Parish Councils and also details the assessment criteria and scores for each of side road options assessed. The scheme update was issued in July 2020 and then further meetings have taken place with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.</p>
<p>Consultation timescale</p>	<p>It was requested to Highways England that when they were to hold the next consultation if they consider our parish council dates which are set across the year so our residents would have opportunity to raise any</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Noted. The project team has continued to engage with the local parish councils throughout 2020 and early 2021. This is detailed in Consultation Report Annex O: Ongoing stakeholder engagement (<b>TR010037/APP/5.2</b>)</p>

	<p>concerns at our parish council meeting. We received notification at the time of parish council meeting and distribution of a newsletter to then be informed of the consultation period was June to July and out of meeting dates. This meant at great effort we had to arrange an EGM and again had deliver notices to inform, It had also missed the church newsletter deadline so we locally were not able to inform properly. As a small parish with limited resources and a parish clerk who is part time this puts a lot of strain on capacity of councillors and staff. As a parish it was also the one month when we have our parish events and had three events at Ladybelt County Park, this added further strain to a very important local issue.</p>		
<p>Consultation timescale</p>	<p>This consultation process should have started earlier. Our Parish Council wasn't even consulted initially, when it covers the area most affected.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Highways England acknowledge that regrettably East Carleton &amp; Ketteringham Parish Council were omitted from the Non-Statutory Consultation in March 2017. However, they were included in the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options were considered and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented and confirmation that the Side Road Strategy Options report would be available at the</p>

			Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, shows that consideration was given to the proposals made by the Parish Councils and also details the assessment criteria and scores for each of side road options assessed. The scheme update was issued in July 2020 and then further meetings have taken place with East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish Council on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.
Cost	I believe the cost to link in to the B1172 must be far in excess of that to construct the footbridge to also take traffic.	N	Five options were assessed for the sideroad connection and these were presented in the Sideroads Option Report.  This report demonstrated the assessment criteria applied to each option, and how the preferred option was identified.  The report was freely available at consultation events, online, and on the HE project website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a>
Cost	I would say no to any changes, the cost and disruption outweigh the potential benefits.	N	Noted. Key benefits of the scheme are: reduce congestion, improve reliability of journey times and provide capacity for future traffic growth, improve resilience of the road in coping with incidents such as collisions, breakdowns and maintenance and improve road safety for all road users and for those living near the junction.
Cost	Why do all this work. Take away roundabout and put traffic lights up. Save money.	N	Noted. Comprehensive traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that the current proposals will significantly reduce congestion on the A47 and A11 by providing free flow links. Traffic lights will not provide a similar reduction in congestion and improvements in safety for road users and local communities.

Cost	The scheme comes into the poor value for money category under a Low Growth scenario (Benefit Cost Ratio of 0.87) and into the low end of medium value for money category under a High Growth scenario (Benefit Cost Ratio of 1.60). However, calculation of the Benefit Cost Ratio is on the basis of capital costs of £66 million at 2010 prices. The present capital cost is likely to be much higher and would further reduce the Benefit Cost Ratio but updated cost is not contained in the 2019 Consultation information. Most of the scheme's economic benefits are derived from very small time savings (about one third derive from insignificant time savings of 0-2 minutes, and two thirds derive from 2 – 5 minutes time savings. A negligible number of time savings is greater than 5 minutes.	N	Noted. The cost benefit ratio is acceptable for the scheme to progress.
Cost	The Benefit Cost Ratio is low to low/medium. - The capital cost of construction is likely to be very much higher than the estimated £66 million at 2010 prices and a higher cost would depress the Benefit Cost Ratio.	N	Noted. The cost benefit ratio is acceptable for the scheme to progress.
Cost	The case for the Scheme has not been made. - A significant number of journeys passing through the junction would appear to be short local car trips. - The main economic benefit derives from very small time savings.	N	Case for the Scheme has been developed throughout the design stage and will form part of the DCO examination process. <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1)</b> .
Cycling	The new link road connecting Cantley Lane South to B1172 must have a separate cycle path (as currently on the B1172) and not just a white marked lane as this will be a hazardous road for horse riders, cyclists and walkers.	N	It is currently proposed that the new Cantley Lane Link will incorporate an off carriageway cycleway route along the eastern verge.
Cycling	Cycles. There is a good recent purpose built cycle track along the B1172, some cyclists still choose to use the road. This is a cause of frustration for drivers in both directions. Can use of this cycle path be made compulsory.	N	The existing footpath and its designation for cyclist usage is out with the requirements of this scheme.
Cycling	A full cycle strategy should be carried out. The cycleway to Wymondham is becoming very busy and the crossings over Thickthorn are poorly designed.	N	Noted. Toucan crossing facilities are currently provided at Thickthorn Junction to facilitate the safe crossing of the slip roads by cyclists.



Design	Diversion of Cantley Lane on to the B1172 will create another hazardous junction.	N	<p>The existing connection between the A11 and A47 is sub-standard and is being severed and removed as part of the scheme. The only other access to the existing properties in under the existing railway bridge on Cantley Lane south which has an associated height restriction. To maintain non restricted access to these properties and to maintain access from Cantley Lane South to the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction, the proposed Cantley Lane Link is required. The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the proposed scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p>
Design	I disagree with the solution for Cantley Lane South, particularly with the construction of new roads in Cringleford to serve the new housing development. My opinion is that it must be a more satisfactory solution to link in with this new development than to bring the new road out onto the B1172 involving bridges over free-flow links and A11.	N	<p>The existing connection between the A11 and A47 is sub-standard and is being severed and removed as part of the scheme. The only other access to the existing properties in under the existing railway bridge on Cantley Lane south which has an associated height restriction. To maintain non restricted access to these properties and to maintain access from Cantley Lane South to the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction, the proposed Cantley Lane Link is required.</p>

<p>Design</p>	<p>I have serious reservations about the proposed link road from Cantley Lane South to the B1172. This new route will cut through farm and meadow land and requires the removal of some mature trees, it also disturbs Cantley Stream and requires two new bridges over the A11. On the current plans the new junction with B1172 will be without any traffic control.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>A flood risk assessment has been undertaken in consultation with the Environment and is reported in the Chapter 13 Road Drainage and Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (<b>TR010037/APP/6.1</b>). An Arboricultural survey has been undertaken and is included in Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Effects of the Environmental Statement. The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the proposed scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p>
<p>Design</p>	<p>I would be concerned that the new Cantley lane link will become a rat run especially if during any kind of issue on the Hethersett Road or the A11, everyone looks for alternatives.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>With the scheme in place, the existing Cantley Lane South (CLS) at Thickthorn junction end will be closed. The northern part of CLS will become a local resident access only as such there will be no through traffic;</p> <p>Furthermore, the traffic model does not predict any rat running traffic or any significant additional traffic along CLS between Hethersett and Mulbarton via the new Cantley Lane Link road.</p>

Design	The proposed solution for Cantley Lane is completely over engineered. The existing junction is already at a lower level than the A47 carriageway and your plans show you already intend to widen the railway bridge, if necessary it could be widened more and the new slip road junction moved further back to allow the necessary length to raise the slip road up and carry it over Cantley Lane.	N	Current design proposal stops off Cantley Lane South with an WCH bridge crossing the A47 south of the existing footbridge. The Scheme design no longer requires widening to the Cringleford railway bridge.
Design	In addition to this the Cantley lane turn out onto the Norwich Road will be AWFUL at rush hour for those who live in Cantley as trying to turn right out of there won't happen!	Y	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the proposed scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p>
Design	As I have said lived down Cantley lane,I use to walk regularly up and down lane,as a child,would not allow my kids to use road has become more busy,a cut though now!!! Be doing your proposed road,will only make this country lane more dangerous!!more cars will use it,which will lead to accidents,it is an unfit road for proposal,	N	<p>With the scheme in place, the existing Cantley Lane South (CLS) at Thickthorn junction end will be closed. The northern part of CLS will become a local resident access only as such there will be no through traffic;</p> <p>The results of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATs) Model indicate that the Scheme has a relatively minor impact on traffic flows on Cantley Lane South. Cantley Lane</p>

			<p>South experiences a minor traffic flow increase of around 40 to 140 PCUs in the AM and PM peaks in year 2040 but would not attract any significant rat running movements between B1172 and Cantley Lane South. A majority of the traffic appearing on Cantley Lane South (then Cantley Lane Link) is the north bound traffic originating from Ketteringham, East Carleton and Mulbarton while the south bound traffic destined for those areas would use A11 south bound then turn left into the Station Lane South. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme for details of traffic modelling. <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1).</b></p>
Design	<p>The proposed new road linking Cantley Lane South (CLS) with B1172 will cause several problems. In 2011 the right turn from Station Lane onto A11 northbound was closed by HE. This resulted in a very large increase in traffic volumes accessing Thickthorn via CLS (a traffic count I did in Jan 2018 showed 199 vehicles using CLS between 7-9 a.m.) This is on a road that HE acknowledges is single track in large parts - often with no passing places. The proposed link road does nothing to address this already dangerous level of traffic - which has caused many local people to give up walking, cycling or horse riding along the road.</p>	N	<p>With the scheme in place, the existing Cantley Lane South (CLS) at Thickthorn junction end will be closed. The northern part of CLS will become a local resident access only as such there will be no through traffic;</p> <p>The results of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATs) Model indicate that the Scheme has a relatively minor impact on traffic flows on Cantley Lane South. Cantley Lane South experiences a minor traffic flow increase of around 40 to 140 PCUs in the AM and PM peaks in year 2040 but would not attract any significant rat running movements between B1172 and Cantley Lane South. A majority of the traffic appearing on Cantley Lane South (then Cantley Lane Link) is the north bound traffic originating from Ketteringham, East Carleton and Mulbarton while the south bound traffic destined for those areas would use A11 south bound then turn left into the Station Lane South. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme for details of traffic modelling. <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1).</b></p> <p>Widening Cantley Lane South does not form part of the scheme.</p>
Design	<p>The junction between your Cantley Lane link and the B1172; Having quickly read some of your report concerning this link, it seems that the visibility at the junction will not be as good as you would wish, while the</p>	N	<p>As part of this scheme proposal the B1172 will be reduced to 40mph. The visibility associated with this junction will be compliant with current standards.</p>

	traffic on the B1172 is fast here, travelling at speeds of 60mph.		
Design	Norwich Cycling Campaign would like to see a Construction Logistics and Community Safety (CLOCS) Standard scheme in place for this development and all others in Norfolk.	N	Noted. This will be reviewed with the Principal Contractor during the detailed design stage.
Design	I appreciate that the new link roads between the A47/A11 will be single lane (with hard shoulders), but wonder if it would be beneficial to have a ""smart"" capacity to allow both lanes to be used at peak flow times (and/or when the roundabout has restricted flow capacity due to accident or other event)?	N	The link road between the A11 and the A47 will have a hard shoulder for maintenance and emergencies, however, due to the proposed diverge and merge arrangement which is constrained by the existing merge from the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction and the existing railway overbridge providing a two lane merge is not considered viable.
Design	I think the lane leaving the A11 Norwich bound to link to the A47 needs to be 2 lanes. If you have ever travelled the A11 at peak times or holiday times at Friday night it will only take 1 slow moving vehicle to back everybody up. Presently on Fridays the traffic is backed up to the Ketteringham junction and beyond.	N	Our traffic forecast indicates that having 1 lane would provide adequate capacity to accommodate future year traffic even in the design year of 2040.
Design	A lot of effort has been spent developing a Side Road Strategy Options report but this has focused entirely on minimizing inconvenience to Cantley Lane residents. Options 5,6 and 7 for Cantley Lane residents all involved access road construction in the vicinity of Station Court Business Park. It is essential that a similar level of scrutiny be applied to the access for Station Court Business Park. At an absolute minimum, Station Lane needs a slip road that allows vehicles to exit the A11 safely, but I believe that a safety assessment would determine whether a more significant solution is needed.	N	A safety assessment has been undertaken on the A11/Station Lane north junction and highlighted the need to improve the entry onto the A11. as such, a taper merge has been provided. Warning signs/road markings are to be provided in advance of the Station Lane junction to warn road users of the junction. There is no accident data to suggest that exiting the A11 onto Station Lane is unsafe, and improvements to the current layout fall outside the scope of the A47 Thickthorn Junction scheme.
Design	Approach-lanes on A11N to be lengthened, allowing traffic turning onto A47W, B1172 and A11N to filter off earlier. e) Lengthen the merging lane(s) onto the A11E. There is some room beneath the existing footbridge for this. This is currently quite a busy and difficult merge in rush hours because of only two lanes existing on the A47.	N	Our traffic model shows all existing and proposed merges will operate satisfactorily with the current design. Large volume of traffic being removed from the Thickthorn Gyratory A11 NB approach and A47 East merge by the A11/A47 connector road



Design	I suggest the following could be looked at, with a view to reducing the amount of traffic having to use the roundabout. : a) A single-lane slip road A47W to A11S, but much nearer the junction than proposed, not necessitating movement of the existing footbridge. b) To reduce traffic entering the roundabout traffic going A47W to A11N (and the B1172) to be routed from a slip road (cloverleaf style) to the west of the junction, to join the roundabout at the B1172. This gives easy access to the Park-and-Ride park, and then this traffic does not interfere with southbound traffic on the main roundabout.	N	<p>The scheme announced PRA in 2017 which outlined the preferred junction solution. Further details of the previous options considered are contained within the Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) which is available on the Project Website.</p> <p>During Stage 3 works have been undertaken to detail out the sideroad strategy, of which 5 options were assessed and presented in the Sideroad Options Report. This is available to view on the Scheme website:  <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a></p>
Design	1. There is only a relatively small distance between the 2 entry slip roads onto the A47 Gt Yarmouth bound carriageway. As traffic on the roundabout is signal controlled, blocks of traffic from this slip road will fill the nearside lane of the A47 for a short distance meaning that, at times, there will be little room for merging traffic from the A11. A very long lane from the A11 slip road is needed for safer merging and to avoid a backlog of traffic on this slip road.	N	Our traffic model shows all existing and proposed merges will operate satisfactorily with the current design.
Economy	There is no indication of costs in the brochure. This is a huge project, with a large number of bridges, underpasses and roadways. It will undoubtedly be very expensive, and cause enormous disruption during construction. By introducing less invasive measures, rather than a massive, untested scheme, much cost could be avoided.	N	<p>Noted. Key benefits of the scheme will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce congestion, improve reliability of journey times and provide capacity for future traffic growth.</li> <li>• Improve resilience of the road in coping with incidents such as collisions, breakdowns and maintenance</li> <li>• Improve road safety for all road users and for those living near the junction.</li> </ul>
Economy	We are spending the public's money to resolve a problem for about 15 houses at a cost of £65 million. That money could be better spent at Station Lane	N	<p>Noted. Key benefits of the scheme will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce congestion, improve reliability of journey times and provide capacity for future traffic growth.</li> <li>• Improve resilience of the road in coping with incidents such as collisions, breakdowns and maintenance</li> </ul> <p>Improve road safety for all road users and for those living near the junction.</p>

Economy	No evidence has been provided to show that the Scheme would increase employment rates in the area. The EIA Scoping Report (Feb 2018) states: "If the Proposed Scheme results in new employment in the area, this could have a slight beneficial impact on employment rates."	N	Employment opportunities will be created during the construction phase of the project.
Environment	It is essential the reasonable action is taken minimize the impact of construction on the local environment.	N	The Principal Contractor will follow a Construction Environmental Management Plan ( <b>TR010037/APP/7.4</b> ) included in the DCO submission.
Environment	There is also the threat of cumulative environmental impacts from plans to dual the A47 and construct a Norwich Western Link such as an increase in carbon emissions and loss of and disturbance to protected species. Taken in conjunction with the construction of the Norwich Southern Bypass and the Norwich Northern Distributor Road, the creation of a third orbital around Norwich will involve significant environmental loss. A complete orbital would generate considerable traffic and result in a never ending succession of road improvements as underlined by the proposed Scheme.	N	Cumulative impacts are considered in ES Chapter 15 (Cumulative effects assessment) of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010037/APP/6.1</b> ).
Environment	The scheme is anticipated to generate carbon emissions during construction and operation as a result of higher traffic speeds and additional traffic. This increase in emissions is incompatible with the Climate Emergency and the imperative to hold global temperature rise to no more than 1.5 degrees C.	N	An assessment of the impact of the proposed scheme on the climate is included in Chapter 14 – Climate of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010037/APP/6.1</b> ).
Environment	We are concerned that any new employment growth in the area will take place on land severed by the new improvements and cause further harm to the environment as well as generate new traffic.	N	Access to all Highways England owned land will be maintained.

Traffic	The scheme as outlined should be redesigned to allow more effective movement from the Norwich area to the Hethersett area by sustainable modes. The proposal as outlined will mean that journey time for sustainable modes will be increased whereas travel by non-sustainable modes will decrease. This will mean the amount of people using carbon emitting non-sustainable modes of transport will rise as a result of this scheme.	N	<p>The objectives of the scheme are to reduce the congestion and journey times as a result of the junction capacity in am and pm peaks.</p> <p>The proposed scheme provides a new all user segregated connection for Walkers, Cyclists &amp; Horse riders over the A47 replacing the existing structure which does not provide all user access.</p> <p>The proposed scheme also provides a safe route from cringleford to the B1172 Norwich Road, with access into the proposed P&amp;R extension.</p> <p>As part of our development works and engagement with NCC, the proposed scheme will also see the speed limit on the B1172 Norwich Road reduced from National to 40mph.</p>
Environmental	The road will increase carbon dioxide emissions and contribute to climate change, at a time when both national and governments have acknowledged we have a climate emergency.	N	An assessment of the impact of the proposed scheme on the climate is included in Chapter 14 – Climate of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Environmental	The money spent on this road should instead be spent on alternatives to private transport, including public transport and cycling and pedestrian facilities that actually work. We are experiencing a climate crisis - schemes like this must be stopped.	N	Noted.
Environmental	More detailed work undertaken since the public consultation in 2017 has shown the following: 1. The scale of environmental damage involved in the works. Extent of impacts on biodiversity and landscape such as fragmentation and loss which are impossible to mitigate. The planet is suffering a biodiversity crisis mainly due to loss of wildlife habitats as a result of human impact. The UK has the dubious reputation of being one of the most nature depleted countries in the world.	N	The impact of the proposed scheme on biodiversity is included in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Flood risk	Road drainage - flooding a concern in Cantley lane South due to verge erosion from the cut through traffic and unsuitable vehicles.	N	A new road alignment and drainage system is proposed for Cantley Lane South as part of the scheme.

Flood risk	Please pay great attention to the Drainage. Whenever we have heavy rain Thickthorn Roundabout floods either on the West side or the East side. Water runs down from the fields on the East side at a great rate.	N	New additional, drainage proposed to the central channel of the A47 Thickthorn Junction as part of the scheme.
Footbridge	It would be helpful if consideration could be given to keeping the existing footbridge in place until the new NMU bridge is open. Ensuring access for cyclists is maintained is important.	N	Noted. Public right of way (PRoW) over the A47 will be maintained during the construction of the new WCH overbridge.
Footbridge	As a side point the new bridge is MUCH further away from the existing location which makes me wonder if actually this weill lead to it being under used. It could easily be put back in the same position and not interact with the gravel pit site on the south side and cutting into less of the green space on the north side. This plan seems its done for cost rather than actual usefulness.	Y	Noted Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches.
Footbridge	but remain very concerned that access through Cantley Lane will create a rat run through Brettingham Avenue to Norwich.	N	Comment unclear, WCH overbridge would not contribute to rat run along Brettingham Avenue.
Footbridge	Why so far from original?	Y	Noted. Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches.
Footbridge	It seems to involve a longer route, so I do not understand how accessibility will be improved; perhaps it has ramps? This is not explained.	Y	Noted. Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches.
Footbridge	If the bridge is to allow horse riders to cross from Cantley Lane South to Cantley lane there needs to be safe access for the horse and rider to travel down Cantley Lane South to reach this access point.	N	The bridge has been designed in accordance with current standards and in line with British Horse Society requirements. Improvements to Cantley Lane South outside the scheme boundary are not part of the Scheme remit.
Footbridge	There seems to be no provision for cyclists during the construction period when the current bridge will be removed, until it is replaced.	N	Noted. Public right of way (PRoW) over the A47 will be maintained during the construction of the new WCH overbridge.
Footbridge	I understand the need to remove the footbridge to construct these new link roads. I would just be mindful of the fact that does mean (dependant upon how long the proposal takes) these people will be unable to walk into Norwich easily. And access will be rather tricky as	N	A new road link in this area was considered as part of the side road options report (available on the Scheme website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a> ) but has not been taken

	the new road will not yet have been built. To me building the new road to allow access for their cars seems to be the best option to work along side the bridge removal.		forwarded as part of the proposed scheme. Details of the review process undertaken are found in the Side Road Options Report.
Footbridge	Necessary to have a footbridge but design impacts on recreational space planned by Big Sky for recreational area off Colney Lane.	N	Noted. The project team is working with Big Sky developers to minimise the impact of the scheme on the recreational space off Cantley Lane.
Footbridge	Inconvenient for local residents. Walking to access GP surgery and school.	Y	Noted. Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches.
Footbridge	Although the present footbridges current design is not ideal its location is good to access local services, doctors, buses and shops. When the A47 severed Cantley Lane previously this bridge was not the preferred design but due to cost it was the one provided. As a regular walker on Cantley Lane South and user of the foot bridge at all times of the year and times of the day including evenings, the proposed design disserves the local community.	Y	Noted Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches.
Footbridge	It seems to involve a longer route, so I do not understand how accessibility will be improved; perhaps it has ramps? This is not explained. If so, length for walkers, particularly, increased in time.	Y	Noted. Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches.
Footbridge	The footbridge ramps seem very long.	Y	Minimum required length of the ramp has been provided to span over A47 and link road. Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches.
Footbridge	Increased length of journey time /distance to Dr's surgery, vets on Cantley Lane, and to other services in Cringleford (shops, bus services). This would particularly affect the elderly, the infirm and the very young e.g. parents with young children.	Y	Noted. Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches.
Footbridge	and street lighting would have to funded by the parish council who have limited funds from precept.	Y	Noted. Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches.



Footbridge	This design has been produced to cut costs and is in place to serve the Cantley lane South community who should be a priority in cost in providing this access provision.	Y	Noted. Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches.
Footbridge	and when the new houses are built in Cringleford the trees will probably make it a perfect hideaway for local youths with drugs, alcohol and other anti-social behaviour. The plans make it appear like it will be an idyllic country walking and cycling route, but the reality will be very different once the new houses are built. I note that Highways England have not consulted Norfolk Police regarding this scheme, as housing developers are required to do when creating new footpaths in residential areas.	Y	Noted. Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches.
Footbridge	The prospect of pedestrians, disabled, cyclists and horse riders all being on the footbridge at the same time could result in an accident in view of the narrow confines of a footbridge and noise levels from traffic below (startling horses). Should be made mandatory that cyclists / horse riders dismount whilst using the footbridge so that all users are pedestrians.	N	WCH overbridge cross section is 3.5m which is in accordance with national guidance which will provide adequate width for two-way travel.
Footbridge	The consultation Brochure indicates a new underpass on Cantley lane, for shared use by cars, bikes and other traffic. If this is the proposed replacement for the current foot bridge, this is likely to be a busy route used by cars as a rat run, and will (unless provision is made for a cycle lane) likely result in a less safe cycle route. A significant proportion of our staff and students that commute by bike to the NRP do so from the other side of the a47 to the west and south, and require safe crossing points. The Cantley lane bridge is one of few such crossing points that avoid busy roads. Rural Norfolk has a network of quiet minor roads ideal for cycling, and Norwich has some cycling infrastructure. However the two are not well connected, and cyclists have a very sparse set of safe crossing points to get across the A47.	N	The proposed bridge across the A47 is for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrian users not motorised vehicles.

Footbridge	The footbridge is going to be used by a diverse group of people who do not easily mix safely. Walkers, cyclists, horses and families with push chairs are not to be mixed together safely in an enclosed space. In addition to the longer walk this is also providing a very unsafe environment for vulnerable residents using the footbridge in winter and during the night.	N	The proposed structure shall be truss with standard parapets and surfacing materials suitable for cyclist, equestrian and public users.
Footbridge	The route is elongated compared to the existing pedestrian bridge. If the pedestrian bridge must be replaced to accommodate the freeflow links, a like-for-like replacement may be preferable.	Y	Noted. Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches.
Footbridge	Given that there is a climate emergency, we should be doing all we can to prioritise walking and cycling over motorised transport. The route of the footbridge, once again, like just about every junction in the country, does the exact opposite. This footbridge should provide the shortest, most direct and convenient route for pedestrians and cyclists but spectacularly fails to do so.	Y	Noted. Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches.
Footbridge	Why is the existing footbridge being taken down and a new one installed that is 3 times as long as the original? Why can't you extend the existing footbridge if required and lengthen the ends to suit? Not that I've ever used or intend to use the footbridge but it seems ludicrous to make it 3 times as long!	N	Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches. The current cross-section of the structure is not feasible for equestrian use and due to the current sub-structure arrangement (bank seat on raked piles) the extension of current structure will be not economical compared to the proposed solution, Also the current sub-structures might not be feasible for extension.
Footbridge	The proposed new footbridge would involve a long detour and expose non-motorised users to noise and air pollution for a longer time period. The existing footbridge provides access to Cantley Lane, a quiet rural road between Norwich and Wymondham via Ketteringham. Cantley Lane provides an attractive route for cyclists through open countryside to the south of Norwich. If the new link road to the B1172 goes ahead, the road is likely to attract new traffic as an alternative route between Wymondham and Norwich or	Y	Noted. Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches.

	further afield. This would pose greater road danger to cyclists and other vulnerable road users and increase accidents. We object to proposed footbridge.		
Footbridge	I feel it is a waste of money to build a new road and footbridge - surely extending the existing bridge would be better and place less pressure on the wildlife and environment!	N	The current cross-section is not feasible for equestrian use and due to the current sub-structure arrangement (bank seat on raked piles) the extension will be not economical compared to the existing solution and also the current sub-structures might not be feasible for extension.
Footbridge	This proposal would seem counter-intuitive and a poor use of resources as the sustainable transport movement (bicycle and walking) as a substantial investment is being made through the Transforming Cities bid funding to improve the cycle path between Norwich and Hethersett.	Y	Noted. Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches.
Footbridge alternative / additional	There is a strong argument for footbridge linking the new communities living south and north of the A11. This new footbridge should be located approximately at the end of footpath FP1.	N	The New Cantley Lane Link Road will connect the existing B1172 Norwich Road to the north of the A11 and Cantley Lane South to the south and will provide off road cycle and pedestrian facilities.
Footbridge alternative / additional	My major concern is crossing the A11 between Roundhouse Park and the new development on Cantley Lane i.e. old Cringleford. At present the lights are very dangerous and clearly a footbridge / underpass needs to be built in this location.	N	Noted, however this is outside the scope of the current A47 Thickthorn Junction scheme.
Footbridge alternative / additional	A suggestion has been made that it should be investigated whether the old bridge could be re-used in a new location.	N	New bridge will be spanning existing A47 and proposed link road therefore the existing bridge length is not sufficient to cover the required span. Also, the current cross-section of the structure is not feasible for equestrian use.
Footbridge alternative / additional	If the proposals are to go ahead we would welcome the inclusion of the underpass for bicycles and those on foot. However, we would think it would be more effective if these measures were moved north to allow a more segregated journey for bikes and pedestrians moving from the Old Newmarket Road to the Norwich Road. This may partly mitigate the impact of non-sustainable modes.	N	Off-road cycle facilities are already provided across the Thickthorn Junction. Any solution to the north of the existing Thickthorn junction would have to either incorporate a lengthy diversion to the north to cross the A47 once the slip roads have merged onto the mainline carriageway, or the structure would have to cross the slip roads as well. This would greatly increase the length of any structure required. The current scheme proposals provide a WCH overbridge to the south whilst maintaining the at grade signal controlled crossing of the A47 slip roads at the Thickthorn Junction

Footbridge alternative / additional	Why not have a footbridge / cycle bridge also on the Swaffham side of the roundabout connecting the cycle-way from Wymondham / Hethersett to the cycle-way leading off the T/thorn roundabout that uses the dis-used road to roundhouse way . This would also access the hospital and City cycle paths and avoid the hazards of having to cross the A47 on-ramp from t/thorn and the A47 off-ramp from Swaffham onto T/thorn which although provided for by traffic control lights, can be dangerous. I have used the existing footbridge at Cantley Lane but only very occasionally and think a bridge on the Swaffham side would have more appeal and be used more by the population centres of Wym / Heth etc. particularly given the recent investment and completion of the Wymondham / Hethersett cycle-way. It just seems logical a bridge should be on this side.	N	Any solution to the north of the existing Thickthorn junction would have to either incorporate a lengthy diversion to the north to cross the A47 once the slip roads have merged onto the mainline carriageway, or the structure would have to cross the slip roads as well. This would greatly increase the length of any structure required. The current scheme proposals provide a WCH overbridge to the south whilst maintaining the at grade signal controlled crossing of the A47 slip roads at the Thickthorn Junction.
Footbridge alternative / additional	It would it be more cost effective to combine a pedestrian and single lane vehicle underpass linking Cantley Lane.	N	A new road link in this area was considered as part of the side road options report but has not been taken forwarded as part of the proposed scheme. Details of the review process undertaken are found in the Side Road Options Report. A route through this area would potentially increase traffic along Cantley Lane South and through the new Cringleford development as rat run into and out of Norwich.
Footbridge alternative / additional	Why cannot the existing location be maintained and the bridge extended? One can see it would have to be a replacement bridge but without graded approaches it would be inaccessible to disabled pedestrians, cyclists or horse riders.	N	The current cross-section is not feasible for equestrian use and due to the current sub-structure arrangement (bank seat on raked piles) the extension will be not economical compared to the existing solution and also the current sub-structures might not be feasible for extension.
Footbridge cycling	Please build the bridge to allow cycling, i.e.. without steps. We cycle this route on a tandem , sometimes with visually impaired riders, and the existing stepped footbridge is very difficult to negotiate.	N	Noted. The current proposed structure comprises of flat deck with ramps, not steps.
Footbridge design	Why not just do a road bridge and join up Cantley roads north and south and incorporate options for pedestrians and bikes on the road bridge? No land or trees will then be sacrificed , no black spot created on the B1172. No increase in traffic on the B1172.	N	A new road link in this area was considered as part of the side road options report but has not been taken forwarded as part of the proposed scheme. Details of the review process undertaken are found in the Side Road Options Report (available on the Scheme website: This is available to view on the Scheme website:

			<a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a> ). A route through this area would potentially increase traffic along Cantley Lane South and through the new Cringleford development as rat run into and out of Norwich.
Footbridge design	The footbridge need to have some sort of shelter to stop people dropping items onto the road which could be a hazard and/or dangerous. Where possible, CCTV camera coverage of this footbridge is a must.	N	Mesh infill and kick plate on each parapet will be provided so that accidental dropping items on bridge will not fall onto the road.
Footbridge design	high enough side fencing for people and horses!	N	1.8m high parapet will be provided as required by current standard and British Horse Society.
Footbridge design	This is a very reasonable proposal, although a direct underpass would be better.	N	A direct underpass construction will cause major traffic disruption on A47 and the construction will not be economical as the solution will be materials and labour intensive.
Footbridge design	It is so very important for Highways England to engage with Big Sky Developments specifically as far as the footbridge/Cantley Lane priority is concerned. For the footbridge to provide a link for houses/ cycles,/ pedestrians to Cantley Lane through the new houses the footpath must have priority over the roads in the new development linking houses to the west and east of Cantley Lane.	N	Noted. Further to feedback received through the consultation process the new WCH overbridge has been moved north, closer to the current location of the existing footbridge, reducing the length of approaches. The design team has been in consultation with Big Sky developers throughout the development of the design.
Further assessment	Have Highways England modelled the impact of the scheme (and this particular element) of the scheme in terms of sustainable modes including local bus services and the cycle path in particular?	N	<p>Buses are included in the strategic NATS modelling assessment and the VISSIM local modelling assessment. These tools are used to evaluate the impact of the scheme on local bus services and the Thickthorn P&amp;R.</p> <p>No modelling assessment is undertaken on cycles. However they are included in the WCH assessment, see Chapter 12 Population and Human Health of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b></p>



<p>Further assessment</p>	<p>There is a lack of basic information about traffic passing through the junction. We suspect that a significant number of trips passing through the junction are short, car commuting journeys by single occupants. We would like to see, based on driver surveys, Origin and Destination analysis of the distances travelled, journey purpose and the number of car occupants.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The NATS model base year has been calibrated to represent a 2015 base year, utilising the data collected as part of the scheme assessment as well as SERTM network and mobile phone data.</p> <p>Mobile phone data, from SERTM, is the primary source used for deriving the distribution of trips in the base year prior demand matrices in the schemes impact area. Traffic count data is used to calibrate the model based on a matrix estimation (ME) procedure. The SATURN ME process adjusts the prior trip matrix based on the strategic traffic assignment and the observed count data.</p> <p>Subsequent to the ME process, the model has been validated against independent data sets including Trafficmaster journey time data.</p> <p>The base model was developed in accordance with the DfT's TAG Unit M3.1: Highway Assignment Modelling (2020) and has been signed off by Highways England TPG.</p> <p>Traffic modelling analysis indicates that in the existing situation large traffic flows are accessing the Thickthorn Junction on the A47 eastbound, A11 westbound and A11 eastbound approach arms. Delays are present on the A11 eastbound and B1172 approach arms, particularly in the AM peak, due to the traffic demand exceeding the available junction capacity. This is consistent with the observed Trafficmaster journey time data.</p> <p>Vehicle occupancy assumptions are included in the variable demand modelling, where DfT standard TAG values are adopted. These are 1.1 for both commuting and business purposes and 1.6 for other purpose.</p>
---------------------------	---	----------	---

Further assessment	Impact assessment of the cut through traffic on the local infrastructure with or without option A i.e. continued cost to Norfolk County Council 3. inadequate traffic data modelling to show present and future housing /business development prediction.		Traffic modelling has been undertaken for a design year of 2040 and includes all current permitted developments within the study area. This is detailed in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme ( <b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b> ). Modelling does not predict significant rat running between Hethersett and the Mulbarton area.
Further to previous consultation	East Carleton and Ketteringham Parish had exceptionally poor consultation in 2017, the parish was informed when a parishioner who told the parish council it was in the local paper and consultations had already been agreed in Hethersett and Cringleford/ The parish boundary of East Carleton and Ketteringham runs to the third of the Thickthorn roundabout and It is the most significant parish for residents being affected and severed and the purpose of the side road strategy with Option A and Option B. The parish council and to react quickly and produced a flyer that was distributed by hand by parish councillors to inform on Mother's Day and spent the day hand delivering leaflets across Ketteringham with my son helping. Two local residents came up with an alternative scheme to upgrade Station Lane as an alternative solution and supported by the parish council and local residents. We had a further meeting in August when Highways England did a presentation but by that time the DCO boundary had been determined by the EIA report and our parishes views were not considered. The expense of the consultation for the side road strategy could have been spared if Highways England had respectfully worked with the parish and parishioners rather than lip service. We wanted a real solution not just a box ticking exercise. Further meetings were arranged with Highways England with the support of local county, district councils and our MP Richard Bacon support that found out that we do not have adopt the options and this was confirmed by the House of Commons Library. It was referred to as the least worst' option by Highways England. Our parish has been severed twice once at	N	<p>Highways England acknowledge that regrettably East Carleton &amp; Ketteringham Parish Council were omitted from the Non-Statutory Consultation in March 2017. However, they were consulted during the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation demonstrated an objection by other consultees to the proposed Cantley Lane severance solution. A meeting was held with the Parish Council in April 2017 to discuss the proposals and a commitment was made to assess their proposals for the Cantley Lane South link road. An assessment of numerous side road options were considered and further meetings were held on 12th and 28th September 2017 to discuss these. In November 2017 a community update was issued to advise that two potential options had been shortlisted for further assessment. In April 2018 a meeting was held at Norfolk County Council offices where Highways England updated on the progress of the side road options appraisal and explained the rationale for not progressing the proposed Station Lane solutions further. A meeting with Parish Councils took place in December 2018 and the updated proposals were presented and confirmation that the Side Road Strategy Options report would be available at the Statutory Consultation. The Side Road Strategy Options Report, published as part of the suite of documents made available for the 2019 Statutory Consultation, shows that consideration was given to the proposals made by the Parish Councils and also details the assessment criteria and scores for each of side road options assessed. The scheme update was issued in July 2020 and then further</p>

	Station lane Ketteringham and at the A47 Cantley lane, Cringleford both times disserved by the severance with poor solutions. We have twice had the consultations cancelled at short notice due to over budgeting and local residents have their life's put on hold during this process. I had reported multiple complaints with the manner and way residents were dealt with in trying to obtain information. Generally being denied important information effecting household near the proposals.		Parish Council meetings have taken place with them on 27 August, 8 December 2020 and 17 March 2021.
General	It is absolute madness to be doing this and at the same time increasing the housing density in proximity to major routes. You are storing up problems for the future generations.	N	Noted. Traffic modelling has been undertaken for a design year of 2040 and includes all current permitted developments within the study area. This is detailed in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1)</b> .
General	Instead of encouraging more road traffic, how about improving public transport particularly trains?	N	Noted. However, this is outside the scope of the Scheme.
General	Although the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass and A11 dualling were built to serve long-distance traffic, they are heavily used for short local car journeys, contrary to their intended purpose. The proposed scheme is designed to re-route A11 traffic away from the existing A47/A11 Thickthorn junction to release capacity for local traffic movements such as car commuting trips between Wymondham/Hethersett and Norwich and vehicular trips generated by proposed large residential developments at Hethersett and Cringleford. In short, this scheme is based on Predict and Provide which is a discredited method of planning for new roads.	N	<p>The base model was developed in accordance with the DfT's TAG Unit M3.1: Highway Assignment Modelling (2020) and has been signed off by Highways England TPG.</p> <p>Traffic modelling analysis indicates that in the existing situation large traffic flows are accessing the Thickthorn Junction on the A47 eastbound, A11 westbound and A11 eastbound approach arms. Delays are present on the A11 eastbound and B1172 approach arms, particularly in the AM peak, due to the traffic demand exceeding the available junction capacity. This is consistent with the observed Trafficmaster journey time data.</p> <p>Thus the scheme provides benefits by removing congestion, which is present in the existing situation before future year developments such as Hethersett and Cringleford are taken into account.</p> <p>The Scheme supports the objectives of the various sub regional policy documents in delivering the required and supported improvements to the A47. Local planning policies support the implementation of enhancements to the</p>

			A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction to accommodate future planned growth, housing development, tackle congestion and improve road safety, which are consistent with the Scheme objectives.
General suggestions	I am surprised provision for, even if it was just passive provision for now, for free flow links to the eastern A47 are not proposed. It is inevitable that these will be required in 15 to 20 years time considering the amount of growth proposed in the east of the region.	N	Noted. However, this is outside the Scope of the current A47 Thickthorn Junction scheme. Traffic modelling has been undertaken for a design year of 2040 and includes all current permitted developments within the study area. This is detailed in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1)</b> .
General suggestions	Leaving Norwich and transiting the Roundhouse roundabout, I believe that there is a need for a slip road to join the A47 rather than having to stop at Thickthorn roundabout. Again when coming up to Thickthorn at peak times (4-7PM weekdays) the left hand lane from the Roundhouse roundabout is often queued back from Thickthorn. The majority of the traffic in that lane is going left at Thickthorn to the A47. Perhaps one of those lanes which does not need to stop at the lights and is its own enclosed lane like the one on the NDR near Thorpe?	N	Noted, however this is outside the Scope of the current A47 Thickthorn Junction scheme.
General suggestions	I think the road into and out of Norwich should be unrestricted so it should be tunnelled with slip roads onto the A11. This would help keep the traffic moving in the years to come as Norwich continues to expand exponentially. So remove the roundabout for through traffic.	N	Noted, however this is outside the Scope of the current A47 Thickthorn Junction scheme.
General suggestions	Really to future proof this junction we need the same going West. This is more complex however would provide better links to and from Norwich and surrounding areas and ease congestion.	N	Noted, however this is outside the Scope of the current A47 Thickthorn Junction scheme.
General suggestions	I hope that we have an opportunity to review the draft Traffic Management Plan before final approval, once the main contractor has been appointed.	N	Noted. An outline Traffic Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.5)</b> will be submitted as part of the application and a detailed Traffic Management Plan will be developed following the grant of consent, in consultation with the local authorities, emergency services and key stakeholders.

Heritage	Cultural heritage of the area with the ancient tumuli and bronze age burial mounds at the top of Cantley Lane South.	N	Noted. The Tumuli and bronze age burial mounds are not included within the Order limits and do not form part of the land required for the Scheme and any impacts will be mitigated as far as possible.
Heritage	What about Archaeology? How will finds be handled, if there is to be a preliminary excavation in areas which could be rich in archaeology given the existence of tumuli.	N	A geophysical survey of the site has been undertaken, as has archaeological trenching in selected areas (based on the Geophysical surveying). Both of these works have been undertaken by qualified archaeological contractors in consultation with Historic England and the County Archaeologist. Detailed mitigation measures are set out in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> .
Maintenance	The proposed ponds to capture the water run off will not be maintained as required to reduce environmental impact because the existing tanks on the A11 have never been cleared in over 20 years, so with this as a track record how can we be expected to believe the new ponds will be maintained and reduce the environmental impact.	N	The maintaining authority (Highways England) will have a duty to adequately maintain the drainage basins.
Hydrology/attenuation pond	How will your plan deal with deep foul drain that take sewerage from Hethersett to Trowse and runs parallel to water course in Cantley lane valley.	N	Where utilities are affected by the proposed scheme, they will be diverted by the affected utility company where necessary or adequate protections will be put in place.
Maintenance	What is best practice mitigation measures? The fact that the water course has already been polluted by the water run off from the A11, because the water capture ponds have not been cleaned out since the A11 was built over 20 years ago, does not give me confidence the measured outlined will actually be properly implemented.	N	The mitigation measures will be set out in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> .  The maintaining authority (Highways England) will have a duty to maintain the drainage assets associated with the Strategic Road Network.
Landscape/visual	I believe the proposed alignment of the northbound slip road has been chosen on cost alone so as not to affect an arable field and some low quality man made structures being a P&R site, a Burger King, petrol station, Travel lodge etc to the detriment of a small woodland area.	N	The alignment of the A11/A47 connector road has been developed so that is compliant with the current standards, minimises land take and environmental impact within the constraints of the whole site.



Lane design	I commute from the B1172 to the A47 eastwards direction. Though under this scheme I have priority from those joining from the A11 I foresee a large volume of traffic often involving haulage/juggernauts coming from this direction. This means it is likely to make it quite difficult for vehicles such as mine to have true priority. This is because haulage firms tend to use large vehicles and are often intimidating once they get up to speed as they would do as they move out of the underpass. Would it be possible to make the A47 3 lane at this junction or other similar traffic management scheme?	N	<p>The B1172 arm of the existing junction is currently not signal controlled; the proposed scheme addresses this by providing signal controlled junctions on all arms with a new smart mgmt. system controlling the junction.</p> <p>Vehicles travelling from the B1172 Norwich Road, will enter the junction through the new signals, and then access the A47 via the existing merge slip road.</p> <p>There are no plans to increase the A47 to 3 lanes through this section of works.</p>
Lane design	Coming back in the opposite direction it is often quite precarious joining the B1172 from the A47. This is because as the lane markings on the slip road as they are at present mean I have to quickly transverse from the outside lane to the inside lane once I have passed the A11 junction. If the A11 southbound traffic can only use the newly constructed road this could mean that a separate lane on the left hand side purely for those heading towards the B1172 would be a sensible way forward ?	N	The proposed scheme addresses the existing issues at the junction by providing a new 4th lane on the eastern section, ensuring 4 lanes throughout. There will also be new road markings, destination markings, road signage and signal controls on all arms.
Lane design	Option B with contra flow. When originally constructed the roundabout worked perfectly. After the fourth lane approach for the A11 (S) with one lane reserved for left turns and only one to A47 Ebound, then the problems started. The left lane is under-used and wasted. Left alone the traffic would have used this lane for left turns and straight ahead to A11 Norwich. Interference with common sense traffic patterns prevented smooth traffic flows and a pot of paint would have solved the problems.	N	Noted.
Lane design	We hope that the improvements will include reverting to the designation of the middle of three lanes coming from the A47 (Yarmouth direction) to the Thickthorn Roundabout onto the B1172 towards Hethersett. We believe this to be the natural flow route for traffic to Hethersett, rather than depending upon the confusing third lane directing traffic to Hethersett, the A47 and	N	The proposed scheme addresses the existing issues at the junction by providing a new 4th lane on the southern section, ensuring 4 lanes throughout. There will also be new road markings, destination markings, road signage and signal controls on all arms.

	Norwich, while two other lanes direct traffic to A11 Thetford etc.		
Lighting	In addition to the works I would like to see the faulty lighting unit lamps replaced/repared.	N	The street lighting within this scheme extents is being reviewed and upgraded as required as part of this scheme.
Mitigation	Follow up studies would be needed to monitor the precise impact of the proposal and remedy unexpected problems.	N	Noted, this will be undertaken throughout the development of the design and construction phases of the project.
Mitigation a priority	It is important to mitigate any noise or other environmental damage as Cringleford becomes an increasingly unpleasant place to live.	N	Noise surveys and modelling have been undertaken for the Scheme. The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b>
Mitigation a priority	All trees / habitat must be protected to ensure the continued presence of all species identified and any trees / habitat destroyed in the scheme must be replaced as near as possible to existing site of lost habitat.	N	The impact of the proposed scheme on the biodiversity of the area surrounding the proposed works is presented in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> Mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> , which will be included in the DCO submission.
Mitigation a priority	The preservation of wildlife and limiting the effect of construction is important for the natural environment but also to ensure local support.	N	The impact of the proposed scheme on the biodiversity of the area surrounding the proposed works is presented in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> Mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> , which will be included in the DCO submission.
Mitigation a priority	The preservation of habitats for the identified wildlife is extremely important. There must be minimal disruption and upheaval for these creatures to ensure normal behaviours (i.e. breeding) and also maintain ecosystems. I enjoy seeing the wildlife in the area and would hate to see it affected.	N	The impact of the proposed scheme on the biodiversity of the area surrounding the proposed works is presented in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> Mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> , which will be included in the DCO submission.
Mitigation a priority	The water meadow at Cantley Lane South by option A is an ideal scene and important habitat for biodiversity and the local wildlife linking throughout the whole scheme. Barn owls are an important and dominate seen and heard in Cantley Lane South.	N	The impact of the proposed scheme on the biodiversity of the area surrounding the proposed works is presented in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> Mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> , which will be included in the DCO submission.

Mitigation effectiveness	The reality is that mitigation is not an answer to new road building. It does what it says on the tin. The aim is to reduce the overall impact of the works, which are significant with lots of excavation and regrading and the subsequent noise and pollution increases and increased volumes of traffic. Just think, that bird, bat, frog, toad, insect or other wildlife has now got to run the risk of two extra traffic lanes as well as the existing dual carriageway. These proposals are designed to improve traffic flows to the exclusion of everything else that might be around on the planet at the same time. Thickthorn is the classic example of more roads begetting more traffic and filling up to capacity (at certain times), thereby needing more road space.	N	Noted. Noise surveys and modelling have been undertaken for the Scheme. The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Mitigation effectiveness	For example, mitigation measures proposed include planting of shrubs and trees to deter barn owls. Replacement planting could also be short lived because the Preliminary Report indicates that further improvements to the junction could be required in future for dealing with delays that could still occur on some approaches at some times of day.	N	The impact of the proposed scheme on the biodiversity of the area surrounding the proposed works is presented in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> Mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> , which will be included in the DCO submission.
Mitigation effectiveness	I do believe that research has shown that bat measures are not successful and are a waste of money.	N	Noted. Mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> , which will be included in the DCO submission.
Mitigation effectiveness	Everything that can be attempted should be, but we are not confident that enough can be done. It is a heavy price to pay, but needed, in respect of the main two slip roads at least.	N	Noted. The connector road from the A47 Westbound to the A11 Southbound no longer forms part of the Scheme proposals, which reduces the impact of the Scheme on the surrounding area. Mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> , which will be included in the DCO submission.

Mitigation effectiveness	How can you mitigate for the water-based wildlife when you are going to dig a new channel for the river? The existing wildlife will be destroyed and are unlikely to return after the work has been carried out. The wildlife refuges are unlikely to be effective as the existing habitat will be destroyed before the replacement habitat is created. What is best practice mitigation measures? The fact that the water course has already been polluted by the water runoff from the A11, because the water capture ponds have not been cleaned out since the A11 was built over 20 years ago, does not give me confidence the measured outlined will actually be properly implemented.	N	The realigned watercourse will be constructed first and allowed to mature prior to the removal of the existing water course. Mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan ( <b>TR010037/APP/7.4</b> ), which will be included in the DCO submission.
Mitigation effectiveness	Mitigation is not a solution to disrupted eco systems. There is no solution to the disrupted connectivity of roosting, foraging during the construction periods and the majority of 'after the event' mitigations are poor, eg. whip planting or small tree planting instead of mature trees or hedgerows.	N	The impact of the proposed scheme on the biodiversity of the area surrounding the proposed works is presented in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010037/APP/6.1</b> ) Mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan ( <b>TR010037/APP/7.4</b> ), which will be included in the DCO submission.
Mitigation lack of information	There is no discussion of the merits or otherwise of different type of mitigation for protected species in the consultation brochure.	N	The impact of the proposed scheme on the biodiversity of the area surrounding the proposed works is presented in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010037/APP/6.1</b> ) Mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan ( <b>TR010037/APP/7.4</b> ), which will be included in the DCO submission.
Mitigation lack of information	P9 reads like corporate non-speak for not doing very much. What does 'replacement habitats' mean?	N	Landscaping and plating to be provided as part of the scheme will suitable habitats of wildlife identified as being present with the study area. Specifically, sections of the existing Cantley Stream will be developed to provide suitable habitat for water voles. Areas within the scheme have also been identified to be developed as riparian habitat. These areas are presented in the Environmental Masterplan ( <b>TR010037/APP/6.8</b> ).
Mitigation lack of information	Does the mitigation options remove any negative impact from the scheme. This is not clear.	N	The impacts with and without mitigation for the proposed scheme will be detailed in the Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010037/APP/6.1</b> ).

Mitigation a priority	In my garden I get 2 types of Deer, have they been thought about.	N	Ecology surveys have been undertaken, please see Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Mitigation of information	Lack of detail on any mitigation work affecting Cringleford. Reason being given this is responsibility of Blue Sky Developments who are currently building houses adjacent to proposal. Highways England need to take responsibility for their own project in this respect.	N	Mitigation will be provided as necessary; the project team has been engaged with Big Sky regarding the development of the landscaped and recreational area between the A47 and the housing development.
Mitigation veteran trees	Regarding Cantley lane south there is no mention of the 200year old oak tree which they would have to demolish in part of their construction.	N	The impact of the proposed scheme on the biodiversity of the area surrounding the proposed works will be included in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Mitigation veteran trees	B1172 egress is not easy and putting in this road seems to destroy 2 mature trees. Why can't the road be moved to avoid this or, better still, revisit this unsatisfactory solution.	N	The impact of the proposed scheme on the biodiversity of the area surrounding the proposed works will be included in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Noise	Any Elevated Sections will make it noisier as Roundhouse Park residential ,(plus proposed Cringleford residential and even N&N Hospital,) is downwind (Predominately South-Westerly wind), from all Traffic but even more so from Rouge Exhaust pipes and some Motorbikes which are bad enough at the moment, as they can be heard for minutes before getting out of Earshot.	N	The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Noise	Construction and operation would displace important wildlife such as water voles, otters and kingfishers. - remove two irreplaceable veteran trees. - harm the setting of two ancient burial mounds, Scheduled Monuments. - generate noise, air pollution and carbon emissions.	N	The impact of the proposed scheme on the biodiversity of the area surrounding the proposed works, climate and cultural heritage will be assessed in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> . Mitigation will be set out in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> .
Noise mitigation	When the dual A11 was built we were promised noise mitigation and the replacement of the concrete surface with asphalt - the noise mitigation does not work and we still have a noisy concrete surface What assurances and accountability is being provided to ensure that this scheme will be completed and will work.	N	The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme. See Chapter 11 - Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .



Design	When we purchased our house it was part of a 10 year plan to be resurfaced, this, however, has never materialised, those houses on Cantley Lane are closer than us. The houses close to the proposed junction on Cantley Lane South will have the road at first floor level!!	N	Visual screening in the form of new trees will be provided along the Cantley Lane Link Road in the vicinity on the junction with Cantley Lane South. These are detailed on the Environment Masterplan <b>(TR010037/APP/6.8)</b> . The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme, see Chapter 11, Noise and vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Noise mitigation	The now established A47/A11 tree lined route is a distinctive feature of the area and has matured well especially on Cantley Lane South. It is of concern that the well-established trees and road screening is now being removed and will take many years for this to show impact and absorb the pollution created.	N	Visual screening in the form of new trees will be provided along the Cantley Lane Link Road in the vicinity on the junction with Cantley Lane South. These are detailed on the Environment Masterplan <b>(TR010037/APP/6.8)</b> . The impact of the Scheme on the biodiversity of the area surrounding the proposed works will be included in the Chapter 8, Biodiversity Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> . A noise assessment of the scheme onto the surrounding area has been undertaken and will be included in Chapter 11, Noise and vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Noise mitigation a priority	The speed of traffic on the new slip roads will be faster than existing so you could assume the tyre noise will be worse so will need lots of mitigating.	N	A noise assessment of the proposed scheme onto the surrounding area has been undertaken and will be included in the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme.
Noise mitigation a priority	Ketteringham residents suffer considerable road noise from the A11, because of poor road surfacing. Residents need to be protected from noise by every means possible.	N	A noise assessment of the proposed scheme onto the surrounding area has been undertaken and will be included in Chapter 11, Noise and vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme.
Noise mitigation a priority	This is a very busy road intersection that is very close to a very densely populated area of housing, every attempt should be made to mitigate the effects of noise pollution	N	A noise assessment of the proposed scheme onto the surrounding area has been undertaken and will be included in Chapter 11, Noise and vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> . The assessment of

	and air pollution for the long-term benefit of the local community		operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme.
Noise mitigation alternative measure	The A11 concrete surface course needs replacing with asphalt. Around 15 years ago HE had a programme to replace all concrete surfaced roads which ran close to residential areas to reduce noise pollution this needs doing on the A11 north of Wymondham as part of this scheme.	N	Noted. Concrete replacement on the A11 does not fall within the scope of this project.
Design	A huge improvement would be to resurface the A47 from Thickthorn to the A140. The surface is extremely noisy, particularly when compared to the section after the A146 junction.	N	As part of this scheme, Thickthorn circulatory will be resurfaced, however, the A11 between the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction and the A140 are out with this scheme proposal and will therefore not be resurfaced as part of this scheme.
Noise mitigation combine measures	The design needs to incorporate adsorptive as well as deflective components. No single component can usually do both.	N	A noise assessment of the Scheme onto the surrounding area has been undertaken and will be included in Chapter 11, Noise and vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> . The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme.
Noise mitigation combine measures	Combination seems most adequate assuming Earth banking includes trees and hedging.	N	A noise assessment of the Scheme onto the surrounding area has been undertaken and will be included in Chapter 11, Noise and vibration of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> The assessment of operational noise demonstrates that there are no significant adverse effects expected and therefore mitigation is not necessary during the operational phase of the Scheme.
Noise mitigation combine measures	Truely I have no vested interest in this as I do not live there and would not wish to. However should I live there I would hope you would use a combination of all of these to help them with noise and that if one was very poor you would look to remove this and change the plans.	N	Noted.

Noise mitigation community compensation	Since noise pollution will become worse anyway how will residents in NR4 be compensated financially. When the southern bypass was built financial compensation was provided.	N	<p>Financial compensation under Part I of Land Compensation Act 1973 (a Part I claim) may be claimed in certain circumstances by people who own and also occupy property that has been reduced in value by more than £50 by physical factors caused by the use of a new or altered road.</p> <p>These factors include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noise</li> <li>- Vibration</li> <li>- Smell</li> <li>- Fumes</li> <li>- Smoke</li> <li>- Artificial lighting</li> <li>- Discharge of any solid or liquid substance on to the land.</li> </ul> <p>Such claims may be made one year after the Scheme opens for traffic estimated for Thickthorn as early 2025 and can be submitted to Highways England for consideration. Each case will be treated on its own circumstances and mitigation evidence will be needed to provide support of any claim.</p>
Design	however deep cuttings can trap windblown snow and earth banking can become unstable.	N	Noted. All earthworks will be designed to current design standards.
Noise mitigation earth banks	Banking and fencing are too prominent.	N	Noted.
Noise mitigation fence	Timber fencing rots - looks ugly and is expensive.	N	Noted. Assets maintenance will be undertaken by the maintaining authority (Highways England).
Maintenance	So long as there is provision for the maintenance of timber fencing.	N	Noted. Assets maintenance will be undertaken by the maintaining authority (Highways England).
Old Newmarket Road	Please close the access to the Old Newmarket Road from the Thickthorn Roundabout. It creates unnecessary confusion about which lane to use for the exit to Norwich and the Hospital. The single house served by this road could easily make use of a new road coming through the adjacent new housing development.	N	The existing access between Old Market Road and Thickthorn Roundabout is not being altered as part of this scheme, however, new road markings on the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction will be provided to provide clear direction to road users.

Preliminary Environmental Information	The non-technical summary does not really outline any specific solutions.	N	Noted. The mitigation is set out in more detail in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> .
Preliminary Environmental Information	The non-technical summary explains what impact there will be, but little about actual mitigation proposed, except diverting Cantley Stream, which seems eminently avoidable if the link road were not built.	N	Noted. The mitigation is set out in more detail in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> .
Preliminary Environmental Information	Issues with potential flooding have not been properly assessed (see correspondence sent to you by [redacted] (and others I believe).	N	Flood modelling has been undertaken for the proposed scheme and has been included in the Flood Risk Assessment. The project team has consulted with the Environment Agency and the Lead local Flood Authority. The drainage within this area has been designed accordingly. See Chapter 13 Road Drainage and Water Environment of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Preliminary Environmental Information	Although the PEIR says that annual mean air quality objective for NO2 will not be exceeded, fine particulate matter is likely to increase, for which there is no safe limit.	N	In line with the new DMRB criteria, if no exceedances in the baseline scenario are observed then there is no need to assess the Do-Minimum and Do-Something scenarios for PM10 impact. We had no exceedances in the baseline scenarios with modelled concentrations being well below the air quality objective. With the PM10 concentrations so low, it is also safe to make an assumption the PM2.5 (which is a constituent of PM10) will also not be at risk of exceeding.
Preliminary Environmental Information	The preliminary EIA was produced to early as it determined the DCO boundary to be extended.	N	Noted.
Preliminary Environmental Information	The residents of Cantley Lane South live in a relatively rural setting with the river and water meadows as their local views and setting. No amount of mitigation is going to replace this environment for them.	N	Noted.
Preliminary Environmental Information	Cantley Stream realignment. The potential impacts on the nearby Meadow Farm Meadow CWS must be considered and mitigated for in the ES. Any realignment should take the opportunity to include new habitat	N	A flood risk assessment has been undertaken and will be reported in the ES in consultation with the Environment Agency and the LLFA. Mitigation will be set out in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> .

	creation wherever possible to ensure a net gain in biodiversity post-development.		
Preliminary Environmental Information	Attenuation pond. We recommend that opportunities are sought to incorporate habitat creation in the attenuation pond design. Where opportunities arise, SUDS can be incorporated into surface water catchment features, with associated benefits for water quality through natural treatment.	N	The impact of the Scheme on the biodiversity of the area surrounding the proposed works will be included in the ES. Mitigation will be set out in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> .
Preliminary Environmental Information	Follow up studies would be needed to monitor the precise impact of the proposal and remedy unexpected problems	N	The impact of the Scheme on the biodiversity of the area surrounding the proposed works will be included in the ES. Mitigation and monitoring requirements will be set out in the Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> .
Preliminary Environmental Information	More detailed work on the environmental impacts of the proposals since the Public Consultation Report in 2017 has indicated the scale of damage. However, much more work is required to evaluate the likely damage, for example, detailed surveys of protected species.	N	The impact of the Scheme on the biodiversity of the area surrounding the proposed works will be included in the ES <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> and further protected species surveys will be carried out.
Preliminary Environmental Information	rail bridge widening. Please note this is adjacent to the Meadow Farm Meadow CWS, which should be considered in any evaluation of ecological impacts.	Y	This has been removed from the design.
Preliminary Environmental Information	Bats. We note with concern the significant likely use of the proposed development site by several species of bats, and strongly recommend a robust survey programme to fully identify bat use in the area and the level of reliance on existing crossing points for connectivity between roosts, commuting routes and foraging areas. Any development will need to demonstrate that there are no impacts on this connectivity, in particular the retention of existing habitats and avoidance of lighting. In addition, in line with our previous comments on 3.2.8, opportunities to provide greater connectivity across the road corridor should be sought.	N	The impact of the Scheme on the biodiversity of the area surrounding the proposed works will be included in the ES <b>(TR010037/APP/7.4)</b> .



Transport modes	In the environmental statement the document concerning alternative solutions does not fully scope the possibility of using other modes of transport to realise the goals of the project. This could include: The re-instatement of the Dereham to Norwich Rail service The building of a rail station at Ketteringham The use of an enhanced bus quality partnership to improve bus services between Dereham & Wymondham and Norwich A train tram or light rail solution Norwich to Dereham/Wymondham	N	Noted. The proposed solutions are not being considered as part of the current scheme proposals.
Property/land affected	The new junction and road will be at first floor level for residents on the junction. the houses are very close to the new road and the proposed mitigation will not reduce the negative impact for these residents.	N	Noise modelling has been undertaken and mitigation will be provided were necessary.
Public transport	Has the potential withdrawal of the evening bus service been included in the equalities impact report?	N	This is not related to the Scheme and so is not within the scope of the equalities impact report.
Public transport	The impact of reducing journey time of non-sustainable modes may damage the commercial viability of buses between Norwich and Wymondham and rail services between Norwich and Ely. The evening bus service is currently a threat of being withdrawn by the operator. This could mean the most inclusive form of transport could be negatively impacted by this scheme and accessibility is reduced.	N	Noted, the commercial viability of the local bus services is not within the scope of the project.
Public transport	Try to prioritise cycling and bus use. Bus lanes etc	N	Cyclists are being fully considered as part of this scheme and a new WHCR route is being provided over the A47 and an unsegregated route is being provided along the New Cantley Lane Link Road.  As part of this scheme, there is little opportunity to provide specific enhancements for buses, however, buses will benefit in general from the improved infrastructure being provided as part of this scheme.
Public transport	Enhance park and ride and prevent single occupancy private vehicles into city.	N	The park and ride is subject to development by Norwich County Council but is not being developed as part this scheme.

Public transport	Highways England should examine the preferable alternative solution of reducing the amount of traffic passing through the junction. Measures should include a combination of travel planning and modal switch to reduce the number of single occupant car commuting journeys and encouraging trips using green modes of travel. Local developments in the vicinity should be developed on a traffic neutral basis whereby for every car journey created, a car journey should be taken off the road. Priority measures should be incorporated at the junction to speed the passage of public transport serving the A11 corridor and park and ride buses at Thickthorn.	N	Noted, however this is outside the scope of the current project.
Request further engagement	Improve sign posting by asking local users their views	N	Sign Strategy has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council.
Request further engagement	Please can Highways England contact the Royal Mail Postal Address Management team ( Address Management Unit, Royal Mail 2 Admiral House, Admiral Way, Doxford International Business Park, Sunderland, SR3 3XW, 08456 011 110, addressmaintenance@royalmail.com ) and invite them to review the changes in road layouts in order to update post codes so that the postal service remains efficient.	N	Noted. This will be undertaken in due course as the project progresses.
Request further engagement	Emails about how you have come to the decisions you did would be useful. You need to make people aware that you are listening.	N	Noted. Scheme updates are available on the HE A47 Thickthorn website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/</a>
Request further engagement	initial decisions such as the development boundary limits must be opened again to consultation.	N	Noted. Consultation process is detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. This is available to view on the Scheme website: This is available to view on the Scheme website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a>
Request further engagement	Ask the locals from Hethersett and Wymondham after more decisions are made and before final decision made / implemented.	N	Noted. Consultation process is detailed in the Statement of Community Consultation document included in the consultation literature. This is available to view on the Scheme website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a>

Request further engagement	Would be interested to see the results of the feedback and if anyone taking on board any constructive comments and observations.	N	Feedback is included within the Consultation report, which is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate during the DCO process ( <b>TR010037/APP/5.1</b> ).
Request further engagement	Please contact the NBI Bicycle User Group for any consultation exercise in the area	N	Noted. Members of the NBI Bicycle Users Group were invited to a WCH consultation meeting on the 10/09/2020
Request further engagement	Somebody from HE needs to come and walk along Cantley Lane South during the morning peak traffic period to understand how unsuitable the proposed solution is for local residents. Nobody I spoke to at the consultation in the Village Hall had actually driven or walked along Cantley Lane South. The same was true from earlier consultations and meetings with HE.	N	Project Team has been on site at various points during the development of the design. The sideroad options report details the options that were considered and assessed by the Project Team. The report outlines the appraisal methodology and how the preferred option was validated.
Request further engagement	Please can you consult Norfolk Wildlife Trust on the Environmental Statement when produced. If you have any queries regarding our comments, we would be happy to discuss them directly with you in more detail.	N	The Environmental Statement ( <b>TR010037/APP/6.1</b> ) will be available to view on the Planning Inspectorate website once the DCO application has been submitted.
Request information/materials	It would be good to have an understanding on how the proposed road closure would work,	N	Noted. An outline Traffic Management Plan ( <b>TR010037/APP/7.5</b> ) is submitted with the DCO application and a detailed Traffic Management Plan will be developed at later stages of the project, in consultation with the local authorities and emergency services.
Request information/materials	In relation to Question 9, I would like an explanation as to why it appears that you are only diverting traffic from A47 / A11 at Thickthorn eastbound. Does this mean that all traffic to and from A47 / A11 west and southbound still will use Thickthorn Roundabout? Why? Please explain exactly where the diverted traffic will be sent.	N	Traffic Management on both eastbound and westbound carriageways will be required during the construction phase of the project.
Request information/materials	Assuming that both these ideas fall away, has Network Rail agreed that two container lorries could pass safely beneath its bridge on Cantley lane en-route to farms/depot?	N	The railway bridge at Cantley Lane South is subject to height restrictions and not suitable for HGV diversions.
Request information/materials	Since this stretch of the A47 was opened in around 1992 I have never seen anyone use the pelican crossing on the eastbound slip road from the A11 to the A47. Will this be removed?	N	Yes, the 'Pegasus' crossing will be removed. Equestrian users will be able to use the proposed new WHCR bridge south of the existing.

Request information/materials	Is it suitable for mobility scooters or those with walking difficulties?	N	Yes, WCHR routes designed in accordance with latest design guides, gradients of ramps and cross sections of WCHR facilities will be suitable for all users.
Respondent context	In addition, smaller vehicles wishing to access the NCC Recycling Centre from the South travel through the village of Ketteringham, adding considerable to the volume of traffic along these narrow roads. The NCC Recycling Centre is immensely and increasingly popular, due to the ever-increasing housing developments in Wymondham and Hethersett.	N	Noted. Improvements to the local road access to the NCC recycling centre do not fall within the scope of the A47 Thickthorn Junction Improvement scheme.
Road design	Single carriageway link roads A11 - A47 is shortsighted and will not deal with the traffic increases you predict - build them as dual carriageways to avoid massive future works - A14 being a classic example.	N	Our traffic forecast indicates that having 1 lane would provide adequate capacity to accommodate future year traffic even in the design year of 2040.
Road design	There is already high volumes of traffic passing through Ketteringham Village at times. Mainly people going to and from the Recycling Centre on Station Road. I suspect that the proposed changes to the A47 Thickthorn junction will increase this problem. Can I suggest you consider making Low Street in Ketteringham a one-way system to try and ease this problem?	N	With the scheme in place, traffic from Wymondham and Hethersett could use B1172 and the new Cantley Lane Link road to access the recycle centre an alternative route. Changes to Low Road do not fall within the scope of the A47 Thickthorn Junction Improvement scheme.
Signage/lane markings	There need to be clearer Lane markings possibly using signals on a gantry. Further the connection from A11 to A47 eastwards needs improving to avoid the confusion drivers have with the two lanes marked A47 and city. Possibly a free flow link avoiding B1172	N	New signage and road markings should provide a clear and understandable road layout within this scheme extents.
Signage/lane markings	Link road from both A11 and proposed link road to Park and Ride better signage for all routes in particular Thickthorn Interchange. Include signage on Thickthorn Interchange bridges as road signage is obscured by traffic. Include MacDonalds etc in signage at earliest opportunity on all roads.	N	The existing signage associated with this scheme is being reviewed as part of the proposal and changes will be made as required to provide clear and usable information.
Signage/lane markings	Current speed restriction signs of 40mph are located at a distance before each access point to the Thickthorn interchange. While adjustments are being made, is it possible to add speed restriction signs directly on the	N	The proposed signage within the scheme extents is being reviewed and will be subject to road safety audits. Currently there are no plans to install speed cameras as part of this scheme proposal.

	junction, supported by speed cameras, in order to encourage drivers to adhere to the 40mph limit?		
Signage/lane markings	Link road from both A11 and proposed link road for the Park and Ride better signage for all routes including signage on the bridges on the A11, include MacDonalDs in the signage. Good signage on A47 sliproad where it splits to A11 and other traffic.	N	The existing signage associated with this scheme is being reviewed as part of the proposal and changes will be made as required to provide clear and usable information.
Signage/lane markings	As I live near the junction, I notice a lot of cars from outside the area, have no idea which lane to be in. Would it not help, if an overhead gantry like the one at the M11/M25 in Essex, is placed on the London side of the junction?	N	There is currently no proposal to incorporate overhead gantries within the scheme at this time, however, new signage and road markings should provide a clear and understandable road layout within this scheme extents.
Support with caveats	I am totally in agreement with the scheme to improve the Thickthorn junction other than as previously stated I disagree with the solution for Cantley Lane South, particularly with the construction of new roads in Cringleford to serve the new housing development.	N	The sideroad options report (available on the Scheme website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a> ) details the options that were considered and assessed by the Project Team. The report outlines the appraisal methodology and how the preferred option was validated.
Support with caveats	I like the main proposals for the A11 and the A47. I assume that traffic coming off the A 47 towards Hethersett will still do so via Thickthorn. However, the idea of putting a road (including two road bridges) across fields meaning the destruction of the local environment is absurd.	N	The sideroad options report (available on the Scheme website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a> ) details the options that were considered and assessed by the Project Team. The report outlines the appraisal methodology and how the preferred option was validated.
Support with caveats	Whilst I broadly support the scheme, there is one specific area which needs urgent attention to ensure public safety. On the A11 Northbound carriageway, half a mile before the proposed free flow link to the A47, is Station Lane. Station Lane was split by the A11 bypass and the northern side takes you to Station Court business park. Station Court business park and surrounding businesses (Light manufacturing and scrap merchants) require access for passenger cars and HGVs to and from the A11. I am very concerned that the proposed free-flow link roads will severely impact on the safety of this junction.	N	A safety assessment has been undertaken on the A11/Station Lane north junction and highlighted the need to improve the entry onto the A11. as such, a taper merge has been provided. Warning signs/road markings are to be provided in advance of the Station Lane junction to warn road users of the junction. There is no accident data to suggest that exiting the A11 onto Station Lane is unsafe, and improvements to the current layout fall outside the scope of the A47 Thickthorn Junction scheme



Support with caveats	On the whole it seems a good scheme. However, even with traffic from A11 diverted to new road it still leaves a huge amount of traffic to and from the city in rush hours, especially into the city.	N	Noted. Queuing on the approach to the junction on the A11 Northbound will be significantly reduced. The fully signalised junction will be controlled by an intelligent system (MOVA) that will maximise the operational capacity of the junction
Support with caveats	I think that this is good scheme for helping to help improve traffic flow at Thickthorn, however thinking about this logically this only helps traffic going to or coming from the East. Really to future proof this junction we need the same going West.	N	Noted. Improvements to the east to west travel do not form part of the High Level Requirements for this scheme, however the fully signalised junction will be controlled by an intelligent system (MOVA) that will maximise the operational capacity of the junction.
Support with caveats	I am broadly in agreement with the proposals however I have serious reservations about the proposed new link road from the B1172 to Cantley Lane South.	N	The sideroad options report (available on the Scheme website: <a href="https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents">https://highwaysengland.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-thickthorn-junction/#documents</a> ) details the options that were considered and assessed by the Project Team. The report outlines the appraisal methodology and how the preferred option was validated.
Traffic congestion	The B1172 has had a massive increase in traffic during the last few years due to the expansion of housing in both Wymondham and Hethersett which is set to continue.	N	Whilst it is likely that the B1172 will become more congested in the future due to committed developments at Hethersett and Wymondham, the scheme will divert A11-A47 traffic away from the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction and therefore improve the operation of the junction and the B1172 approach. See Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme ( <b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b> ) for Scheme impacts on the local road network.
Traffic congestion	I really think that only having one new lane Eastbound from the A11 and one new lane southbound to the A11 will not work as the traffic will tailback. They have to be duelled both ways! Both tailbacks will then have the knock on effect to reduce both A11 and A47 roads to one lane! As it will cause queuing!	N	Our traffic forecast indicates that having a single lane connector road from the A11 northbound will provide adequate capacity to accommodate future year traffic even in the design year of 2040.

<p>Traffic congestion</p>	<p>Given that Highways England admit that the southern portion of Cantley Lane South is not appropriate for two-way traffic, this proposal will create a new road that will facilitate exactly that. At the moment, there is no benefit to traffic (apart from residents) to use the current access off the A11 near Thickthorn to go south down Cantley Lane South, when they can continue on the A11 for a few hundred yards and come off onto Station Lane. With this new road, it will be far easier for traffic heading from Hethersett to Mulbarton (Mulbarton's secondary catchment school is Hethersett Academy) to turn right onto the new link road and 'rat run' through East Carleton. This will create more two-way traffic on the southern part of Cantley Road South (on a road that is not suitable for two way traffic) and more traffic travelling through East Carleton.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The results of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATs) Model indicate that the Scheme has a relatively minor impact on traffic flows on Cantley Lane South. Cantley Lane South experiences a minor traffic flow increase of around 40 to 140 PCUs in the AM and PM peaks in year 2040 but would not attract any significant rat running movements between B1172 and Cantley Land South. A majority of the traffic appearing on Cantley Lane South (then Cantley Lane Link) is the north bound traffic originating from Ketteringham, East Carleton and Mulbarton while the south bound traffic destined for those areas would use A11 south bound then turn left into the Station Lane South. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme for details of traffic modelling. <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1).</b></p>
<p>Traffic congestion</p>	<p>Although the scheme will cause for a temporary respite will on congestion, under the proven phenomena of induced demand this simply transfer congestion in other places, (which are less suitable with greater populations).</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The Scheme will divert A11-A47 traffic away from the Thickthorn junction and therefore release capacity at this junction to accommodate future traffic growth. The proposal scheme only deals with the Thickthorn junction and its surrounding areas and therefore congestion on other parts of the network is not within the scope of our work.</p>
<p>Traffic congestion</p>	<p>Consideration needs to be given to traffic management on the Hethersett road while the A11 is partially closed since access to the road during peak times has been almost impossible on occasions when an incident on the A11 has caused cars to divert along this road toward Norwich.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Noted, the traffic management plan will be developed to minimise the impact on the surrounding local road network.</p>

<p>Traffic congestion</p>	<p>Concerned that yet another junction is being introduced on the B1172, this road is at burstng point with huge tailbacks during the morning rush hour at present and will only get worse with the 1100 homes currently being built in Hethersett. With the expected increase in traffic the B1172 will probably have enough traffic to upgrade to an A road - has this been taken into account.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The Scheme will divert A11-A47 strategic traffic away from the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction and therefore improve the operation of the junction and the B1172 approach.</p> <p>The B1172 and new residential developments, including those with planning permission and yet to commence construction, are included within the scheme traffic model. The scheme traffic model also takes into account natural growth factors.</p> <p>The B1172 is owned and maintained by Norfolk County Council, Upgrading the B1172 to an A road is not within the scope of the scheme.</p>
<p>Traffic congestion</p>	<p>The very marked increase in traffic flow may affect the junction of the B1172 with Station Lane and the road down to the wall road. This is also very busy at peak times and is likely to increase as the increasing housing and the use of the Hospital and Research Park increases.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The Scheme will divert A11-A47 strategic traffic away from the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction and therefore improve the operation of the junction and the B1172 approach.</p> <p>The B1172 and new residential developments, including those with planning permission and yet to commence construction, are included within the scheme traffic model. The scheme traffic model also takes into account natural growth factors.</p> <p>The B1172 is owned and maintained by Norfolk County Council.</p>
<p>Traffic congestion</p>	<p>I have noticed the volume of traffic through cantley lane south from my travelling direction has worsened. its sometimes event too dangerous to reverse into the driveway due to volume and speed of traffic. i'm unable to return in the direction of east Carleton using the single-track road due to the volume and speed of the oncoming traffic. this requires that I travel towards a47 bypass to pick up the Thickthorn roundabout which is always congested in rush-hour.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>With the Scheme in place, Cantley Lane South at Thickthorn end will be closed and all traffic heading towards East Carleton direction will be required to continue along A11 and come off onto Station Lane or alternatively using the new Cantley Lane Link road via B1172.</p> <p>The results of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATs) Model indicate that the Scheme has a relatively minor impact on traffic flows on Cantley Lane South. Cantley Lane South experiences a minor traffic flow increase of around 40 to 140 PCUs in the AM and PM peaks in year 2040 but would not attract any significant rats running movements between B1172 and Cantley Lane South. A majority of the</p>

			<p>traffic appearing on Cantley Lane South (then Cantley Lane Link) are the north bound traffic originated from Ketteringham, East Carleton and Mulbarton while the south bound traffic destined at those areas would use A11 south bound then turn left into the Station Lane South. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme for details of traffic modelling. <b>(TR010037/APP/7.1)</b>.</p>
Traffic congestion	<p>My concern is that two sources of traffic merging on to the A47 within a relatively short distance could make it difficult and possibly hazardous. Traffic modelling may show no problem, but this would not account for the fact that people drive far too close to the vehicle in front making it difficult to merge. It is likely that there will be occasions when both lanes of the A47 will be full where the new road will enter.</p>	N	<p>The traffic modelling does not show any operational issues. Verge signage and road markings will provide additional warning of the successive merges.</p>
Traffic congestion	<p>I feel that the impact of the proposed residential development in Cringleford is of greater significance to the amount of traffic in this area. This needs to be where time and money is spent!</p>	N	<p>The roundhouse roundabout is not part of the scheme. The local authority has a separate plan on roundhouse roundabout to improve the access to those new developments at Cringleford.</p>
Traffic congestion	<p>Traffic will increase in Ketteringham and traffic calming measures. The study has not appreciated the impact on Low and High Street Ketteringham - already used as a rat run.</p>	N	<p>Our traffic model indicates that majority of the traffic appearing on the new Cantley Lane Link road would be the northbound local traffic from Ketteringham/East Carleton/Mulbarton to access the Thickthorn junction. The SB traffic will continue to use the A11 South then come off onto Station Lane. Furthermore, the traffic model does not predict any rats running traffic or any significant additional traffic along CLS between Hethersett and Mulbarton via the new Cantley Lane Link road.</p>
Traffic congestion	<p>If all traffic from CLS goes into Hethersett and then out to Thickthorn they are missing the link road option as well as increasing traffic flow out of Hethersett to Thickthorn roundabout which is what HE is trying to alleviate? Living on CLS we have seen a big increase in large vehicles using the lane and the lane is not designed for this size or volume of traffic.</p>	N	<p>With the scheme in place, Cantley Lane South (CLS) at Thickthorn end will be closed. As such, large vehicles accessing recycling centre will have to use either A11 South - Station Lane or the new Cantley Lane Link road. This would remove those large vehicles from the northern part of the CLS.</p>

Traffic congestion	It will create a rat run through East Carleton to Hethersett, significantly increasing volume of traffic as people simply bypass Thickthorn.	N	Our traffic model indicates that majority of the traffic appearing on the new Cantley Lane Link road would be the northbound local traffic from Ketteringham/East Carleton/Mulbarton to access the Thickthorn junction. The SB traffic will continue to use the A11 South then come off onto Station Lane. Furthermore, the traffic model does not predict any rats running traffic or any significant additional traffic along CLS between Hethersett and Mulbarton via the new Cantley Lane Link road.
Traffic congestion	Essential to make sure Hethersett residents can get in and out of Hethersett. Since the massive housing developments in Wymondham it can be very difficult to leave with queues of 10+ vehicles trying to leave Steeple Tower. Need to remove traffic from B1172 not increase it as it is already too congested.	N	Whilst it is likely that the B1172 will become more congested in the future due to committed developments at Hethersett and Wymondham, the scheme will divert A11-A47 traffic away from the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction and therefore improve the operation of the junction and the B1172 approach. See Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme ( <b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b> ) for Scheme impacts on the local road network.
Traffic lights	Do not add further full-time traffic lights to thickthorn. 95% of the time, they are not needed and simply hold traffic necessarily. Engineer around the problem. With the additional underpasses suggested in the proposal, you should be looking at removing existing lights, or switching them to peak-times only, not adding more. The clusterf**ck of the barton mills roundabout highlights how easily traffic lights can turn free flowing roads into gridlock (see A11 eastbound at evening peak, esp friday).	N	The A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction is a strategic junction which is currently signalled controlled with the exception of the B1172 arm. The proposed scheme will add a 4 <sup>th</sup> lane to the eastern section of the roundabout to provide uniformity of lanes throughout the junction. By signalling the B1172 arm the junction will operate more smoothly and will be controlled by an intelligent signal system (MOVA) which manages flows on each link accordingly.
Traffic lights	The lights are likely to have a negative impact on 10 buses heading into Norwich each hour from this road plus other services heading into Norwich from the A11	N	The Scheme has been developed taking into account the existing P&R and the proposed P&R Extension being promoted by NCC. The project team have worked together with NCC to ensure that bus movements are maintained. By signalling the B1172 arm, we are providing consistent movement access to the junction which provides a better solution when compared to the existing arrangement.
Traffic lights	Some kind of traffic control MUST be included where the proposed new link road meets Norwich Road. Given that this will be the primary route to the Thickthorn interchange for the villages lying to the south-east of	Y	The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.



	<p>Thickthorn, the vast majority of traffic will be turning right into what will be a constant flow of traffic heading from Wymondham and Hetherset to Norwich during the morning peak. To have no traffic control to allow right-turning traffic to join this flow safely is absolute lunacy.</p>		<p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the proposed scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hetherset.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p>
<p>Traffic lights</p>	<p>marked increase in traffic flow may affect the junction of the B1172 with Station Lane and the road down to the wall road. This is also very busy at peak times and is likely to increase as the increasing housing and the use of the Hospital and Research Park increases. Putting lights at this junction would improve it.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Whilst it is likely that the B1172 will become more congested in the future due to committed developments at Hetherset and Wymondham, the scheme will divert A11-A47 traffic away from the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction and therefore improve the operation of the junction and the B1172 approach. See Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for Scheme impacts on the local road network.</p> <p>Signalization of any other junctions along B1172 is not within the scope of the Scheme.</p>

<p>Traffic lights</p>	<p>As a preliminary, please change the Thickthorn traffic lights to Part Time only. When I travel at say 11pm from Thetford to Great Yarmouth I am liable to be stopped at 3 sets of lights when there is no other traffic around.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction is a Strategic Junction which is currently signalled controlled with the exception of the B1172 arm. The proposed scheme will add a 4<sup>th</sup> lane to the eastern section of the roundabout to provide uniformity of lanes throughout the junction. By signalling the B1172 arm the junction will operate more smoothly, and will be controlled by an intelligent signal system (MOVA) which manages flows on each link accordingly.</p>
<p>Traffic lights</p>	<p>The main issue I have is the need for traffic signals on the B1172 approach. As a traffic signal engineer I am wondering the exact control technique required to achieve optimal operation. Placing sets of traffic signals in close proximity causing difficulties in efficient traffic signal control. May I suggest the placing of loops on the B1172 when the queue gets to specific points. When the loop is activated the intergreen is then extended to let more vehicles out of the B1172. The number of loops could be more than one set and for each set the intergreen value increased accordingly to where the queue is. Recently I was in a queue on the B1172 and eight vehicles were able to get out in one go (4 x 2 lanes), By extending the intergreen more than eight vehicles would be able to get out in one go. I do believe signalling 'each zone' is not always the solution. Can this be rethought as it is quite hard to get good signal control with 3 sets of traffic signals in close proximity.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The signalisation of the junction has been modelled in VISSIM using the latest traffic date, and the junction will operate under a MOVA system of control. During the detailed design stage the modelling/signal phasing will be reviewed to ensure that the junction is operating as efficiently as possible. This can then be reviewed once the junction is operational.</p>
<p>Traffic lights</p>	<p>At the Thickthorn junction with the Norwich Road B1172, I see additional traffic light control is proposed. When travelling from Wymondham to the A47 westbound, the left-hand lane should be structured so the traffic is free flowing in it's own lane, rather than held via the use of traffic light for thsi lane only as there is enough road width on the up-ramp (slip road) to the A47 west.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Noted. However, it is not possible for the junction to operate safely unless the stop line retains all of the B1172 traffic.</p>

<p>Traffic safety</p>	<p>During the original consultation I expressed serious concerns about the distance between traffic joining the A11 south on the new link road and the current exit for Station Lane. The Station Lane off-slip is extremely short and does not provide a safe braking distance (before a sharp left-hand bend). This means that traffic leaving the A11 at Station Lane has no option but to start slowing down whilst still on the main carriageway. This scheme will introduce a new single lane of traffic accelerating from 50-70mph in order to join the southbound carriageway, at the same time that traffic preparing to leave the A11 at Station Lane will be slowing down. This is a recipe for disaster and is clearly unsafe. A constant flow of traffic joining the A11 from the new link road will make it harder for traffic leaving the A11 at Station Lane to pull into the inside lane to prepare to leave at the Station Lane junction. It will also mean that traffic joining the A11 from the new link road will not be able to safely filter in, as traffic leaving at Station Lane will already be slowing down and will be less able to move into the outside lane.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The scheme now includes a short taper merge lane to enable the traffic from Station Lane to join the A11, thus addressing this issue. Warning signage and road markings will be provided on approach to the Station Lane junction. No Advanced Directional Signage for the A11/A47 connector Road is provided upstream of the existing Station Lane exit. The first sign is approximately 270m downstream of the junction. There is no accident data to suggest that exiting the A11 onto Station Lane is unsafe, and improvements to the current layout fall outside the scope of the A47 Thickthorn Junction scheme. There is no accident data to suggest that exiting the A11 onto Station Lane is unsafe, and improvements to the current layout fall outside the scope of the A47 Thickthorn Junction scheme</p>
<p>Traffic safety</p>	<p>The new underpass roads are single carriageway - what happens when there is an accident or emergency vehicles need to come through?</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Hard shoulder is provided along the length of the new connector road which will provide access for the emergency services.</p>

<p>Traffic safety</p>	<p>I am very concerned that the proposed free-flow link roads will severely impact on the safety of this junction. This matter was raised at the first public consultation, but I can see no discussion of it in the current public consultation documents. Station Lane currently joins the A11 as a T-junction. It requires vehicles to slow down to a maximum of 20 mph to safely leave the A11 and its commonplace to have following cars swerving to avoid turning vehicles. I am worried that the current proposed free flow link from A11 to A47 will have lead-in signage located near this dangerous junction and that it will cause drivers to focus their attention on changing lanes. This in turn means drivers may not realise that a car is indicating to turn off the A11 rather than just changing lanes, and it increases the risk of collisions. At the moment rush hour traffic jams mean that rush hour is the safest time to turn into Station Lane because traffic is so slow! The proposed improvements will lead to a net speed increase at this junction along with increase driver distraction.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Our traffic model shows all existing and proposed merges and diverges will operate satisfactorily with the new design. In addition, the scheme now also includes a short taper lane to enable the traffic from Station Lane to join the A11 easier. Warning signage and road markings will be provided on approach to the Station Lane junction. No Advanced Directional Signage for the A11/A47 connector Road is provided upstream of the existing Station Lane exit. The first sign is approximately 270m downstream of the junction. There is no accident data to suggest that exiting the A11 onto Station Lane is unsafe, and improvements to the current layout fall outside the scope of the A47 Thickthorn Junction scheme.</p>
<p>Traffic safety</p>	<p>Traffic management at the new junction on the B1172. The B1172 is 60mph at this point making turning manoeuvres riskier.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The Project Team has engaged with NCC and highlighted concerns raised in consultation feedback on the speed of vehicles using the B1172. Through dialogue, the proposed scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p>
<p>Traffic safety</p>	<p>I do not understand why the section of A11 north of the Thickthorn Interchange has been excluded from Highways England plans. My major concern is crossing the A11 between Roundhouse Park and the new development on Cantley Lane ie old Cringleford. At present the lights are very dangerous.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>This section of the A11 does not form a part of the proposed Highways England scheme. There are improvement works underway as part of the commitments around local development which are being delivered by Norfolk County Council on behalf of the housing developers. This scheme will see improvement to roundhouse way, roundhouse roundabout the pedestrian crossing facilities in this area.</p>

<p>Traffic safety</p>	<p>Without a slip road it is a dangerous junction to exit the A11 as vehicles need to be travelling at 20 mph to corner safely, this is reduced further to between 10 mph and 15 mph for HGV's. Without a slip road to join the A11, vehicles have to enter the A11 from a static position on Station Lane whilst cars are travelling at 70 mph on the A11. This is highly dangerous as it is at the minute without the added distraction of signage for the new A47 exit road. For HGV's the danger is highly increased due to their need for distance to reach their top speed. These vehicles weigh 44 tonnes and are pulling out from a stationary position on an uphill incline onto the A11 where cars are travelling at 70 mph. The HGV's will only have just reached their top speed by the time they are at the A47 exit road.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The Scheme now includes a short taper merge lane to enable the traffic from Station Lane to join the A11, thus addressing this issue. Warning signage and road markings will be provided on approach to the Station Lane junction. No Advanced Directional Signage for the A11/A47 connector Road is provided upstream of the existing Station Lane exit. The first sign is approximately 270m downstream of the junction.</p>
<p>Traffic safety</p>	<p>The safest time to use this junction in its current state is during rush hour when the traffic has queued back from the Thickthorn roundabout. By eliminating the queue with the A47 sweeping road you're also eliminating any safe time to use the junction in its current state.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The scheme now includes a short taper merge lane to enable the traffic from Station Lane to join the A11, thus addressing this issue. Warning signage and road markings will be provided on approach to the Station Lane junction. No Advanced Directional Signage for the A11/A47 connector Road is provided upstream of the existing Station Lane exit. The first sign is approximately 270m downstream of the junction. There is no accident data to suggest that exiting the A11 onto Station Lane is unsafe, and improvements to the current layout fall outside the scope of the A47 Thickthorn Junction scheme.</p>
<p>Traffic safety</p>	<p>I do foresee problems with Traffic from Ketteringham wanting to access the junction by the new link road and turning right onto the B1172 which will see increased traffic due to the excessive new houses been built in Hethersett. The speed allowed B1172 at this location is currently 60mph with traffic accelerating away from the 40 mph restriction at Thickthorn. I believe it will be extremely difficult and therefore dangerous to make this manoeuvre in the same way as it is at the B1172 Conley Lane interchange.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the proposed scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken</p>



			<p>in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p>
Traffic safety	<p>My concern is that two sources of traffic merging on to the A47 within a relatively short distance could make it difficult and possibly hazardous. Traffic modelling may show no problem but this would not account for the fact that people drive far too close to the vehicle in front making it difficult to merge. It is likely that there will be occasions when both lanes of the A47 will be full where the new road will enter.</p>	N	<p>The traffic modelling does not show any operational issues. Safety Risk Assessments have been undertaken as part of the design process, and the risk is not significant.</p>
Traffic safety	<p>The new road network is of massive concern to me as I believe it is increasing the danger to an already dangerous junction. A few years ago the A11 was altered at the Station Lane junctions, both southbound and northbound. The Station Lane/A11 southbound junction had slip roads put in place to exit and enter the A11 southbound safely. The Station Lane/A11 northbound junction did not. Without a slip road it is a dangerous junction to exit the A11 as vehicles need to be travelling at 20 mph to corner safely, this is reduced further to between 10 mph and 15 mph for HGV's. Without a slip road to join the A11, vehicles have to enter the A11 from a static position on an uphill incline on Station Lane whilst cars are travelling at 70 mph on the A11. This is highly dangerous as it is at the minute without the added distraction of signage for the new A47 exit road.</p>	Y	<p>The scheme now includes a short taper merge lane to enable the traffic from Station Lane to join the A11, thus addressing this issue. Warning signage and road markings will be provided on approach to the Station Lane junction. No Advanced Directional Signage for the A11/A47 connector Road is provided upstream of the existing Station Lane exit. The first sign is approximately 270m downstream of the junction. There is no accident data to suggest that exiting the A11 onto Station Lane is unsafe, and improvements to the current layout fall outside the scope of the A47 Thickthorn Junction scheme.</p>

<p>Traffic safety</p>	<p>For HGV's the danger is highly increased due to their need for distance to reach their top speed. These vehicles weigh 44 tonnes and are pulling out from a stationary position on an uphill incline onto the A11 where cars are travelling at 70 mph. The HGV's will only have just reached their top speed by the time they are at the A47 exit road where cars will be switching lanes to use/avoid the A47 exit road.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The scheme now includes a short taper merge lane to enable the traffic from Station Lane to join the A11, thus addressing this issue. Warning signage and road markings will be provided on approach to the Station Lane junction. No Advanced Directional Signage for the A11/A47 connector Road is provided upstream of the existing Station Lane exit. The first sign is approximately 270m downstream of the junction.</p>
<p>Traffic safety</p>	<p>What measures are going to be put in place to widen the lane, speed control, safety of riders, runners, walkers and who is going to monitor the size of vehicles that are using the lane for access to Thickthorn?</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>With the scheme in place, Cantley Lane South at Thickthorn end will be closed. As such, the northern part of CLS will become local resident access only therefore does not allow any through traffic.</p> <p>This is no evidence that the scheme will bring any rat running according to our traffic model. Instead, it indicates that majority of the traffic appearing on the new Cantley Lane Link road would be the northbound local traffic from Ketteringham/East Carleton/Mulbarton to access the Thickthorn junction. The southbound traffic will continue to use the A11 South then come off onto Station Lane.</p> <p>Furthermore, the model does not predict any additional trips travelling between Hethersett and Mulbarton via the new Cantley Lane Link road and southern part of the Cantley Lane South as a result of the scheme.</p>
<p>Traffic safety</p>	<p>A majority of the lane is single lane but there is not enough notices up for this, there is no speed limit in place either. [...] I cannot see how the options HE have put forward will alleviate this issue but will probably increase them.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>With the scheme in place, the existing Cantley Lane South (CLS) at Thickthorn junction end will be closed. The northern part of CLS will become a local resident access only as such there will be no through traffic.</p> <p>Furthermore, the traffic model does not predict any rat running traffic or any significant additional traffic along CLS between Hethersett and Mulbarton via the new Cantley Lane Link road.</p> <p>Widening Cantley Lane South does not form part of the scheme.</p>

Traffic safety	I would like Cantley Lane South to remain as I remember from my childhood, a peaceful area with great outdoor areas for children to play safely. Whereas currently it is difficult to walk a dog.	N	<p>With the scheme in place, Cantley Lane South at Thickthorn end will be closed. As such, the northern part of CLS will become local resident access only therefore does not allow any through traffic.</p> <p>This is no evidence that the scheme will bring any rat running according to our traffic model. Instead, it indicates that majority of the traffic appearing on the new Cantley Lane Link road would be the northbound local traffic from Ketteringham/East Carleton/Mulbarton to access the Thickthorn junction. The southbound traffic will continue to use the A11 South then come off onto Station Lane.</p> <p>Furthermore, the model does not predict any additional trips travelling between Hethersett and Mulbarton via the new Cantley Lane Link road and southern part of the Cantley Lane South as a result of the scheme.</p>
Traffic safety	The predicted accidents savings are low because accident records show that the vast majority of accidents at Thickthorn junction come into the 'slight' category.	N	For the accident analysis, the observed accident records between 2014 and 2018 has been used.
Traffic safety	It is very difficult to safely exit Hethersett Village already onto B1172 at peak journey times, particularly to turn right towards Wymondham.	N	Whilst it is likely that the B1172 will become more congested in the future due to committed developments at Hethersett and Wymondham, the scheme will divert A11-A47 traffic away from the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction and therefore improve the operation of the junction and the B1172 approach. See Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme ( <b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b> ) for Scheme impacts on the local road network.
Traffic safety	With the increase of traffic from the development in Hethersett and Wymondham which lead directly onto the B1172, there is no control of through traffic's speed to allow safely joining the B1172 at any of the junctions (no traffic lights. Why.) That is All Four and the new junction. PS. Would access to the Park and Ride from the link road and not using the B1172 be a safer option?	N	<p>Whilst it is likely that the B1172 will become more congested in the future due to committed developments at Hethersett and Wymondham, the scheme will divert A11-A47 traffic away from the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction and therefore improve the operation of the junction and the B1172 approach. See Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for Scheme impacts on the local road network.</p> <p>Provision of an alternative access to P&amp;R from the link road</p>

			<p>is not considered within the scope of the scheme. The project team has had extensive dialogue with NCC regarding access to the Park and Ride facility to demonstrate that the Traffic Modelling reflected the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension and catered for this growth.</p>
Traffic safety	<p>Right turns from the B1172 could be banned for safety and traffic flow if there is no room for a right turn lane: it is not far to the roundabout for right turning traffic to turn round and come back to the junction and turn left.</p>	Y	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the proposed scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p> <p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p>
Traffic safety	<p>The B1172 is a very busy road carrying traffic between Wymondham, Hethersett and Norwich. The new junction will undoubtedly become an accident black spot without some measures of control.</p>	Y	<p>The proposed junction connecting Cantley Lane Link road with the B1172 is a "ghost Island junction" this is similar to a T-Junction but provides a widened carriageway with a central turning lane.</p> <p>We have also liaised extensively with Norfolk County Council to ensure that the proposed Park &amp; Ride extension is also included. Through dialogue, the proposed scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hethersett.</p>

			<p>Supplementary local road traffic surveys were undertaken in October 2019. These surveys were analysed and included within the scheme traffic model. Please see Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (<b>TR010037/APP/7.1</b>) for details of the traffic modelling.</p> <p>The traffic model has been analysed and operational modelling undertaken which demonstrates that this proposed junction form operates well within the parameters for the scheme opening year of 2025, and the design year of 2040.</p>
Traffic safety	<p>The junction from the A11 onto Station Lane is used regularly by HGVs, LGVs and cars accessing the Station Lane businesses. In particular now we have a large proportion of those vehicles visiting Tots Town and therefore carrying very young passengers. This junction is by its very layout already an incredibly dangerous place to exit the A11. A vehicle has to slow down and indicate and ensure that those behind and not necessarily aware of the junction will slow down. Its a wonder there haven't been any serious accidents here actually!</p>	Y	<p>The scheme now includes a short taper merge lane to enable the traffic from Station Lane to join the A11, thus addressing this issue. Warning signage and road markings will be provided on approach to the Station Lane junction. No Advanced Directional Signage for the A11/A47 connector Road is provided upstream of the existing Station Lane exit. The first sign is approximately 270m downstream of the junction. There is no accident data to suggest that exiting the A11 onto Station Lane is unsafe, and improvements to the current layout fall outside the scope of the A47 Thickthorn Junction scheme.</p>
Traffic safety	<p>Station Lane currently joins the A11 as a T-junction. It requires vehicles to slow down to a maximum of 20 mph to safely leave the A11 and it's commonplace to have following cars swerving to avoid turning vehicles. I am worried that the current proposed free flow link from A11 to A47 will have lead-in signage located near this dangerous junction and that it will cause drivers to focus their attention on changing lanes. This in turn means drivers may not realise that a car is indicating to turn off the A11 rather than just changing lanes, and it increases the risk of collisions. At the moment, rush hour traffic jams mean that rush hour is the safest time to turn into Station Lane because traffic is so slow! The proposed improvements will lead to a net speed</p>	Y	<p>The scheme now includes a short taper merge lane to enable the traffic from Station Lane to join the A11, thus addressing this issue. Warning signage and road markings will be provided on approach to the Station Lane junction. No Advanced Directional Signage for the A11/A47 connector Road is provided upstream of the existing Station Lane exit. The first sign is approximately 270m downstream of the junction. There is no accident data to suggest that exiting the A11 onto Station Lane is unsafe, and improvements to the current layout fall outside the scope of the A47 Thickthorn Junction scheme.</p>



	increase at this junction along with increase driver distraction.		
Traffic safety	On the A11 Northbound carriageway, half a mile before the proposed free flow link to the A47, is Station Lane. Station Lane was split by the A11 bypass and the northern side takes you to Station Court business park. Station Court business park and surrounding businesses (Light manufacturing and scrap merchant) require access for passenger cars and HGVs to and from the A11. I am very concerned that the proposed free-flow link roads will severely impact on the safety of this junction.	Y	The scheme now includes a short taper merge lane to enable the traffic from Station Lane to join the A11, thus addressing this issue. Warning signage and road markings will be provided on approach to the Station Lane junction. No Advanced Directional Signage for the A11/A47 connector Road is provided upstream of the existing Station Lane exit. The first sign is approximately 270m downstream of the junction. There is no accident data to suggest that exiting the A11 onto Station Lane is unsafe, and improvements to the current layout fall outside the scope of the A47 Thickthorn Junction scheme.
Traffic safety	The existing footbridge provides access to Cantley Lane, a quiet rural road between Norwich and Wymondham via Ketteringham. Cantley Lane provides an attractive route for cyclists through open countryside to the south of Norwich. If the new link road to the B1172 goes ahead, the road is likely to attract new traffic as an alternative route between Wymondham and Norwich or further afield. This would pose greater road danger to cyclists and other vulnerable road users and increase accidents.	N	With the scheme in place, the existing Cantley Lane South (CLS) at Thickthorn junction end will be closed. The northern part of CLS will become a local resident access only as such there will be no through traffic.  Furthermore, the traffic model does not predict any rat running traffic or any significant additional traffic along CLS between Hetherset and Mulbarton via the new Cantley Lane Link road.
Traffic safety	Traffic speed enforcement / monitoring to be carried out on B1172 where the proposed link road joins it. Think this is 60mph at this point but have observed many who continue at the faster speed when approaching 40mph roundabout. Potentially dangerous for vehicles turning right toward roundabouts ref current speed limit. 60 - 40mph and 40mph to 30mph please. From Wymondham to Thickthorne limits are 30, 50, 40, 60, 40	Y	The Project Team have engaged with NCC and highlighted concerns raised in consultation feedback on the speed of vehicles using the B1172. Through dialogue, the proposed scheme will introduce a 40mph speed restriction from the McDonalds roundabout through to Hetherset.

	drivers get confused and Wymondham Estates have to pull out in front of cars going 40-50 in a 30mph zone. The link road will face similar problems if not rectified.		
Wildlife	It is highly likely that land severed by the free flow links and B1172 link road will be subject to intense development pressures and further loss of wildlife habitat.	N	The areas of each habitat lost and each one created are calculated in the Chapter 8, (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Wildlife	Any road "improvement" will have a detrimental effect on wildlife, not least because it will increase traffic and carbon dioxide emissions. This will make climate change, and associated extinctions more serious.	N	Riparian enhancements along Cantley Stream and grassland improvements to the south of the junction for invertebrates are provided as part of the Scheme proposals. These areas are presented in the Environmental Masterplan <b>(TR010037/APP/6.8)</b> . The areas of each habitat lost and each one created are calculated in the Chapter 8, (Biodiversity) of the Environmental Statement <b>(TR010037/APP/6.1)</b> .
Wildlife	How can you mitigate for the water based wildlife when you are going to dig a new channel for the river? The existing wildlife will be destroyed and are unlikely to return after the work has been carried out. The wildlife refuges are unlikely to be effective as the existing habitat will be destroyed before the replacement habitat is created.	N	It is proposed that the realigned watercourse be constructed first and allowed to mature prior to the removal of the existing water course.