

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A47 NorthTuddenham to Easton](#)
Subject: A47 Scoping Report - FAO Michael Breslaw
Date: 29 October 2019 14:31:44

Dear Michael

Please find below comments from Honingham Parish Council regarding the A47 Scoping Report.

1) 1.8.4 states the affect of extreme weather events on flood patterns will be assessed within the Scoping Boundary, however the main village of Honingham is not within the Scoping Boundary in Appendix A. The River Tud runs directly through the centre of the village and it is one of the lowest lying points of land in the area and as such is already affected by water run off from the current A47 leading to regular flooding. It appears irresponsible to have excluded the village from the Scoping Boundary for the purposes of this report when the village will be so heavily affected by the construction of this road, and not just by the flooding implications. A recent example is the flooding on Sunday 6th October when both the A47 and The Street in Honingham were impassable due to flooding.

2) It is recognised in 1.11.5 and 6 that Highways England should act in a manner to minimise environmental impacts and seek to enhance the quality of the surrounding environment. They are also required to cooperate with others to coordinate long term planning. There is little in the Report to suggest that these principles are being followed.

3) The Report notes in 4.1.7 that there has been engagement with landowners. The statement is misleading and should more properly describe any engagement as limited based on feedback from landowners in our parish.

4) There are various areas prescribed throughout the report for which particular standards are set. However, the Figure A Scoping Boundary overview seems to limit those areas. The Scoping boundaries exclude the villages of Hockering, Honingham and Easton and appear to have been set completely arbitrarily. As noted in point 1 above to exclude these areas from the Scoping Report is irresponsible and negligent.

5) 6.3.4 lists designated assets. In September 2018 the war memorial on The Street (opposite the Honingham Buck pub) was awarded Grade II listing. This is not in the report.

6) 6.6 suggests that non statutory public consultation has taken place. However, the extent of this limited consultation is not defined, it does not mention the other major projects such as the Food Enterprise Zone and the Norwich Western Link which will have a huge effect on the immediate area, and it does not reflect the reservations of the Broadland District Council and the Honingham Parish Council depending on the details of connecting roads.

7) Designed setting elements of a historic park (not registered) adjacent to the A47 at Taverham Road are referred to in 6.7.2. This "historic park" is not defined and does not appear on any maps or plans of the area.

8) Conclusion 6.10.1 refers to the potential for a direct effect on the

setting of Listed buildings, though the Report does not actually detail the listed buildings to which it refers.

9) 7.7 details the removal of local vegetation, specifically mature shrubs, hedgerows and trees. Every effort should be made to ensure the impacts of this are minimised as these plants provide a natural screening to both the visual and sounds impacts of the new road, the impact of removing them being described as causing a significant adverse affect in the report. This is particularly relevant to Honingham where the impacts of the current road are consistently experienced. Further more the removal of excessive amounts of vegetation should be clearly assessed and justified in line with the current climate emergency. Any mitigation by new planting should seek to improve the impacts in a timescale significantly shorter than the proposed 15 years. The limited area of the Scoping Boundary further demonstrates that the impacts on those who actually live in the affected area are not being taken into consideration and this Boundary should be revised so that the report can more accurately assess the possible impacts of the road.

10) 10.7.3 refers to the re-routing of the River Tud during construction. What considerations will be taken into account of the possible impact of this diversion on the rivers capacity during periods of heavy prolonged rain and how this might affect flooding in the area?

11) Construction 10.7.4 states that where the existing A47 is unaffected by the dualling, it will become part of the local road network. There is no indication of how it will be absorbed or what changes will result from the dualling.

12) Existing and baseline knowledge 12.1 page 108 makes reference to the Food Enterprise Zone. The Report requires updating, it does not record that the LDO has been approved and is incorrect in its statement that the Food Enterprise Zone comprises 20 acres. In fact it is 46 acres within a larger 100 acre site immediately adjacent to the A47. 12.1 also makes no reference to the extensive conditions already imposed by Broadland District Council as part of the LDO for the Food Enterprise Zone.

13) Combined and Cumulative effects 15 makes no mention of the Food Enterprise Zone, the Norwich Western Link, or the major housing developments under consideration for Honingham as part of the Greater Norwich Local Plan. The Report refers to "major developments within the area (which) have not been identified" as though there are none that should be considered.

In summary there appears to be no joined up thinking with respect to the other large scale schemes due in the same area, specifically the Norwich Western Link and the proposed junction at Wood Lane/Berrys Lane. The also seems to be a significant lack of consideration being given to the communities living directly next to the A47 in both Honingham and Hockering.

Regards
Jordana

Jordana Wheeler
Parish Clerk
Honingham Parish Council



