

A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Dualling

Scheme Number: TR010038

Volume 5

5.2 Annex N: 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 North Tuddenham to Easton
Development Consent Order 202[x]

**CONSULTATION REPORT ANNEX N
TABLE EVIDENCING REGARD HAD TO STATUTORY CONSULTATION
RESPONSES (IN ACCORDANCE WITH S49 OF THE PLANNING ACT
2008)**

Regulation Number:	5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010038
Application Document Reference	TR010038/APP/5.2
BIM Document Reference	PCF STAGE 3 HE551489-GTY-LSI-000-TK-ZH-30014-C01
Author:	A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Dualling Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev.0	March 2021	Application Issue

CONTENTS

1	OVERVIEW.....	1
2	TABLES EVIDENCING REGARD HAD TO STATUTORY CONSULTATION RESPONSES.....	2
2.1	Statutory consultation under Section 42(1)(a) & (b) of the Planning Act 2008	2
2.2	Statutory consultation under Section 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008	77
2.3	Statutory consultation under Section 47 and Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008	116

1 OVERVIEW

- 1.1.1 The tables provided below evidence the regard had to responses received to the Applicant's statutory consultation for the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Dualling 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. Where multiple responses containing the same comment have been received, these are addressed in a single entry in the tables below.
- 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 STATUTORY CONSULTATION RESPONSES

2.1 Statutory consultation under Section 42(1)(a) & (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):
Air Quality	The Councils made comments relating to Air Quality and Noise back in October, with regard to the EIA Scoping, and most of these have been addressed within the Planning Inspectorate's comments in the SoS Scoping Opinion, so we do not propose to expand on these any further at this stage.	Broadland District Council & South Norfolk Council	N	Noted. The relevant chapters of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) have considered the responses received during the EIA Scoping consultation.
Air Quality	Our position is that reducing public exposures of non-threshold pollutants (such as particulate matter and nitrogen dioxide) to below air quality standards will have 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). We encourage their consideration during development design, environmental and health impact assessment, and development consent.	Public Health England	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains an air quality impact assessment (see Chapter 5) and, where needed, proposes mitigation measures to reduce any significant adverse effects.
	We could find no explicit proposal in the PEIR for the assessment of fine particulate matter (PM2.5). However, PM2.5 is of particular concern with regard to transport emissions and the impact of air quality upon public health. We would therefore request that this be considered further in the air quality assessment of the final ES.		N	The air quality assessment has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB LA 105 guidance. LA 105 states that there is no need to model PM2.5 as the UK currently meets its legal requirements for the achievement of the PM2.5 air quality annual mean objective. However, PM10 concentrations used to demonstrate the project does not impact on the PM2.5 air quality objectives.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>The PEIR states that air quality impacts will be modelled, and reference is made to baseline monitoring data for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). In the final ES, we would welcome the inclusion of validated data from the Highways England NO₂ monitoring survey, which commenced in October 2019. If suitable monitoring data is not already available, we also recommend that air quality monitoring is undertaken, at least for PM₁₀, to provide a baseline for the modelling of particulate matter.</p>		N	<p>To determine the current baseline conditions around the study area, a six-month nitrogen dioxide survey was conducted for the purpose of the air quality assessment. The diffusion tube survey ran from September 2019 to March 2020. This monitoring was conducted to supplement the existing monitoring.</p>
	<p>The PEIR includes a section on Potential mitigation but does not currently propose any specific air quality mitigation measures for the operational phase. We recommend that specific air quality mitigation measures are included, where appropriate, in the final ES for the operational phase once the full air quality assessment has been conducted.</p>		N	<p>The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains an operational air quality impact assessment (see Chapter 5) and, where needed, proposes mitigation measures to reduce significant adverse effects.</p>
Air quality	<p>In the PEIR it is recognised that there may be indirect impacts from air pollution without mitigation on CWS and pCWS (see 7.6.4) and on PH (see 7.6.6). It is unclear how indirect impacts due to air quality will be assessed on these sites, or what potential mitigation measures are proposed. As highlighted in our response (dated 18 October 2019 (our ref:14593/295632)) to the EIA scoping consultation: ...air pollution remains a significant issue; for example over 97% of sensitive habitat area in England is predicted to exceed the critical loads for ecosystem protection from atmospheric nitrogen deposition (England Biodiversity Strategy, Defra 2011). A priority action in the England Biodiversity Strategy is to reduce air pollution impacts on biodiversity. The planning system plays a key role in determining the location of developments which may give rise to pollution, either directly or from traffic generation, and hence planning</p>	Natural England	N	<p>Ecological receptors have been assessed within the air quality assessment. Where exceedances of the annual mean NO_x were identified, a nitrogen deposition assessment was conducted. The results of these assessments are presented within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/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):
	<p>decisions can have a significant impact on the quality of air, water and land. The assessment should take account of the risks of air pollution and how these can be managed or reduced. Further information on air pollution impacts and the sensitivity of different habitats/designated sites can be found on the Air Pollution Information System (www.apis.ac.uk). Further information on air pollution modelling and assessment can be found on the Environment Agency's website.</p>			
	<p>With the range of natural habitats and wealth of biodiversity assets that lie within, along and adjacent to the Scheme boundary, we advise that further work is required to assess the indirect impacts and how these can be managed or reduced.</p>		N	<p>The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains a biodiversity impact assessment (see Chapter 8) and, where needed, proposes mitigation measures to reduce any significant adverse effects.</p>
Climate	<p>The statement in the climate section on page 15 on the PEIR Non-Technical Summary does not refer to the new version of the government's climate target (net zero emissions target by 2050) but refers to the old 80% target.</p> <p>Section 1.16 of the PEIR Non-Technical Summary could be worded more clearly. For example, Section 1.16.2 states that the "the assessment of effects on climate will consider the extent to which carbon emissions resulting from the Proposed Scheme may impact the global climate and contribute towards climate change" without elaborating on this. Section 1.16.4 states that "the</p>	Norfolk County Council	N	<p>Section 13. 1 of the PEIR (methodology for effects on climate) acknowledged The Climate Change Act (2008) sets legally binding targets for reducing the UK's carbon emissions by at least 100% by 2050 (net zero), relative to a 1990 baseline.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains Chapters 8 Biodiversity and 14 Climate that assess the impacts of the Scheme on and by the climate and, where needed, propose mitigation</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>Proposed Scheme is anticipated to generate an increase in carbon emissions during both construction and operation". Reference should be made to how government's net zero climate change target has been taken into account in the assessments.</p>			<p>measures to help the Scheme support the government's net zero climate change and biodiversity net gain targets.</p>
Climate	<p>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 170(d)), which should be demonstrated through the ES.</p>	Natural England	N	
Climate	<p>Natural England recently published a second edition of the Climate Change Adaptation Manual (see link here) which is a good resource to support decision making regarding climate change adaptation. It includes a strong focus on different natural habitats together with a section on individual species, and provides evidence on their sensitivity, potential vulnerability and potential adaptation responses. We suggest it could provide a useful tool in helping to make the existing and newly created natural habitats more resistant to the impacts of climate change.</p>	Natural England	N	<p>Noted. Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the vulnerability of the Scheme to climate change and the Scheme's resilience and ability to adapt.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Construction	Would also expect there to be minimum disruption on the local highway network during the construction period and would want to work with Highways England, or its contractors, on managing traffic during the works.	Norfolk County Council	N	An Outline Traffic Management Plan (TR010038/APP/7.5) is presented in the DCO application and, prior to commencing construction, would be developed into a full plan for managing construction traffic to minimise disruption and disturbance risks. Norfolk County Council, as the local highway authority, would be consulted during the development of the traffic management plan.
Construction	Have significant concerns about the amount of construction traffic which will pass through Barnham Broom during the construction of the road.	Barnham Broom Parish Council	N	Due to its location, no construction traffic is anticipated to pass through Barnham Broom during the construction of the Scheme.
Consultation	Calling it the Norwich Road junction is very misleading and does not represent its location.	Honingham Parish Council	N	The junction name is consistent with previous Scheme documentation and changing the name could lead to greater confusion
Consultation	The consultation also now takes in almost 3 weeks of lockdown during the Coronavirus outbreak yet Highways England have refused to make any changes to the consultation dates to allow for all those to respond who wish to. The consensus is that Highways England, who are already years behind on this project, are trying to push through this project, taking little notice of the feedback from local residents.	Honingham Parish Council	Y	The consultation deadline for receipt of responses was extended from 08 April 2020 to 30 April 2020 to allow more time to provide a response to the Statutory Consultation in acknowledgement of the difficulties reviewing material following the closure of public information points with paper copies.
Consultation	In your preferred route Option 2 Document August 2017 Highways England said, 'Key concerns raised by the public regarding Option 2 have influenced a realignment which means it can be built with less impact during construction and the existing road can remain for local traffic movements, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians'. What happened to that promise to the people of Honingham.	Honingham Parish Council	Y	The design at statutory consultation utilised the existing A47 north of Honingham for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. However, following feedback from the parish council the existing A47 north of Honingham will now be de-trunked for local traffic.
Consultation – materials	There were mock photos at the event of what the road might look like and it was requested that these were made available on the consultation website however this has not been done.	Honingham Parish Council	Y	The project images were uploaded to the website, and be found at the below link:

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				Project+images+-+how+the+scheme+may+look.+Consultation+March+2020.pdf (highwaysengland.co.uk)
Consultation – materials	For the final scheme, (Ed: details removed) would expect the proposals to include full details of construction and compliance with nationally recognised standards, which would ensure that the road improvement is fit for purpose.	Norfolk County Council	N	Volume 2 of the DCO application contains engineering drawings and the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) Chapter 2 'Proposed Scheme' outlines the expected the construction methods. The Scheme is designed in accordance with the government's highways standards prescribed in the UK Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).
Consultation – materials	We welcome the proposal for a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP), and request to be consulted on that document as it is prepared.	Environment Agency	N	An outline Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) for the Scheme is provided within Appendix 10.2 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.2) for review as part of the DCO application consultation process. The Environment Agency will continue to be consulted as construction management plans are developed prior to commencement of the construction phase.
Cost	The food Hub should be providing their own access roads and not using public money.	East Tuddenham Parish Council	N	Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer. The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Cost	Weston's proposal for an interchange should be costed against the current proposals taking account of the reduced need for side roads etc.	Weston Longville Parish Council	N	<p>A full junction assessment was undertaken during early development of the preliminary design and was presented at consultation in the 'A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Junction & Sideroad Strategy Report' (February 2020).</p> <p>The proposals presented by the Parish Council were not in accordance with the junction hierarchy in the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB), provided no local road connection to the A47 or NWL for residents and required 5 new structures. This proposal was therefore discounted, and feedback provided to the Parish Council.</p>
Design – access	We have had sight of the proposed route adjustments with regard to the A47 and have a concern that part of our village will be fully cut off from the rest of the village to pedestrians and cyclists.	Easton Parish council	Y	<p>Following Statutory Consultation, the Scheme has incorporated provision of a new overbridge at Easton roundabout to provide safe access for walkers and cyclists across the A47, linking properties in Easton and lower Easton located north and south of the A47.</p>
Design – access	We note that you have provided an underpass access to Hall Farm NR9 5AS while it has access off a road called The Broadway. Do the residents of Lower Easton not deserve to have the right to remain part of the main village this linkage dates back to 1351.	Easton Parish Council	Y	
Design - alternative	All that is needed is an underpass for the old A47 south of Lady's Grove and a single underpass at Wood Lane to enable the Western Link to join the new A47 or a larger underpass at Wood Lane to take both the B1535 and access to the Western Link.	Morton on the Hill Parish Council	N	<p>The extent and design options considered in developing the junctions and side road connections was presented at consultation in the 'A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Junction & Sideroad Strategy Report' (February 2020). The options assessment considered the environmental impacts.</p>
Design - alternative	The proposed junction of the B1535 with the new A47 should be redesigned as an Interchange to protect the environment.	Morton on the Hill Parish Council	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design - alternative	Routes both north to south and east to west have been improved for WCHR but could be improved further by improving the access to the church. Honingham would also benefit from a better bus service and by keeping the existing A47 open this could make this possible.	Honingham Parish Council	Y	The WCH provision between Honingham and St Andrew's Church has been reviewed and amended since statutory consultation. Following feedback from the parish council the existing A47 north of Honingham will now be de-trunked and used predominantly for local traffic.
Design – alternative	We notice that our proposal to construct an underground HV cable has not been considered in your Preliminary Environmental Information, but we notice that Orsted's Hornsea 3 project has been referred to. We think it is appropriate for Highways England to consider Equinor's proposals in the context of your scheme and include reference to Equinor's scheme in your cumulative impact assessment.	Equinor UK - Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Projects	N	Highways England has engaged with Equinor to share design information so the A47 proposals are accommodated in Equinor's design. The cumulative impact with other developments has been assessed in Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/AP/6.1) . Highways England is engaging with local major developers to manage the interaction of the Schemes, as reported in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) .
Design – alternative	The new dual is too far south into the Tud Valley and Flood Plain. It is proved that this area has its own climate and is prone to mist and fog which doesn't affect the current A47 which is on higher land.	East Tuddenham Parish Council	N	The design has been developed, taking into account safety design considerations required by the Department of Transport.
Design – alternative	We expect that a Crossing Agreement will be required so that Equinor's HV cables can be installed under this new road scheme. The Crossing agreement should consider the requirements for both schemes in the construction phase and operations phase. Equinor will seek to agree limitations for any future excavation of the road in close proximity of the cables in order to ensure that there will be no impact to the HV cables.	Equinor UK - Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Projects	N	Highways England has commenced and will continue to engage with Equinor to share design information, so the Scheme is accommodated in Equinor's design. Any associated agreement would be discussed as part of Equinor's application process. Highways England is engaging with local major developers to manage the interaction of the Schemes, as reported in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) .

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – alternative	All the fourteen parishes along the route have expressed a wish at previous meetings that the existing A47 should be retained in its entirety for local traffic. The B1535 should connect with the old A47, not the new A47.	Morton on the Hill Parish Council	Y	A review of the side roads post Statutory Consultation has led to a reduction in the length of the existing A47 being abandoned with more being retained as part of the local side road network, especially around Honingham.
Design – alternative	We would ask that land in Anglian Water's ownership be excluded from the site boundary and that access to the existing site be maintained both during construction and the operational phases.	Morton on the Hill Parish Council	N	No land owned by Anglian Water is directly affected, whilst access to the facility along Gypsy Lane will be retained.
Design – alternative	Support the full closure of local access to Berry's Lane, Dereham Road, Honingham, and also no access from the new Church Lane link road which is being proposed by the A47 Taskforce. The Berry's Lane junction could then be just be the new dualled A47 and the new link road at Hockering. Highways England can radically redesign and reduce the scale of the junction, especially the proposed South roundabout which can be reduced to two links to the new dual carriageway on the westbound carriageway. Local traffic can access the new A47/NWL via the Easton/Taverham Rd junction. This means a 2 mile diversion for westbound traffic from Berrys Lane, which is largely what people do now, but something we think we should push for to protect our villages and keep traffic on the new roads and away from our largely single track country lanes.	Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council	Y	In response to Statutory Consultation feedback and subsequent direct engagement with Parish Councils, residents and landowners: Berrys Lane closed to through traffic, with access maintained for residents, landowners, walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Increased integration of the A47 into the local side road network to direct traffic from the A47 away from Honingham village to reach Mattishall Road roundabout. The side road connection at the northern end of Church Lane has been removed with access now only via Mattishall Road to the south.
Design – alternative	The parish councils of (Ed: details removed) are campaigning to have the southerly roundabout at Wood Lane/Berry's Lane reduced to two links to the new dual carriageway on the westbound carriageway. This would mean local traffic would access the new A47/NWL via Mattishall Road at the Taverham Road/Blind Lane junction.	Barnham Broom Parish Council	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – alternative	The size of the roundabouts proposed, 80m, are vastly oversized for the requirements of the traffic using it now or in the future. There appears to be no justification for why these roundabouts need to be so big in size when the roundabouts at Blind Lane are only 60m in size.	Honingham Parish Council	N	The extent and design of the junctions was presented at consultation in the 'A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Junction & Sideroad Strategy Report' (February 2020). The junctions have been designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges sized accordingly to accommodate the traffic modelling for the scheme opening year (2025) and design year (2040).
Design – alternative	There can be no justification that traffic levels, either now or in the future, will be enough to have such a large junction connecting to single track country roads.	Honingham Parish Council	N	
Design – alternative	If the current proposals are implemented then it is important to have a side road strategy which continues to diffuse north/south traffic along the corridor from Hockering to Easton. If the above routes are closed then the only remaining north /south option for local traffic will be the B1535 and the C167. If the NWL is constructed this means that all the north/south routes will travel through a single parish, Weston Longville.	Weston Longville Parish Council	Y	Statutory Consultation concerns about north-south traffic flows were explored during various Local Liaison Group, sessions chaired by Martin Wilby, and the South of the A47 Taskforce, chaired by George Freeman MP. Both forums included representation from directly affected Parish Councils and those within the locale of the Scheme. This led to proposed changes to the local side road network and connections to roads south of the A47.
Design – alternative	If the old A47 were to be retained as far as the Norwich Road Junction and the junction at Wood Lane replaced with an interchange connecting the new road to the Norwich Western Link Road there would be no need for the northern roundabout at Wood Lane. Traffic from the B1525 would turn right on to the new section of road and join the old A47 at Lady's Grove. An underpass (which could be combined with the Sandy Lane / Church Lane underpass) would take the old A47 under the new road and then continue until it picked up the new section of road east of the Norwich junction. The only underpass required at Wood Lane would be the one carrying the slip road from the NWL to the east bound new A47 and the northbound traffic from the new road to the NWL. Through traffic would flow more seamlessly from the	Weston Longville Parish Council	N	<p>A full junction assessment was undertaken during early development of the preliminary design and was presented at consultation in the 'A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Junction & Sideroad Strategy Report' (February 2020). This assessment demonstrated that an interchange solution was not viable because of both existing and future anticipated traffic figures.</p> <p>The proposed A47 scheme is a standalone scheme, with committed funding in place and following a different planning route.</p> <p>We will continue to work with Norfolk County Council collaboratively on the development of the</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	new A47 to the NWL. The old A47 would cater for local traffic.			proposed Norwich Western Link scheme, and interface with the A47 scheme.
Design – alternative	The existing A47 between Wood Lane and the Honingham Roundabout should be left open for local traffic.	Honingham Parish Council Weston Longville Parish Council Barnham Broom Parish Council Easton Parish Council Morton on the Hill Parish Council	Y	This section of the existing A47 has now been incorporated into the side road network so traffic from Wood Lane Junction does not have to pass through Honingham village.
Design – alternative	We believe that the entirety of the existing A47 (not just sections) should be retained for local traffic, walking, cycling and horse riding.	Morton on the Hill Parish Council	Y	A review of the side roads post Statutory Consultation has led to a reduction in the length of the existing A47 being abandoned and instead more being used as part of the side road network, especially around Honingham.
Design – alternative	All proposed new WCH provision should be included and extended where possible. Any side roads that are being severed and having vehicle rights stopped-up should keep, at the minimum, access on foot. This may mean there are short sections of cul-de-sac path but in other locations such paths are used, particularly for dog walks, and as the infrastructure is already there, this access should be retained.	Norfolk County Council	N	Section 4.11 of the Case for Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) and Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) describe how the Scheme has managed impacts on the existing walking, cycling and horse-riding network, plus integrated new and improved existing routes where possible.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – alternative	The proposed usage of the former A47 for WCH routes needs to ensure that it is of a suitable width and surface for horses and carriages.	Norfolk County Council	N	
Design – alternative	We note the impacts identified under 11.6.4. and advise that where existing PROW need to be diverted to alternative routes, there is join up and connectivity to create circular routes and avoid dead ends. Opportunities should be sought for any other improvements or enhancements that can be made to both the existing PROW network which lies within the scheme boundary and links outside. New connections to expand and link up the network through the creation of wider green infrastructure should be sought to help encourage and support greater usage by WCH.	Natural England	N	
Design – alternative	With so many new footpaths included in the design it is difficult to disagree that the design might improve WCHR connections. However those routes in the design are not necessarily the right solution in the right location. The walking route to Honingham church is a joke. What is a five minute walk from the current Honingham roundabout has turned into a 25 minute walk, taking a completely unnecessary detour in the wrong direction.	Honingham Parish Council	Y	Following Statutory Consultation feedback and a review of the River Tud bridge design, the proposed new WCH connection between Honingham and St Andrew's Church is a more direct, shorter route.
Design – alternative	Welcome the proposed WCH route to the Church Lane underpass and want to see this retained as it does open up new and other WCH opportunities by increasing connectivity. However, it is felt that either a replacement footbridge or underpass on the current Footpath 7 alignment, or a facility provided on Mattishall Lane alignment to retain WCH connectivity south and west is required. Notwithstanding, Footpath 7, and (sections of) the other PROW in this area need to be upgraded to bridleway status otherwise, cyclists and horses will not be able to access the new WCH route nor will it be linked to the adopted highway network. Both these	Norfolk County Council	Y	Following Statutory Consultation, a new Mattishall Lane Link Road has been included in the Scheme and this has included provision to maintain the WCH connectivity between Hockering and south of the A47. Section 4.11 of the Case for Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) describes the changes to the existing walking, cycling and horse-riding network and provision of new and improved routes.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	measures would significantly increase WCH travel and recreation opportunities			
Design – alternative	<p>Honingham Restricted Byway 1 (RB1)</p> <p>The current RB1 crossing of the A47 (as can be seen in Figure 2 within Section 3.56 below) is problematic and so diverting it through the farm access underpass removes this north/south connectivity barrier. The proposals appear to suggest that the diversion route of the affected RB1 will be the route of the proposed WCH route connecting Dereham Road to the Wood Lane junction utilising the former A47 carriageway. If so, the width and surface of this will need to be suitable for horses and carriages. It appears that there is no provision for a graded connection of the new WCH route and RB1 on the north side of the new road and so the embankment will prevent WCH users accessing one from the other. The council suggest that an additional route for the RB diversion at the foot of the embankment would remove this obstruction.</p>	Norfolk County Council	N	<p>On the north side of the proposed A47 dual carriageway the restricted byway (RB1) will be diverted and follow the path between the underpass and northern roundabout of Wood Lane junction. RB1 will then follow a north easterly diversion for a short length before tying back into the existing route.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – approach	Equinor is particularly interested in factors associated with crossing the new road which may impact transmission capacity of Equinor's HV cables. Factors such as the elevation of the new road and the width of the road easement will determine the length and depth profile of the trenchless crossing, which will likely be done by horizontal directional drilling. Deeper cables typically have a higher operating temperature and this will impact the transmission capacity of the HV cables. Equinor is intending to design a cable route which crosses the Highways England scheme where the easement (road width) is narrowest as this will result in a shorter and shallower HDD in order to minimise the impacts to the transmission capacity. If Highways England change elements of the design or layout of the new road scheme Equinor will most likely need to make changes to the design or installation method of the HV cables therefore kindly request that Highway England keep Equinor informed about any changes.	Equinor UK - Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Projects	N	Highways England has engaged with Equinor to share design information, so the Scheme is accommodated in Equinor's design. Highways England will continue to engage with Equinor during the detailed design stage.
Design – approach	Hockering Water Recycling Centre located to the south of the existing A47 is shown as forming part of the site boundary in the scheme plan provided. This operational site is managed by Anglian Water on behalf of our customers to provide water recycling services within the Hockering sewerage catchment and is accessed on a continuous basis for operational and maintenance purposes. It is unclear from the scheme plan provided why it is considered necessary for this land has been included within the site boundary or whether existing access arrangements would be affected.	Anglian Water Services Limited	N	Gypsy Lane is within the Scheme boundary to allow access rights and stopping up of the southern end, but the Scheme will not directly affect the Hockering Water Recycling Centre nor prevent operational access to the site.
Design – approach	Strictly speaking the options are – close all the side roads or keep them all open. Anything else will disadvantageous to some parishes and will benefit others. Not an equitable outcome.	Weston Longville Parish Council	Y	Highways England has taken feedback from the statutory consultation, stakeholders, local liaison group and traffic modelling into consideration when deriving the final side roads design.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – approach	The scheme as it stands is unnecessarily complicated, too many side roads, too many roundabouts. It is an urban rather than a rural solution, planned in a piecemeal fashion by many hands, rather than as a coherent whole with an eye to the future and the inevitable growth of Norwich. HE staff seem to recognise that they will be back in 10/20 years time building the interchange that they could be building now as an altogether more effective solution.	Weston Longville Parish Council	N	The extent and design options considered in developing the junctions and side road connections was presented at consultation in the 'A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Junction & Sideroad Strategy Report' (February 2020). Subsequent design development is discussed in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3).
Design – Berry's Lane	Berry's Lane must be improved and a 7.5 ton restriction.	East Tuddenham Parish Council	N	As a result of wider feedback from the statutory consultation process, Berrys Lane will now be stopped up and vehicles will be re-routed south to Mattishall Road and then east or west accordingly. As a result of being stopped up the volume and type of vehicle utilising Berrys Lane will reduce and change significantly.
Design – Berry's Lane	There should also be no local side road access to/from the A47 from south of the A47 at this junction. Allowing access to Berrys Lane from this junction will cause considerable problems with rat running on unsuitable narrow country roads. Berrys Lane should be closed and there should be no access from the A47 junction at Wood Lane to Berrys Lane.	Honingham Parish Council	Y	In response to Statutory Consultation feedback and subsequent direct engagement with Parish Councils, residents and landowners, access to Berrys Lane was closed to through traffic. The proposed scheme upgrades Honingham FP3 to bridleway status to improve the link between Berrys Lane and Wood Lane via Dereham Road.
Design – Berry's Lane	Want to see the junction at Wood Lane redesigned to remove the access to Berrys Lane which will create future problems with rat running.	Barnham Broom Parish Council	Y	
Design – Berry's Lane	Support local proposals to close Berrys Lane on the grounds that leaving it open will encourage local traffic to continue to use this route as a short cut to Wymondham and if the present proposals are carried through will also encourage excessive amounts of traffic to continue to use the B1535.	Weston Longville Parish Council	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – Berry's Lane	Access to Berrys Lane from the A47 should be closed removing the option for rat running by traffic travelling south to the A11.	Honingham Parish Council	Y	
Design – Berry's Lane	If Berry's Lane were restricted this could be used as a safe and attractive route for walking/horse riding/cycling for those south of the A47.	Barnham Broom Parish Council	Y	
Design – Blind Lane	Why is there a junction at Blind Lane when this is due to be closed? Nobody is prepared to answer this question in a clear and honest way.	Honingham Parish Council	Y	<p>Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer.</p> <p>The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.</p>
Design – Blind Lane	Blind Lane is due to be closed under condition 2.20 of the Food Enterprise Zone Local Development Order (LDO). Despite repeated requests for clarification both Highways England and Norfolk County Council refuse to comment on or discuss the future of Blind Lane and this design by Highways England demonstrates a complete disregard for the legal basis of the LDO.	Honingham Parish Council	Y	
Design – Blind Lane	We and other Parish Councils believe that Blind Lane should be closed towards its southern end. This would still allow access between the A47 and Food Enterprise Zone but protect vulnerable communities from rat-running.	Marlingford and Colton Parish Council	Y	
Design - church	What seems clear and obvious would be to include an underpass by the church where the old A47 is severed by the new A47.	Honingham Parish Council	Y	The design has been reviewed post Statutory Consultation feedback and a new combined footway/cycleway is to be provided between Honingham and St Andrew's Church.
Design – church	The access to Honingham Church is completely unacceptable for those walking there. The route for the footpath demonstrates a complete lack of understanding of the local environment, local users and local needs.	Honingham Parish Council	Y	Following Statutory Consultation feedback and a review of the River Tud bridge design, the proposed new WCH connection between Honingham and St Andrew's Church is a more direct, shorter route.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – church	From the plans available it seems likely that the extensive area of infrastructure development to the south of the church will separate it from the fields in this direction to a much greater extent than the present road does. The multiple carriageways might also be seen between the church and its wider landscape in views from the south. The immediate visual impact on the church and its churchyard could also be much increased, particularly by the retaining wall. The countryside remains rural on three sides and although the current A47 is clearly an improved modern road its relationship to the churchyard boundary could suggest it is following an ancient alignment. The volume and speed of traffic on the road does detract from the quiet and contemplative qualities of church and churchyard, but the proposed development could significantly increase that effect.	Historic England	Y	The setting of St Andrew's Church has been assessed in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), which presents mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to avoid or reduce adverse effects on the Church setting. Since the statutory consultation, the Norwich Road junction has been moved further east from the church. Therefore, there is no longer a requirement for a retaining wall at this location.
Design – church	It is unclear to what extent the Norwich Road junction will have an effect on the church's setting, but given the raised parts of some carriageways and the lighting on the roundabouts this could be a significant factor. Along with the lighting, the noise from this complex of roads could also be increased, affecting the experience of visitors to church and churchyard.	Historic England	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – church	<p>The A47 and Easton roundabout stand not far from the northern edge of the churchyard, but there is a substantial belt of planting and because the church stands on high ground about the River Tud the modern road is set below it. While the noise of the road and lights on the roundabout are apparent from the churchyard they are to some degree screened.</p> <p>The proposed development would remove the Easton roundabout, which could be a positive aspect, but in place a new road would link the Dereham Road just to the east of the church with the new Norwich Road junction to the west. This link road would be situated in the area between the northern edge of the churchyard and the present A47. It would therefore remove the substantial and relatively successful belt of planting to the north and part of that to the west and bring development much closer to the church.</p>	Historic England	N	<p>The setting of St Peter's church has been assessed in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), which presents mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to avoid or reduce adverse effects on the Church setting.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains a Noise and Vibration chapter that models and assesses the impacts from the potential noise and vibration impacts from the Scheme during construction and operation.</p> <p>The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9).</p>
Design – Church Lane	The consensus of villagers is that they do not want proposed Church Lane slip road.	East Tuddenham Parish Council	Y	<p>In response to various Statutory Consultation feedback, the side road connection north side of the A47 between Wood Lane and Church Lane was removed.</p>
Design – Church Lane	The connection to Church Lane isn't necessary and would cause unnecessary environmental destruction.	Honingham Parish Council	Y	
Design – Church Lane	In the present plan the proposal to build a side road connecting the Wood Lane junction to Church Lane looks excessive and unnecessary given that there is adequate east – west connectivity. The fact that the route from Church Lane to Sandy Lane is a non-vehicular underpass will further encourage traffic to use the new side road to connect to B1535 to travel north.	Weston Longville Parish Council	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – Honingham	Believe the current design does not address the impacts on the local communities, particularly the impact of rat running between Honingham and Wymondham. Roads on this route are small, narrow country roads which are entirely unsuitable for large volumes of traffic, particularly construction traffic and HGV's.	Barnham Broom Parish Council	Y	North-south traffic flows have been explored during various Local Liaison Group, sessions chaired by Martin Wilby, and the South of the A47 Taskforce, chaired by George Freeman MP. Both forums included representation from directly affected Parish Councils and those within the locale of the Scheme. Since Statutory Consultation this has led to changes to the local side road network and connections to roads south of the A47.
Design – horse riding	We note that you have added a new route in front of the church which includes a horse riders route while not engaging with us in relation to this.	Easton Parish Council	N	The route reflects the existing non-motorised user connection from the A47 lay-by to Dereham Road, which was originally being considered for improvements. This element has since been removed post Statutory Consultation as no longer required.
Design – horse riding	The village viewpoint was that closing Honingham Lane to motorised traffic as detailed above would allow it to be re-classified as a bridleway. This would give a direct access on foot, cycle or horse from Ringland to the Ringland Hills Common, which currently can only be accessed from the village by car and is therefore under utilised by the village. If this can be achieved then the villages view would change to a positive response to this question.	Ringland Parish Council	N	The Scheme does not require the permanent closure of Honingham Lane. Any change as proposed would be a decision for Norfolk County Council.
Design – Longwater Junction	In addition, (Ed: details removed) is aware of issues at Longwater Junction, which is beyond the scope of the current proposals. We would want to understand the impact that the dualling proposals have at this junction and what mitigation, if any, Highways England would be taking forward to address any issues.	Norfolk County Council	N	Chapter 4 Transport Assessment of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) presents the assessments of impacts on the road network and measures to manage any effects.
Design - Ringland	A 20mph speed limit must also be imposed through the centre of Ringland in place of the current 30mph limit. Traffic calming measures are not required as the road is	Ringland Parish Council	N	Highways England is not responsible for the wider local road network, we will pass on your feedback to the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	narrower and more restrictive than the Ringland Lane in Taverham which is already restricted to 20mph.			
Design - safety	The close proximity of the Wood Lane and Blind Lane junctions causes great concern for health and safety of road users. Traffic joining the A47 at Wood Lane travelling East towards Norwich will join a flow of traffic travelling at 70mph. Cars in the inside lane will be slowing down to exit the A47 at the Blind Lane junction, causing a potentially dangerous section of road with cars trying to get up to speed whilst at the same time driving in traffic trying to slow down to exit the A47. The design and location of the roundabouts need to be redesigned, simplified and moved to more suitable locations to prevent this dangerous situation developing.	Honingham Parish Council	N	The Scheme is designed in accordance with Government's highways standards prescribed in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.
Design – safety	At present pedestrians have a crossing point from the main part of the village to lower Easton, once the roundabout is removed this will no longer be a safe route for pedestrians to cross the A47.	Easton Parish Council	Y	Following Statutory Consultation, the Scheme has been amended to close the road level pedestrian crossing of the A47 in Easton and replace it with a pedestrian and cyclist overbridge in the location of the existing Easton roundabout following its removal.
Design – safety	If a safe pedestrian crossing point is not provided how will residents use the local bus service, attend the village school, catch the school bus to Costessey High School and sixth form. This degrades and limited the choice residents have in using other means of transport other than the motor vehicle, at a time when we are facing a global climate emergency, sustainable modes of transport are needed. Can you please advise if a crossing point will feature as part of the upcoming consultation and if not why not?	Easton Parish Council	Y	
Design – safety	Extremely concerned at the lack of consideration for the future impacts of the proposed road design on the local road network including the impacts of construction traffic, increased rat running through Barnham Broom en route to the A47 via Berrys Lane and more HGVs using	Barnham Broom Parish Council	Y	In response to Statutory Consultation feedback and subsequent direct engagement with residents, landowners, local liaison group and south of the A47 taskforce; the proposed scheme closes Berrys Lane to through traffic.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	unsuitable roads which are not wide enough to accommodate them causing damage to roads and dangerous driving conditions.			
Design – safety	The proposed design would allow an increased volume of traffic, including HGVs, access to narrow and unsuitable country roads.	Barnham Broom Parish Council	N	Highways England has reviewed the responses in regard to the junctions to derive at what is believed to be the most suitable location given some of the constraints in the area. Where appropriate Highways England has reviewed the impact on the local road network and discussed mitigation with Norfolk County Council.
Design – Taverham Road	The location of the new junction creates an obvious shortcut for traffic leaving the A47 to go to Taverham or Drayton via Taverham Road. This will take the traffic through the centre of Ringland Village which is a single track road with no pavements or street lighting and some very narrow and sharp bends. It is not suited to such traffic.	Ringland Parish Council	Y	
Design – Taverham Road	The village also demands the permanent closure to motorised traffic of the northern part of Taverham Lane, called Honingham Lane and which runs from the Merryhills Leisure Park to Ringland Church . Access for the local farm traffic could be achieved with the use of rising bollards which could also allow access for emergency vehicles. The local farm manager has indicated that the farm may be prepared to assist with the cost of such barriers.	Ringland Parish Council	Y	
Design – Taverham Road	If however the Highways Authority press ahead with their plans to connect the B1535 to the new A47 we suggest that Taverham Road should also be connected to the new A47 at the Norwich Road junction to share the burden of the increased traffic throughout the area.	Morton on the Hill Parish Council	N	
Design – Taverham Road	The village request a simple re-design of the connection between Taverham Road and the new link road to Church lane via the old section of A47 rather than a direct link to the new roundabout. This will introduce a dogleg approach to Taverham lane which may discourage at least a proportion of the traffic and	Ringland Parish Council	N	In response to various Statutory Consultation feedback, the side road connection north side of the A47 between Wood Lane and Church Lane was removed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	encourage it to use the current route via the Ringland Hills.			
Design – Thuxton	The Parish Council is concerned that the scheme will result in increased “rat-running” through the small hamlet of Thuxton and would like to see measures to mitigate against this put in place.	Garvestone, Reymerston and Thuxton Parish Council	N	In response to Statutory Consultation feedback and subsequent direct engagement with residents, landowners, local liaison group and south of the A47 taskforce; the proposed scheme closes Berrys Lane to through traffic. This would also benefit Thuxton to the south.
Design – Western Link	Instead of a footpath there should be an enhanced slip road from the Western Link to the new A47.	Morton on the Hill Parish Council	N	The review of options for the junction design was presented at consultation in the 'A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Junction & Sideroad Strategy Report' (February 2020). Junction types and designs are guided by thresholds set out in the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) and this includes the type and size of slip road provision.
Design – Wood Lane	Against the creation of a junction at Wood lane as this will give vehicles traveling to north Norfolk an option of either continuing to use the B1535 or the C167 through Weston Longville and Morton on the Hill.	Morton on the Hill Parish Council	N	The preferred route was announced in August 2017 indicating locations for the proposed junctions, and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) .
Design – Wood Lane	Would like to see a complete overhaul of the design of the Wood Lane junction which would reduce the impact on the local environment and reduce the impact on the local road network by removing the opportunities for rat running between the A47 and the A11 from Honingham to Wymondham. The Wood Lane junction should only be for NWL/new A47/Wood Lane and be moved further away from Honingham.	Honingham Parish Council	N	The junction and sideroad strategy report presented during statutory consultation outlines the junction hierarchy in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB). The proposed junctions are sized in accordance

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – Wood Lane	Strongly disagree with the proposed junction design at Wood Lane. The design will encourage increased rat running from the A47 to the A11 via Berrys Lane.	Barnham Broom Parish Council	N	with traffic forecasts for the opening year (2025) and design year (2040). North-south traffic flows have been explored during various Local Liaison Group, sessions chaired by Martin Wilby, and the South of the A47 Taskforce, chaired by George Freeman MP. Both forums included representation from directly affected Parish Councils and those within the locale of the Scheme. In response to Statutory Consultation feedback and subsequent direct engagement with residents and land owners amendments were made to the local side road network to reduce the risk of north to south traffic flows, including the closure of Berrys Lane to through traffic.
Design – Wood Lane	There is a non-motorised user (NMU) route proposed to go under the dualled A47 just east of the Wood Lane junction which will head west and join with the non-motorised user route along the east side of the NWL. This needs to be coordinated.	Norfolk County Council	N	The walker, cyclist and horse rider routes have been developed to maintain and, where possible, improve such connections along the corridor. See Section 4.11 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) .
Design – Wood Lane	Have repeatedly requested for the existing A47 between Wood Lane and the Honingham Roundabout to be left open for local vehicular access, however Highways England have ignored this and chosen to close it. Honingham currently has very poor bus links and by leaving the existing A47 open this could allow for an improved service as well as allowing for better WCHR links.		Y	In response to Statutory Consultation feedback the side roads strategy was reviewed and more of the existing A47 is to be kept open as part of the local side road network, in particular the existing A47 between Wood Lane Junction and Honingham Roundabout.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – Wood Lane	<p>Concerned about the creation of a junction at Wood Lane with the B1535. This junction was created by Norfolk County Council comparatively recently to avoid the traffic running through the village of Hockering but it has not been a total success as it has merely diverted traffic through the village of Weston Longville and down to the A1067 at Lenwade and Morton on the Hill.</p> <p>We therefore believe that there should be an A47/Western Link Interchange at Wood Lane and that the B1535 should run under the new dual carriageway and connect with the new A47 at the new Norwich Road junction.</p>	Morton on the Hill Parish Council	N	<p>The options considered, and selection of the preferred layout with regards the proposed junctions and side road connections, were presented at consultation in the 'A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Junction & Sideroad Strategy Report' (February 2020).</p>
Design – Wood Lane	<p>It should be redesigned as an A47/Western Link interchange at Wood Lane and that the B1535 should run under the new dual carriageway either just south of Lady's Grove or at Wood Lane to connect with the existing A47. Traffic could then travel west to connect with the new A47 at North Tuddenham or east to connect to the new A47 at the Norwich Road junction. It would not however connect to the proposed Western Link.</p>	Morton on the Hill Parish Council	N	<p>The proposed A47 scheme is a standalone scheme, with committed funding in place and following a different planning route. We will continue to work with Norfolk County Council collaboratively on the development of the proposed Norwich Western Link scheme, and interface with the A47 scheme.</p>
Design – Wood Lane	<p>Now that N.C.C have proposed that the Western Link should join the A47 at Wood Lane there will be no need for the B1535 (which currently links the A47 to the A1067) to join the new A47 and access to this road should be restricted to protect the countryside to the north of the new A47 so that it can be enjoyed by all concerned.</p>	Morton on the Hill Parish Council	N	
Design – Wood Lane	<p>We have concern about the proposal at the Wood Lane junction to place a single carriageway through an underpass beneath the dualled A47, although we acknowledge that we are awaiting the full modelling analysis to back up the justification for this being single carriageway only. Despite this, we have concerns that as it is through an underpass it would be difficult and</p>	Norfolk County Council	N	<p>The traffic modelling assessment has confirmed that the single carriageway link road between the two roundabouts at Wood Lane junction is appropriate for anticipated traffic flows in the scheme opening year (2025) and design year (2040). In the event of an incident on this link road that would impede emergency service</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	expensive to widen in the future. There is a resilience concern in the event of an accident on the single carriageway severely impacting flow and the passage of emergency vehicles.			vehicles then they would be diverted to Norwich Road junction where they can then access the wider strategic and local road network. Operational Safety assessments and Stage 1 Road Safety Audit for the scheme have also been undertaken.
Environment	The amount of countryside which will be destroyed is not acceptable.	Honingham Parish Council	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) identifies how the environment will be protected and, where possible, improved by the Scheme.
Environment	<p>The proposed route alignment shown in the Scheme Boundary Plan (drawing no. HE551489-GTY-HGN-000-DRCH-30030) contains small areas that have been identified as safeguarded mineral resources (sand and gravel) in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan.</p> <p>The PEIR states in paragraph 9.3.3 that the Environment Statement accompanying the submission will assess the effects of the scheme on the sterilisation (substantially constrain or prevent existing and potential future use of) mineral sites or peat resources. Paragraph 9.4.8 of the PEIR identifies that small areas of safeguarded mineral resources within the scheme site boundary. It also states that the ES will identify mineral safeguarding sites and assess the potential for sterilisation. The Mineral Planning Authority considers that this is an appropriate strategy, and that the ES should as part of the future assessment consider the potential for reuse of mineral along the route to mitigate any potential sterilisation.</p> <p>Table 9.1 of the PEIR lists some waste sites which have an Environment Agency Permit as landfills. While these sites may still have permits, information held by</p>	Norfolk County Council	N	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 Material assets and waste (TR010038/APP/6.1) has assessed the impact on safeguarded mineral resources as identified in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework. The chapter also assesses landfill capacity and disposal to landfill requirements.</p> <p>Appendix 10.3 – Mineral Impact Assessment, submitted as a part of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.3) assesses the effects of the Proposed Scheme onto any potential sterilization of mineral sites and peat resources. Mineral safeguarding sites have been identified and assessed within this appendix.</p> <p>The chapter also assesses landfill capacity and disposal to landfill requirements.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	Norfolk County Council, as the Waste Planning Authority, indicates that only Spixworth Quarry is actively importing waste.			
Environment	Consideration might need to be made regarding the "Environmental Scoping Boundary" which overlaps with the NWL Works Extents Boundary and an NWL drainage lagoon which is also proposed in this area.	Norfolk County Council	N	The interaction of the Scheme with the Norwich Western Link has been explored through on-going liaison with Norfolk County Council.
Ecology	No justification of the chosen study areas (Zone of Influence) for each species has been provided. This is particularly relevant for bats. The study area boundary for the proposed scheme for bat activity is described as 100m. It should be noted that the Core Sustenance Zones for Barbastelle bats is six kilometres away and there is moderate confidence in zone size. There is a known colony of bats at [REDACTED] which is less than six kilometres from the site. Surveys undertaken in 2019 on behalf of the county council in relation to another potential highways scheme have identified additional roosts for Barbastelle in closer proximity to the proposed scheme. The Scoping Report also identifies	Norfolk County Council	N	The Zone of Influence for each habitat has been defined in line with the relevant guidance and methodologies. The results of the surveys on bats, is presented within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), submitted as a part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>that the open arable landscape offers habitat for species such as noctules <i>Nyctalus noctula</i> and possibly common pipistrelles <i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i> to forage. Bat activity surveys have identified extensive noctule activity indicating that there may be a roost nearby. The woodland areas have potential to support species such as brown long-eared bats and Barbastelle bats <i>Barbastella barbastellus</i>.</p>			
Ecology	<p>The Scoping Report highlights that 'changes in water quality or hydrology (of the River Tud) have the potential to impact other qualifying features of the (River Wensum) SAC, including brook lamprey and bullhead. Specific surveys are not proposed for these species, but the impact will be assessed within the HRA using the results of the hydrology assessment and implementation of appropriate mitigation. No sites suitable for brook lamprey spawning have been identified.' It remains unclear how the assessment of suitable spawning sites was carried out.</p>	Norfolk County Council	N	<p>The Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA), (TR010038/APP/6.9) submitted as a part of the DCO application outlines the assessment methodologies used on designated sites.</p>
Ecology	<p>7.4.1. In Table 7.1: Study areas for different receptors we note that for bat activity surveys (outside of statutory bat-designated sites) a distance of 100 m from the proposed site boundary is given in accordance with generic bat survey guidelines. Due to the records of recent barbastelle activity in the vicinity of the scheme, this distance may be insufficient to establish the potential impacts of severance on commuting and foraging routes of barbastelle bats.</p>	Natural England	N	<p>The bat surveys have been undertaken in line with the appropriate guidance and methodologies: Collins, J. (ed.) (2016). <i>Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines</i>, 3rd edition, Bat Conservation Trust; Emergence and re-Entry surveys for high roost potential took place three times, for moderate two times, and for low once, in the period described; and Crossing Point survey specific Berthinussen and Altringham (2015) and Elmeros et al., 2016 The results of the bat surveys are presented in</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) , submitted as part of the DCO application process.
Ecology	Under the first bullet point it is unclear what is meant by 'creating high tree lines at crossing points' as only green bridges or underpasses (of the appropriate design and with good links to suitable adjoining habitat) have been shown to be effective for bats. High tree lines will be ineffective in enabling barbastelle bats, or other naturally low flying fauna, to cross safely the width of a dual carriageway above HGV height.	Natural England	N	Mitigation measures for bats are identified and presented within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) . Mitigation measures have been discussed with Natural England.
Ecology	In Table 7.3: Updated surveys and results update it appears that surveys have not been undertaken to date to establish if bats, and specifically barbastelles, cross the existing A47 from north to south and vice versa. Radio tracking studies of barbastelle bats undertaken in relation to the nearby proposed Norwich Western Link road recorded these animals crossing the A47 within the proposed site boundary. It is unclear how this evidence has been incorporated into the assessment of potential impacts on bats and why radio tracking studies do not appear to have been undertaken/ proposed in relation to this scheme.	Natural England	N	Since the submission of the PEIR, further bat surveys have been undertaken. The results from these surveys are presented within the Biodiversity Environmental Statement chapter. (TR010038/APP/6.1) .
Ecology	In Table 7.4: Valuation of ecological receptors* we note that for barbastelle bats it is currently blank under the 'Description and location' heading. Until the results of further surveys are known and assessed, it is not	Natural England	N	Since the submission of the PEIR, further bat surveys have been undertaken. The results from these surveys, including the significance of bats are presented within the Biodiversity

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	possible to evaluate the potential impacts on barbastelle bats or assign a value.			Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) chapter.
Ecology	The PEIR was produced in February 2020, some four months after we advised it necessary to obtain the bat records from NCC, and it appears that this information has yet to be evaluated (or obtained?). It is difficult to see how there would be sufficient time to undertake any comprehensive radio tracking surveys during 2020, in a pre-coronavirus world, analyse the results and if required, amend the design of the scheme to avoid, mitigate or compensate for any impacts.	Natural England	N	Bat records were obtained from Norfolk County Council and other relevant parties, such as Norfolk Biodiversity Information Service (NBIS) and the Norwich Western Link (NWL) Ecology Liaison Group.
Ecology	The impacts appear to be incomplete and/or an underestimate due to the lack of bat survey data (whether NCC's) or further field surveys, especially in relation to barbastelles.	Natural England	N	
Ecology	With the design of the new road at an advanced stage and with outstanding survey work, we have concerns whether there is sufficient scope and flexibility within the current timescale to integrate any necessary mitigation or compensation measures identified through further survey work.	Natural England	N	The Environment Management Plan, submitted within the DCO application, outlines the required mitigation measures proposed as a part of the Scheme.
Ecology	Natural England expected, and would have welcomed, more specific details being available at this stage of the process in relation to the assessment of impacts on protected species, and biodiversity in general, and accompanying mitigation measures.	Natural England	N	Natural England has since been consulted on the final Scheme design and measures for mitigating impacts on designated habitats and protected species.
Ecology	7.6.18. Details about post-operational impacts on otters, such as otters trying to cross the new dual carriageway, appear not to have been considered.	Natural England	N	The potential impact on otters has been assessed and mitigation measures identified. These are reported within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), submitted as a part of the DCO application.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Ecology	7.6.35. Please refer to our comments made under 7.6.1. above regarding the effectiveness or otherwise of relying on trees to enable species of bats to cross safely. Appropriately designed mitigation which has been shown to work for bats crossing dual carriageways needs to be incorporated into the design of the scheme. Natural England is unlikely to be supportive of the use of trees alone to facilitate bats crossing a newly dualled road.	Natural England	N	Impacts on ecology are assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to avoid and/or reduce significant effects. The mitigation measures outlined in the Biodiversity Environmental Statement chapter have been tried and tested and therefore best practice is being followed to mitigate the effects on the environment.
Ecology	7.6.41. Will otter ledges be amongst the post-operational measures provided to enable otters to navigate the newly dualled carriageway safely?	Natural England	N	Mammal ledges are provided along some of the proposed culverts to provide safe passage for otters. The locations of these are detailed within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) .
Ecology	We believe there is a pressing need to protect the countryside and improve the environment in the villages to the north of the new A.47 by separating the local road network from the strategic road network.	Morton on the Hill Parish Council	N	Noted. The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) identifies how the environment will be protected and, where possible, improved by the Scheme.
Ecology	The Environment Agency have a policy against the installation of new culverts on watercourses, due to impacts on flood risk (see below) and ecology. Culverts are the least environmentally sensitive option and have the potential to create a barrier to fish, invertebrates and mammal species. They create a canalised cross section, and fast flowing stretches of water which can be impassable to some species of fish. Culverts also result in the permanent loss of bankside, marginal and in channel vegetation which is an important habitat for many different species.	Environment Agency	N	The culverts have been designed to accommodate mammals through mammal ledges where required. Any required culverts have been discussed with the Environment Agency and where appropriate have been designed with natural bedding material.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Ecology	7.6.5 includes potential direct impacts on priority habitats. In respect of Running Water we would highlight that the River Tud is priority chalk stream habitat, salmonid river and is noted as an Environment Agency principle core fishery for Brown Trout. The impacts of the scheme on this stream and the protected species within it must be considered carefully.	Environment Agency	N	<p>Impacts on ecology are assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to avoid and/or reduce significant effects.</p> <p>The mitigation measures outlined in the Biodiversity Environmental Statement chapter have been tried and tested and therefore best practice is being followed to mitigate the effects on the environment.</p>
Ecology	Potential impacts on Fish and white-clawed crayfish are considered in 7.6.10 & 7.6.12. We would add that fast flowing culverted sections can be impassable to smaller species of fish including bullhead and eel.	Environment Agency	N	
Ecology	Paragraph 7.6.19 considers possible impacts on Water Voles. Water voles may also be killed, and their habitat permanently destroyed, by the installation of new culverts on the tributaries of the River Tud. There is the potential for the loss of 350m of habitat which must be mitigated for and alternative habitat provided should displacement be required.	Environment Agency	N	
Ecology	We would also highlight that the preference should be to avoid and then minimise impacts on habitats and species.	Environment Agency	N	
Ecology	Paragraph 7.2.3, in relation to the white-clayed crayfish survey, states that it is unlikely that crayfish would only be present in the small area not sampled. This statement should be further clarified.	Environment Agency	N	
Noise	Our Environmental Management Officer visited Easton and Honingham in mid-March, in connection with the baseline noise survey that was due to be carried out later in the month. He separately gave his observations to the consultant after consulting with the parishes.	Broadland District Council & South Norfolk Council	N	
Noise	We are pleased with the detail that has been provided however we do feel that more detailed maps should have been provided as to the noise receptors.	Easton Parish Council	N	Noted. More detail has been provided as part of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) submission.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Environment	The plans submitted with the PEIR report do not give sufficient detail of the proposed works to fully assess the relationship of the proposed new development to the church.	Historic England	N	
Environment	Hall Hills Ringland Covert CWS is stated as being the CWS closest to the proposed road. However, this does not appear to be correct in relation to our comments made in 7.4.3. above. From reading the PEIR it is unclear what the potential impacts on CWS and pCWS will be.	Natural England	N	Impacts on ecology are assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to avoid and/or reduce significant effects. Proposed CWS have been assessed as a CWS site within the biodiversity assessment.
Environment	We believe that the Preliminary Environmental Information Report does not go far enough to protect the countryside to the north of the proposed A47 and that the proposed junction of the B1535 with the new A47 should be redesigned as an Interchange to protect the environment.	Morton on the Hill Parish Council	N	A full assessment of the final Scheme is presented in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/AP/6.1). The full junction assessment undertaken during early development of the preliminary design was presented at consultation in the 'A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Junction & Sideroad Strategy Report' (February 2020). This assessment demonstrated that an interchange solution was not viable because of both existing and future anticipated traffic figures.
Ecology	Biodiversity data collected should be suitable for use in biodiversity metrics for assessment of 'net gain' of biodiversity. Although we recognise that NSIP projects do not have to demonstrate net gain we would suggest that potential 'net gain' for biodiversity could be demonstrated using the Defra metric.	Norfolk County Council	N	Impacts on ecology are assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to avoid and/or reduce significant effects.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Ecology	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 guidance produced by CIEEM/IEEMA/CIRIA (Biodiversity Net Gain Principles and Guidance) for further details.	Natural England	N	Where possible, woodland areas have been retained as part of the Scheme. Where this is not possible, compensatory planting has been proposed. A landscape masterplan is presented within the DCO application to identify replacement landscape planting and ecological habitat creation. The landscape masterplan aims to achieve no net loss of biodiversity value as part of the Scheme and retain habitat connectivity.
Ecology	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.	Norfolk County Council	N	Impacts on ecology are assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to avoid and/or reduce significant effects.
Ecology	No collision surveys have been undertaken to-date. These surveys could be 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	The mitigation measures outlined in the Biodiversity Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) chapter have been tried and tested and therefore best practice is being followed to mitigate the effects on the environment.
Ecology	River Lamprey was identified within the River Tud during other aquatic surveys which is a Species of Principal Importance. There have been no fish surveys carried out to date and only incidental records during other aquatic surveys recorded. Given the proposed significant in-channel works and river diversion necessary on the River Tud and potential to impact on migratory fish species including European eels, we recommend that the applicant carries out fish surveys.	Norfolk County Council	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Ecology	The PEIR document refers to 'Norfolk County Council data regarding surveys that have been undertaken in 2019 for Norwich Western Link Road and previous records from surveys to support the now completed Norwich Northern Distributor Road. On assessment of this data, further surveys may be required in 2020.' A process for sharing information is being discussed between the ecologists working for the developers of the various schemes.	Norfolk County Council	N	Bat records were obtained from Norfolk County Council and other relevant parties, such as Norfolk Biodiversity Information Service (NBIS) and the Norwich Western Link (NWL) Ecology Liaison Group.
Ecology	The bat records provided by Norfolk County Council (and any other parties) are relevant to assessing the potential impacts of this scheme on bats, and need to be used to inform further field bat surveys as a matter of urgency, rather than simply being assessed and reported in the ES.	Natural England	N	
Ecology	Please note that any receptor site or new sites for great crested newts would need to be surveyed in advance to confirm the absence of any existing populations, as well as time for suitable supporting habitats to be created or improved prior to any translocation.	Natural England	N	<p>The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), with the DCO application, contains a biodiversity impact assessment informed by the survey results and, where needed, proposes mitigation measures to reduce significant adverse effects.</p> <p>Great crested newts have been surveyed and a GCN ghost licence is being submitted as part of 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):
Ecology	It is clear that further field surveys, especially in relation to barbastelles as well as other bat species, are required urgently. The results of further field surveys will need to be assessed to determine whether all impacts have been identified correctly and fully. Only then can specific avoidance/mitigation/compensation measures (which are known to be effective) be identified, and which will need to be incorporated fully as part of the scheme.	Natural England	N	The bat surveys have been undertaken in line with the appropriate guidance and methodologies: Collins, J. (ed.) (2016). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines, 3rd edition, Bat Conservation Trust; Emergence and re-Entry surveys for high roost potential took place three times, for moderate two times, and for low once, in the period described; and Crossing Point survey specific Berthinussen and Altringham (2015) and Elmeros et al., 2016 The results of the bat surveys are presented in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) , submitted as part of the DCO application process.
Environment	As these measures have the potential to affect aspects of the final design of the scheme, it is advisable to have all survey work completed, the results assessed and impacts identified, and mitigation measures fully assimilated as part of the proposal prior to submission.	Natural England	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) , with the DCO application, contains a biodiversity impact assessment informed by the survey results and, where needed, proposes mitigation measures to reduce significant adverse effects.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Ecology	7.5.7. and 7.5.8. As Natural England previously advised in our response (dated 18 October 2019 (our ref:14593/295632)) to the EIA scoping consultation, additional bat surveys may be necessary to assess the potential impacts on bats crossing the A47. In our letter we highlighted the need to obtain and evaluate the bat survey records held by Norfolk County Council (NCC) to inform field surveys for this current scheme.	Natural England	N	<p>The bat surveys have been undertaken in line with the appropriate guidance and methodologies: Collins, J. (ed.) (2016). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines, 3rd edition, Bat Conservation Trust; Emergence and re-Entry surveys for high roost potential took place three times, for moderate two times, and for low once, in the period described; and Crossing Point survey specific Berthinussen and Altringham (2015) and Elmeros et al., 2016</p> <p>The results of the bat surveys are presented in the ES, submitted as part of the DCO application process.</p> <p>Further bat surveys have been undertaken in 2020. Records have also been obtained by NCC to further inform the assessment.</p>
Environment	<p>Cumulative and in-combination effects</p> <p>We note that these have yet to be identified and have the following comments to make:</p> <p>14.2.2. As previously advised in our response (dated 18 October 2019 (our ref:14593/295632)) to the EIA scoping consultation, the 2 km Zone of Influence for the assessment of cumulative impacts may need to be extended in relation to bats and include the completed Norwich Northern Distributor Road.</p>	Natural England	N	<p>The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), Cumulative Effects Assessment has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB LA 104 and the Planning Inspectorate Advice Note Seventeen. The Zone of Influence for bats is 30km, in accordance with the above guidance requirements.</p>
Ecology	In respect of ecology, it must be detailed how design measures will be put in place to reduce permanent impacts on the River Tud, such as shading. The height of the bridge, for example, will be significant in this respect.	Environment Agency	N	<p>The design team worked closely with the Environment Agency and ecology team regarding the bridge design. A mammal ledge is proposed under the River Tud bridge to further reduce the potential impacts. The assessment of the design on biodiversity is presented within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), submitted as part of the DCO application.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Ecology	7.6 Scheme considerations Paragraph 7.6.1 lists some of the measures to guide the design of the scheme. We would suggest that the following should be considered:	Environment Agency	-	See below:
	-Inclusion of otter ledges on bridge abutments to allow otter to pass through in high flows.		N	These are being included as part of the design as well as mammal ledge provision in suitable culverts.
	-Avoid or minimise use of culverts for any stretch of main river or ordinary watercourse.		N	Where culverts are proposed, these have been discussed and designed in liaison with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority (Norfolk County Council).
	-Apply Biodiversity Net Gain principles, in line with the government's 25 Year Environment Plan and NPPF guidelines.		N	Impacts on ecology are assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to avoid and/or reduce significant effects.
Ecology	Under Section 7. Biodiversity the appraisal of the scheme on CWS and pCWS could be improved to permit greater understanding of the actual and potential impacts arising from either construction or operational phases of the new road.	Natural England	N	<p>Where possible, woodland areas have been retained as part of the Scheme. Where this is not possible, compensatory planting has been proposed. A landscape masterplan is presented within the DCO application to identify replacement landscape planting and ecological habitat creation.</p> <p>The landscape masterplan aims to achieve no net loss of biodiversity value as part of the Scheme and retain habitat connectivity.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Ecology	Please note that there are four statutory designated sites, rather than three. The River Wensum should be treated as two separate sites. It is designated as the River Wensum Special Area of Conservation (SAC) under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the 'Habitats Regulations') and notified as the River Wensum Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Whilst the boundaries of each site are contiguous in relation to section of the River Wensum closest to the proposed dualling of the A47, and each site shares some special features in common for their designations, each site also has some different designated features. Each is protected under different legislation, resulting in some differences in how each site is considered in relation to development under the planning system, including the proposed road dualling. For these reasons the River Wensum should be treated and assessed as two distinct sites, one of European importance (the River Wensum SAC) and one of national importance (the River Wensum SSSI) throughout the process and in documents.	Natural England	N	Noted. The comments have been duly considered in the assessment and presented within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), submitted within the DCO application.
Environment	We recommend that further work is required including:	Natural England	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), with the DCO application, contains an assessment of the direct and indirect effects of the Scheme related to direct loss, severance, air quality, noise pollution, changes in hydrology or drainage (including CWSs and pCWSs).
Environment	- identifying which CWS and pCWS could potentially be directly or indirectly impacted, either during construction or operation (or both);	Natural England	N	
Environment	- the type and duration of impacts (direct loss (area such be included), severance, air quality, noise pollution, changes in hydrology or drainage etc); and	Natural England	N	
Environment	- potential avoidance/mitigation/compensation measures.	Natural England	N	
Environment	All CWS and pCWS should be assessed unless it can be demonstrated how impacts from the proposed scheme have been ruled out.	Natural England	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Ecology	There is a wealth of small linear local wildlife sites that lie in close proximity to the A47. Under this scheme opportunities exist to create new habitats, provide linkages between existing sites, as well as extending and enhancing them, the majority of which lie within the footprint of the scheme boundary or adjacent to it.	Natural England	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), within the DCO application, contains a biodiversity impact assessment of the construction and operational effects of the Scheme on local wildlife and habitats. Where needed, mitigation measures are proposed to avoid or reduce significant adverse effects. A landscape masterplan illustrates the Scheme planting and new habitats and linkages.
Ecology	We recommend referring back to our comments made in response to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping consultation, in our letter, dated 18 October 2019 (our ref:14593/295632), and specifically under 2.5 in Annex A. This will help to ensure sufficient information is provided to enable a full assessment of potential impacts, mitigation and enhancements in the ES. For example, there are seven Priority Habitat lowland fens present in the study area (12.4.12) which are groundwater dependent ecosystems which need to be protected.	Natural England	N	
Ecology	Note the River Wensum should be listed twice separately as outlined under (1) above, and that SSSI is not an international designation.	Natural England	N	Noted. This is presented in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), submitted within the DCO.
Ecology	Habitats and Species of Principal Importance 7.4.4 We note that a list of habitats is provided in the text. In order to understand the potential impacts on these habitats, it would be useful to provide similar information to that requested for CWS and pCWS in our comments on 7.6.4 above.	Natural England	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), with the DCO application, contains a biodiversity impact assessment of the construction and operational effects of the Scheme on local wildlife and habitats. Where needed, mitigation measures are proposed to avoid or reduce significant adverse effects. A landscape masterplan illustrates the proposed Scheme planting and new habitats and linkages.
Ecology	7.6.1. In the absence of sufficiently detailed surveys to establish if bats are commuting across the existing A47 covered by the proposed scheme, we are unable to offer detailed comments at this stage about either construction or operational impacts and what mitigation measures will be required, although these would most likely be required to address severance issues for bats.	Natural England	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Ecology	7.6.43. Please note that any new habitat that water voles are translocated to needs to be suitable and free from existing vole populations. If new habitat needs to be created then it will need to be established in advance. Full details about compensation for loss habitat, including its location, needs to be provided.	Natural England	N	
Ecology	EIA scoping consultation, additional bat surveys may be necessary to assess the potential impacts on bats crossing the A47. In our letter we highlighted the need to obtain and evaluate the bat survey records held by Norfolk County Council (NCC) to inform field surveys for this current scheme. This is particularly relevant and important as the proposed Norwich Western Link road will connect this A47 scheme with the A1065 which lies the north of the A47; some of NCC's bat surveys encompass land covered by this scheme; and the Council holds barbastelle surveys data in relation to the Norwich Northern Distributor Road, which cover areas of land to the north of this scheme.	Natural England	N	Bat records were obtained from Norfolk County Council and other relevant parties, such as Norfolk Biodiversity Information Service (NBIS) and the Norwich Western Link (NWL) Ecology Liaison Group. Bat surveys have also been undertaken in 2019 and 2020. The results from which are presented within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), submitted within the DCO application.
Environment	Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) It is noted that the PEIR does not include a consideration of the possible health impacts of EMF. We request that the ES clarifies this and if necessary, the proposer should confirm that the proposed development does not impact any receptors from potential sources of EMF. If this is not the case, an adequate assessment of the possible impacts should be undertaken and included in the ES. Please refer to Appendix 1 in the original PHE scoping response letter for more information.	Public Health England	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), within the DCO application, confirms that the Scheme does not impact any receptors from potential sources of EMF.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Environment	Under the third bullet point it is unclear how any illumination could affect bat movements along or across the dualled carriageway and we assume that this will be examined in the ES.	Public Health England	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), with the DCO application, contains a biodiversity impact assessment of the construction and operational effects of the Scheme, including lighting, on local wildlife and habitats. Where needed, mitigation measures are proposed to avoid or reduce significant adverse effects. A landscape masterplan illustrates the Scheme planting and new habitats and linkages.
Environment	Norfolk Constabulary have the responsibility for policing, making Norfolk a safe place where people want to live, work, invest and travel. This includes the key role of road policing. The wider remit extends to ensuring that places are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion.	Norfolk Constabulary	N	Norfolk Constabulary has been consulted on the design and subsequent changes since Statutory Consultation. The risk of crime was considered as part of the Scheme design and this has sought to avoid creating areas that may attract crime or anti-social behaviours. Chapter 5 of the Case for the Scheme includes an assessment of impacts of the Scheme on personal security, such as for women, young people, older people, people with disabilities and black and minority ethnic communities.
Environment	Central Government place great emphasis on the role of the Police. Furthermore, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) gives significant weight to promoting safe communities (in section 8 of the NPPF). This is highlighted by the provision of paragraph 91, which states Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which..... b) are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion... Norfolk Constabulary have the responsibility for policing, making Norfolk a safe place where people want to live, work, invest and travel. A key to this is to ensure that the necessary police infra-structure and resources are available, where major new development places additional pressures on the Police.	Norfolk Constabulary	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Environment	All developments will have some effect on the determinants of health, which in turn will influence the health and wellbeing of the general population, vulnerable groups and individual people. Although assessing impacts on health beyond direct effects from, for example emissions to air or road traffic incidents is complex, there is a need to ensure a proportionate assessment focused on an application's significant effects.	Public Health England	N	Human health has been assessed within the Population and human health assessment, which is part of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), within the DCO application
Environment	We understand that the promoter will wish to avoid unnecessary duplication and that many issues including air quality, emissions to water, waste, contaminated land etc. will be covered elsewhere in the Environmental Statement (ES). We believe the summation of relevant issues into a specific section of the report provides a focus which ensures that public health is given adequate consideration. The section should summarise key information, risk assessments, proposed mitigation measures, conclusions and residual impacts, relating to human health. Compliance with the requirements of National Policy Statements and relevant guidance and standards should also be highlighted.	Public Health England	N	
Environment	In terms of the level of detail to be included in an ES, we recognise that the differing nature of projects is such that their impacts will vary. Appendix 1 summarises PHE's requirements and recommendations regarding the content of and methodology used in preparing the ES. Please note that where impacts relating to health and/or further assessments are identified and determined, promoters should fully explain and justify this within the final version of the ES.	Public Health England	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Environment	<p>Recommendations Definition of health We would recommend the use of the broad definition of health proposed by the World Health Organisation (WHO) and we welcome a specific reference to mental health. There should be parity between mental and physical health, and any assessment of health impact should include the appreciation of both. A systematic approach to the assessment of the effects on mental health, including suicide, is required.</p>	Public Health England	N	
Environment	<p>The assessments and findings of the ES and any Equalities Impact Assessment should be crossed reference between the two documents, particularly to ensure the comprehensive assessment of potential impacts for health and inequalities for vulnerable populations and where resulting mitigation measures are mutually supportive.</p>	Public Health England		<p>Appropriate cross references have been provided in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and Equality Impact Assessment.</p>
Environment	<p>The ES should contain details of monitoring. Monitoring strategies should be based on principles identified within the final ES. These could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Critical assumptions - Critical mitigations measures - Significant impacts on health <p>If you require any clarification on the above points or wish to discuss any particular issues please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	Public Health England		<p>Each technical chapter of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) outlines any monitoring requirements, submitted as part of the DCO application.</p>
Environment	<p>We strongly recommend that Highways England engages with other organisations and parties, including Norfolk Wildlife Trust, to deliver a scheme that is really strong on delivery for the natural environment.</p>	Natural England		<p>Noted. Norfolk Wildlife Trust has been consulted as a part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. The consultation is presented within the Biodiversity assessment which is part of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) within the DCO application.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Environment	Chapter 8 Geology and Soils We note that the grades of agricultural land which will be affected have yet to be identified. This information together with the total area of Best and Most Valuable land to be lost needs to be included in the ES.	Natural England	N	Chapter 8 'Geology and Soils' of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), in the DCO application, assesses the impact of the Scheme on agricultural land informed by a review of affected agricultural grades.
Environment	A full consideration of the implications of the whole scheme should be included in the ES. All supporting infrastructure should be included within the assessment. The ES should include an impact assessment to identify, describe and evaluate the effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with other projects and activities that are being, have been or will be carried out.	Natural England	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), in the DCO application, provides a full consideration of the implications of the proposed Scheme, including an assessment of cumulative effects of the proposed Scheme in combination with other proposed developments.
Flooding/Drainage	We would ask that the hydrogeological assessment and the Construction Environment Management Plan including any proposed mitigation be shared with Anglian Water for comment before these documents are finalised.		N	These are presented in the DCO application documents - hydrogeological assessment in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and the Environmental Management Plan (TR010038/APP/7.4).
Flooding/Drainage	We highly recommend that the scheme is altered to use bridge structures with all abutments outside of the floodplain instead of culverts to reduce the likelihood of the Environment Agency being in disagreement with this scheme. As previously highlighted, an environmental permit for flood risk activities is required from us for work in, under, over or within 8 metres(m) from a fluvial main river and from any flood defence structure or culvert. The River Tud, is designated a 'main river'. Application forms and further information can be found at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits .	Environment Agency	N	The River Tud Bridge has been designed to ensure that no works are within 5m of the river. Consultation has been undertaken with the Environment Agency on the design of the bridge through each stage of the development phase, including temporary works proposals.
Flooding/Drainage	Compliance with the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975 (SAFFA) for migratory salmonids will be required if culverts are proposed, as these structures can act as a barrier to some species.	Environment Agency	N	Noted. Where culverts are proposed, the watercourses they are proposed on have had fishery surveys undertaken. The surveys have identified no presence of fish in the small water

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				channels where culverts will be present. There is no evidence of salmon on site.
Flooding/Drainage	We note that a Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment will be completed. This must consider the impact of the expansion of bridges and instalment of any culverts on the River Tud and tributaries. Such works are likely to have a significant impact on the WFD status of the water body. Under the Water Framework Directive, all development that may prevent waterbodies achieving the objectives of the directive and/or cause a deterioration in the WFD status must be assessed for compliance.	Environment Agency	N	The Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment is presented in Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1).
Flooding/Drainage	4.3. It should be noted that Honingham Parish Council has raised concerns with the Environmental Management Officer regarding a culvert that runs through the village. The culvert runs along the Village Hall access road and crosses Hall Drive. It apparently surcharges and floods in wet weather. There is a concern locally to get this matter improved and ensure that flooding is not made worse by the proposals. The culvert did not appear to be marked on the appendix E plan or the constraints map at Appendix J. This should be addressed.	Broadland District Council & South Norfolk Council	N	Where culverts are proposed, these have been discussed and designed in liaison with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority (Norfolk County Council). The assessment of any impacts and proposed mitigation, in line with national planning policy, is presented in Chapter 13 'Road Drainage and the Water Environment' of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), supported by a flood risk assessment and drainage strategy in appendices 13.1 and 13.2 (TR010038/APP/6.3). This included assessment on flood risk, hydrogeology and surface water and groundwater quality.
Flooding/Drainage	The LLFA request that an appropriate management and maintenance plan be provided for the scheme including an assessment for the temporary needs for the maintenance of ordinary watercourses, culvert etc which may have access cut off for the riparian owners during the construction phase. It would also include a phasing plan of how the drainage scheme will be constructed and vegetated well in advance of the required operational use.	Norfolk County Council	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Flooding/Drainage	<p>Road Drainage and the Water Environment</p> <p>The county council, in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), provided detailed information within the EIA scoping report in September 2019 and these comments should be read in combination with them. The LLFA suggest that the following information should be included within the final versions of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), Drainage Strategy and Environmental Assessment for the DCO application to enable it to meet with local and national guidance. Additional information should be provided on how the scheme will assess other sources of flooding (fluvial associated with the ordinary watercourses, surface water flow paths and groundwater flooding). This is in line with National Policy Statement for National Networks 2014, considering all sources of flooding (section 5.92, 5.93, 5.97, 5.102 to 5.104). This additional baseline information could be included within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Ordinary watercourses including the proposed crossing point south east of Hockering and flood risk associated with fluvial flooding from this source. 	Norfolk County Council	N	
Flooding/Drainage	<p>Drainage Board (Norfolk Rivers) can be managed regarding flood risk from fluvial sources of flooding. The LLFA are also open to having a joint meeting with any other flood risk management authority. Further guidance on information required by the LLFA from applicants can be found at: https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/rubbish-recycling-and-planning/flood-and-water-management/information-for-developers.</p>	Norfolk County Council	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Flooding/Drainage	Section 12: Road drainage and the water environment Paragraph 12.2.2 references the works likely to be required in respect of the River Tud and ordinary watercourses. Our comments in relation to the proposed structures are provided above in response to Section 2: Proposed scheme.	Environment Agency	N	
Flooding/Drainage	A view on the vulnerability classification should be sought from the planning inspectorate. To comply with national policy the application is required to pass the Sequential and Exception Tests and be supported by a site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). As this proposal is considered an NSIP the National Policy Statement for National Networks should be referred to as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) discussed above.	Environment Agency	N	
Flooding/Drainage	Consequently, paragraph 12.6.9 on potential mitigation should include the potential for changes to groundwater flow. We will require a Hydrogeological Risk Assessment for any groundwater abstraction within 250 m of any works proposed below the water table where there is the potential for a change in groundwater flow, even if any change will be temporary. If any dewatering of the shallow aquifer is needed an abstraction licence may be required; the applicant should discuss this with the Environment Agency as soon as possible.	Environment Agency	N	
Flooding/Drainage	The design of any structure within the floodplain must be determined from a flood risk assessment including flood risk hydraulic modelling. In the first instance the consideration must be to design the structures to minimise their impact on the floodplain.	Environment Agency	N	
Flooding/Drainage	Comments following meeting: The applicant is confident that they have the expertise to use Infoworks ICM modelling software for fluvial hydraulic modelling.	Environment Agency	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Flooding/Drainage	Comments following meeting: The applicant confirmed that they are producing a fluvial only model. The applicant agreed that it would be good for the Environment Agency to review the hydrology report and modelling methodology report for the River Tud Model before they build the model to reduce the likelihood that we will have issues with the hydraulic modelling.	Environment Agency	N	
Flooding/Drainage	Comments following meeting: The applicant was satisfied that creating a fluvial only model, with the Environment Agency reviewing reports as mentioned above, would sufficiently reduce the risk of the Environment Agency having significant issues with the hydraulic model.	Environment Agency	N	
Flooding/Drainage	Comments following meeting: The applicant agreed that they would state the reasons for using the hydrographs from the 2017 River Tud model and why they are applicable to the development site.	Environment Agency	N	
Flooding/Drainage	As highlighted in our previous response, the CIRIA SuDS Manual (2015) should be referred to during the detailed design of the drainage scheme, to ensure that appropriate treatment steps for pollution prevention are included prior to any release to groundwater or surface water.	Environment Agency	N	
Flooding/Drainage	Regarding potential mitigation referenced in 12.6.14; we would add that if any hydrogeological assessments indicate that groundwater dependent surface water features may be at risk, (ground) water level monitoring may be required as well as water quality.	Environment Agency	N	
Flooding/Drainage	However, it must be ensured that potential effects on surface and groundwater quality during operation are fully assessed, and that suitable design measures are incorporated to mitigate the risk. This is likely to include an appropriate SuDS treatment train with pollution control measures.	Environment Agency	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Flooding/Drainage	We note that water quality monitoring of the potentially impacted surface water features will be undertaken prior to construction, and then during and following construction, to ensure that the mitigation put in place is effective. It must also be ensured that a clear incident response plan is put in place.	Environment Agency	N	
Flooding/Drainage	We note that the section on potential impacts during construction (12.6.4) does not include the potential for changes in groundwater flow to impact on surface water features and abstractors. This is covered in the section on operational impacts (12.6.6) but should also be considered in constructional impacts, or else the reasons for such impacts being ruled out should be detailed.	Environment Agency	N	
Flooding/Drainage	The LLFA expect that where possible infiltration is considered over connection to a watercourse in line with the SuDS hierarchy. They expect that any infiltration is proved via appropriate testing along the length and at proposed depth of infiltration feature. In Norfolk, proposed infiltration greater than 2m is classed as 'deep' and is at the end of the SuDS hierarchy similar to connection to a sewer. The LLFA state that water quality assessments for DuDA will consider the sensitive receptors of receiving waterbodies and additional treatment provided where appropriate. They state that the use of DMRB water quality assessment is reasonable.	Norfolk County Council	N	Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) is informed by a drainage strategy presented in Appendix 13.2 (TR010038/APP/6.3) that has considered use of sustainable urban drainage systems and management of surface water and groundwater drainage flooding risks taking into account relevant guidance on future climate change allowance and need to control discharge run-off rates. Chapter 14 Climate of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the Scheme's vulnerability to, and ability to manage, impacts from climate change, including flood risk to the Scheme and other receptors. The drainage strategy has been developed in liaison with the Lead Local Flood Authority (Norfolk County Council).
Flooding/Drainage	Groundwater flooding potential following ground investigations, showing where groundwater may be close to surface how this may be managed within the drainage scheme or diverted through/around the development area without adversely affecting the risk of flooding.	Norfolk County Council	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Flooding/Drainage	Demonstration that any SuDS attenuation features will be protected from all sources of flooding to ensure they will be functioning during the 1:100 year plus 40% climate change.	Norfolk County Council	N	
Flooding/Drainage	Mitigation for any source of flooding is demonstrate e.g. compensatory storage for structures, including SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System), dry culverts or interception drainage	Norfolk County Council	N	
Flooding/Drainage	Additional information and evidence is required on how the drainage scheme for the new road will be designed to meet national standards including S2 (peak flow control), S4 (volume Control), S7, S8 and S9 (flood risk within the development including no flooding outside a drainage scheme at 1:30 year event). This would be in line with National Policy Statement for National networks 2014, technical standards for SuDS (section 5.100, 5.110 to 5.115).	Norfolk County Council	N	
Flooding/Drainage	SuDS using source control should be prioritised e.g. over the edge drainage to filter strips and swales to slow water and treat it close to where it falls. The LLFA advise against using pipes to large infiltration / attenuation ponds as this provides little resilience for this type of infrastructure. We have experience of highly variable ground conditions in Norfolk, even after extensive ground investigation. Smaller structures do provide greater resilience if ground conditions prove to be not as favourable as anticipated, allowing for easier alternative arrangements to be designed.	Norfolk County Council	N	
Flooding/Drainage	Where existing drainage schemes are being retained, then an assessment to show why improvements to upgrade the drainage to current standards can not be undertaken. The LLFA would expect on a large scheme such as this where significant landscaping is being undertaken retrofit of SuDS to improve runoff quantity and quality is scoped and provided.	Norfolk County Council	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Flooding/Drainage	Unvegetated SuDS can cause pollution with the mobilisation of suspended solids into the environment. The LLFA understand that all consenting on ordinary watercourse may fall within the Norfolk River Internal Drainage Board. If any structures are proposed outside of their area, this will be consented by NCC LLFA. The LLFA would welcome early discussions on this.	Norfolk County Council	N	
Flooding/Drainage	Surface water flow paths which may cross the area and how these will be incorporated into the drainage scheme or diverted through / around the development without adversely affecting the risk of flooding. This is including flow paths crossing the alignment of the road and associate junctions (South east of Hockering, church / sandy lane and north & east of Honingham – as section 12.4.5 of the PEIR)	Norfolk County Council	N	
Flooding/Drainage	Evidence should be provided to show how current climate change allowances have been considered and demonstrate that surface water originating from the scheme up to the 1:000 year (1% AEP) plus 40% climate change will not leave the site.	Norfolk County Council	N	
Flooding/Drainage	Consideration should be made that the road will be a linear structure that may impede natural greenfield runoff and mitigation suggested to maintain drainage patterns. This may include agricultural land drainage systems.	Norfolk County Council	N	
Flooding/Drainage	However, the new road could increase the noise of traffic heard from the vicinity of the church and it is unclear how visible it and the proposed landscaping would be. Some assessment of this, including modelling of profiles to establish visibility where the level of the new road is changed would be valuable in establishing if there might be a harmful impact on the significance of the listed building.	Historic England	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Flooding/Drainage	Should the proposed method of surface water management relate to Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be consulted to ensure that an effective surface water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented.	Anglian Water Services Limited	N	Anglian Water has been consulted about the Scheme and associated interactions.
Flooding/Drainage	Paragraph 2.8.7 states that attenuation basins shall be "located outside of flood zones where possible", and that compensatory storage may be provided if encroachment is necessary. For any basins proposed to be within the flood zone, it must be ensured that they do not increase flood risk elsewhere and that they remain capable of providing a surface water management function during a flood event (high fluvial flows). It must also be ensured that there will be no significant pollution risk if basins become inundated during a fluvial event. We would recommend that attenuation basins are located outside flood zones.	Environment Agency	N	Drainage basins have been located outside flood zones areas and a flood risk assessment is presented in Appendix 13.1 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.3) .
Flooding/Drainage	The Trust has reviewed your proposals, and on the basis that they appear unlikely to have any impact on our waterways we have no comment to make at this time. Please be aware that the waterways close to this project are not owned or managed by the Trust, but may be owned or managed by other bodies.	Canal & River Trust	N	The comment that the waterways close to this project are owned or managed by other bodies is noted.
Flooding/Drainage	In table 2.1 we note that 'East Culvert', 'New West Culvert' and 'River Tud Culvert' propose new culverts over watercourses. We have a number of concerns on these proposed culvert structures: The Environment Agency have a policy against the installation of new culverts on watercourses, due to impacts on flood risk (see below)	Environment Agency	N	Where culverts are proposed, these have been discussed and are being designed in liaison with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority (Norfolk County Council). The culvert design considerations are discussed in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) .

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Flooding/Drainage	The details in table 2.1 provide very specific dimensions of the proposed structures. This is concerning as the design for these structures should be specific to the on-site constraints including fluvial flood risk, which are not yet known. The design of any structure impacting on fluvial flood risk must be determined from a flood risk hydraulic model and a flood risk assessment. In the first instance the consideration must be to design any structure to minimise the impact on flood risk (and ecology).	Environment Agency	N	
Flooding/Drainage	Should a scheme proposing culverts be progressed, the applicant will be required to explain why culvert structures are proposed when alternatives, such as bridge structures with all abutments outside of the floodplain, could reasonably be constructed and would significantly reduce the impact on flood risk. If the scheme is brought forward as currently proposed, including the culverts described in the PEIR, it is likely that the Environment Agency will not be able to support the scheme.	Environment Agency	N	
Flooding/Drainage	We require the applicant to explain why the current bridge structure is proposing bridge abutments and associated road embankments in the floodplain and why the bridge structure has not been designed with all abutments and road embankments outside of the floodplain. The current bridge design effectively creates an additional and unnecessary barrier in the floodplain. It is unlikely that the Environment Agency will be able to come to agreement with this proposed scheme if it is brought forward as currently described in the PEIR.	Environment Agency	Y	The Environment Agency has been consulted on the design and construction of the River Tud bridge crossing to agree acceptable design and build parameters that manages the flood fluvial and ecological impact risks.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Flooding/Drainage	<p>Also in table 2.1, we note that a new bridge is proposed over the main River Tud. We have a number of concerns on this proposed bridge structure:</p> <p>1. The details in table 2.1 provide very specific dimensions of the proposed bridge. As stated above this is concerning as the design of structures should be specific to constraints including fluvial flood risk and ecological impacts.</p>	Environment Agency	Y	
Flooding/Drainage	<p>Section 12 further discusses the flood risk that affects the route and the Flood risk Assessment (FRA) requirements to ensure that the design adequately mitigates the risk.</p> <p>Our maps show the site lies partially within Fluvial Flood Zones 3b, 3a and 2 defined by the 'Planning Practice Guidance: Flood Risk and Coastal Change' respectively as the functional floodplain, having a high probability of flooding and having a medium probability of flooding. A proposal such as this for a dual carriageway, culverts and a new bridge crossing could be classed 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	Y	The Environment Agency has been consulted during the development of the flood risk assessment to agree to model, scope, results, and proposed flood risk mitigation measures.
Flooding/Drainage	<p>As highlighted in paragraph 12.5.4, the FRA is being progressed with input sought from the Environment Agency. We recently reviewed the proposed hydrology approach for the River Tud fluvial hydraulic model. In our response letter (ref: AE/2020/124932/01-L01, dated 12 March 2020), we highlighted a number of concerns that are summarised in the points below. Following this letter we had a meeting with the applicant to discuss and address the concerns raised.</p> <p>We noted that the applicant intends to create an Infoworks ICM hydraulic model. We were concerned that</p>	Environment Agency	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	Infoworks ICM modelling software is best used for modelling pluvial (surface water) flood risk and would not be best used in modelling to represent fluvial flood risk.			
Flooding/Drainage	We highlighted that we would have significant concerns if the purpose was to create a combined pluvial –fluvial model, as this would present significant challenges on the suitability of the model for representing fluvial flood risk in a planning application. While it is not impossible for us to find an Infoworks ICM model suitable, a significant amount of time and resources will need to set aside to deal with the likely challenges to the models suitability.	Environment Agency	Y	
Flooding/Drainage	The Applicant intends to update the LiDAR data, scheme specific topographic survey and apply relevant fluvial climate change to the existing hydrographs into the (Infoworks ICM) hydraulic model. We felt that this will create more work than may be necessary, as the Environment Agency's review of the model will have to assess the entire model's suitability for planning and so may come across further issues to be addressed.	Environment Agency	Y	
Flooding/Drainage	The intention is to use the same hydrology from the Environment Agency's River Tud (ISIS) hydraulic model 2017, which we feel is likely to be suitable. It should be considered whether the hydrology of this strategic model requires amending to better represent the site-specific hydrology in the model for the proposed development (e.g. is the storm duration right for the site, etc).	Environment Agency	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Flooding/Drainage	It will be imperative for all groundwater abstractions in the area to be protected against potential changes in groundwater quality and flow arising from the proposed works. This includes all licensed abstractions (for public water supply and private licences) and all de-minimis abstractions (i.e. abstractions taking 20 m ³ /d or less that do not require an abstraction licence). Whilst Section 12 mentions all local abstractors, Section 8 mentions only licensed abstractions; the PEIR should consistently refer to all abstractors and it must be ensured that all abstractions are protected.	Environment Agency	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains a Road Drainage and Water Environment chapter that assesses the impacts of the Scheme on water resources and quality during construction and operation, including groundwater abstractions. This includes a hydrogeological assessment. Where required, it proposes appropriate mitigation measures, such as pollution control measures that are also reflected in the Environmental Management Plan (TR010038/APP/7.4). The additional information provided has been considered.
Flooding/Drainage	While potential impacts on water quality from increased sediment and contaminants during construction are listed in 12.6.4, similar risks during the operational phase are not highlighted in this section. Only risks to water quality arising from physical modifications are listed under 12.6.6.	Environment Agency	N	
Flooding/Drainage	With reference to domestic, private drinking water supplies, the Councils hold records for a number of these supplies and sample them for drinking water quality. It is not anticipated that the risk of pollution to domestic supplies is great but we feel the applicant should demonstrate that this is the case. Attached with this response is a record of those supplies that are within 1000m of the existing route, within the scheme area.	Broadland District Council & South Norfolk Council	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Flooding/Drainage	<p>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</p> <p>As noted in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) there are major groundwater abstractions to the northeast, southeast and south of the above project which are used for public water supply. There is also a new public water supply located to the south of the River Tud as previously highlighted by Anglian Water.</p> <p>Reference is made to the preparation of a hydrogeological assessment to assess any impact on any changes to groundwater levels and flows associated with abstractions. Similarly, reference is made to a Construction Environmental Management Plan including further details of the mitigation to prevent pollution to the water environment.</p> <p>Regard should to be had ensuring that pollution of existing groundwater sources is prevented so that we can continue to serve our customers.</p>	Anglian Water Services Limited	N	
Further engagement	<p>Therefore as there is a risk that the scheme may result in extra crime and disorder as a result of the works, Norfolk Constabulary request that a condition be placed on any consent to require additional resources be made available by the applicant to the police to take measures to address such crime and disorder considerations.</p>	Norfolk Constabulary	N	<p>Highways England already support Norfolk Constabulary to manage crime and disorder along the A47 corridor and will continue under existing arrangements for the new dual carriageway. The Scheme design has considered risk of crime and sought to avoid creating areas that may attract crime or anti-social behaviours. Chapter 5 of the Case for the Scheme includes an assessment of impacts of the Scheme on personal security, such as for women, young people, older people, people with disabilities and black and minority ethnic communities. Therefore, a bespoke condition is not warranted.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Further engagement	<p>Norfolk Constabulary would request a meeting between the Scheme Engineer and their Road Policing Inspector to secure the following as part of the emerging scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Places (and the design of places) for Police to stop suspects on the A47; and. •ANRP cameras on the new A47 / Norwich northern bypass / Broadway Road junction. 	Norfolk Constabulary	N	Norfolk Constabulary have been consulted on the design and subsequent changes since Statutory Consultation, with police requirements incorporated into the proposed design.
Further engagement	<p>Due to the close proximity of gas assets, NGG wishes to express their interest in further consultation while the impact on those assets is still being assessed. In respect of existing NGG infrastructure, appropriate protection will be required for retained apparatus including compliance with relevant standards for works proposed within close proximity of its apparatus.</p>	National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC and National Grid Gas PLC	N	Highways England has continued to engage with National Grid regarding their assets and have commenced discussions on the diversion requirements.
Further engagement	<p>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 and have previously been shared with Highways England. Appendix 1 of this letter outlines the recommended wording for inclusion in the Draft DCO. Reference is made to existing utilities and the potential need for diversions. We would ask that the reference be made to both the water supply and foul sewerage networks as set above and Chawston Water Recycling Centre.</p>	Anglian Water Services Limited	N	The draft DCO contains protective provisions for the benefit of Anglian Water. Anglian Water has consulted on the protective provisions and management of risks / diversions to Anglian Water's water supply and foul sewerage networks.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Further engagement	We have produced two updated alternative schematic diagrams of our proposals (based on your own consultation plans) and we would like to share these with you for further consideration and costing by the Highways Authority. Unfortunately there is no facility in this response to annexe this documentation and therefore if (Ed: name removed) were to contact us on (Ed: phone number removed) we can forward these to you under separate cover.	Morton on the Hill Parish Council	N	Alternative scheme layouts have been reviewed and considered. The alternative layouts provided would not be achievable without significant additional land take to accommodate the necessary grade separated movements at the Wood Lane junction whilst maintaining the existing A47 fully for local traffic movements. Further, the layouts would require the proposed mainline to be raised in height and would therefore result in substantial additional construction works and impact to the wider area in terms of the route in its setting.
Further engagement	Strongly believe there is still plenty of flexibility within the Scoping Boundary for Highways England to revise their junction strategy and make all junctions smaller, moving their locations to more appropriate locations at the same time as meeting the objectives of the project.	Honingham Parish Council	N	The extent and design of the junctions was presented at consultation in the 'A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Junction & Sideroad Strategy Report' (February 2020), and includes a justification for the location and size.
Further engagement	It is essential that Highways England work closely with Norfolk County Council to deliver a complete solution to local traffic issues caused by the A47 project. Simply drawing a line 300m from the new road and looking within that zone would be a failure of HE's duty of care to the local population.	Ringland Parish Council	N	The line which is being referred to references the environmental scope boundary. Highways England has engaged with Norfolk County Council to deliver the Scheme and has a Statement of Common Ground in place.
Further engagement	We would also like clarification on the proposed extension of RB1 to be delivered. Section 11.6.15 of the PEIR states that the Proposed Scheme will "permanently divert a short section of the route lying to the north of the A47" but the Scheme Plan seems to indicate a much longer section south to Dereham Road. This extent does not need to be diverted as it is not directly affected by the new road.	Norfolk County Council	N	Section 4.11 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) presents an overview of the existing PRoW network and potential impact, mitigation measures and improvements due to the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Further studies	The county council, as the Local Highway Authority, will require a full Transport Assessment which takes into account the impact of the scheme on the local road network and also the impact on sustainable travel modes.	Norfolk County Council	N	Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) presents a Transport Assessment that assesses the impact of the Scheme on the local road network and walkers, cyclists and horse-riders.
Further studies	You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 47 'Avoiding Danger from Underground Services', and National Grid's specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Grid High Pressure gas pipelines and associated installations - requirements for third parties T/SP/SSW22.	National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC and National Grid Gas PLC	N	Noted. We will be working with the Statutory Utility companies and adhering to relevant safety guidelines to avoid or otherwise minimise any risks to or from underground services.
Further studies	Suggest the proposed WCH surveys scheduled for April 2020 should ensure different days of the week, including weekends, and different times of day are carried out... also suggest that limiting surveys to one month is not sufficient to gauge usage as this will be variable according to seasons and holiday periods. WCH usage incorporates both travel and recreation and therefore surveys should take this into account.	Norfolk County Council	N	The WCH surveys were originally scheduled for April 2020 but were postponed until July 2020 due to travel restrictions and school closures associated with the first Covid-19 lockdown. The WCH surveys conducted in July 2020 commenced on Monday 13 July and were undertaken for 14 consecutive days including two weekends, between 7am and 7pm (twelve hours) on all survey days. As such, the survey period covered the last week of school term time and the first week of the school summer holiday period. The collected usage information, which includes recreational and utility trips, is representative of the average use of the WCH facilities and is sufficient to inform the assessment.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Further studies	<p>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.</p> <p>Any impacts of traffic and transport must include an assessment of the impact on the existing road network. 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 (rat runs as described in para 12.7.9).</p> <p>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.</p>	Public Health England	N	Impacts on transport network users and NMU routes are considered in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) and Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), while an outline of the construction traffic management controls are presented in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (TR010038/APP/7.5).
Further studies	<p>I'm presuming that the column heading Distance from the Scheme refers to the distance from the closest part of a site to the scheme scoping boundary, as shown by the solid red line on many of the figures in the PEIR. If this is the case then a number of the distances listed appear to be incorrect and need to be re-checked. For example, Fen West of East Tuddenham CWS and Fen Planation CWS (listed as being 0.2 km and 0.3 km away, respectively, in the table) each appear to adjoin the scheme boundary as shown in Figure 7.1, see under 7.6.4. for an example.</p>	Natural England	N	Chapter 8 Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) identifies and assesses the risks to designated and proposed County Wildlife Sites, with distances identified as from the construction boundary at closest point (m) and direction.
Further studies	<p>In addition to the information provided for all CWS and pCWS in Table 7.2, it would be helpful if an additional table could be provided which lists all these sites, their size and (briefly) what main Priority Habitats (PH) each one contains.</p>	Natural England	N	
Landscape/Visual	<p>The new road could increase the noise of traffic heard from the vicinity of the church and it is unclear how visible it and the proposed landscaping would be.</p>	Historic England	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), in the DCO application, contains a Heritage and Archaeology impact

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Landscape/Visual	The volume and speed of traffic on the road does detract from the quiet and contemplative qualities of church and churchyard, but the proposed development could significantly increase that effect as well as bring a much greater visual impact.	Historic England	N	assessment that considers the effects of the Scheme on these Churches and other Listed Buildings and proposes mitigation measures where significant effects on the assets and their setting are identified.
Landscape/Visual	The EIA Scoping Report (dated September 2019) established a 1km study area around the site boundary in which to assess both designated and undesignated heritage assets. Within this area the key heritage assets which come within the scope of our advice are the parish church of St Michael at Hockering, the church of St Andrew at Honingham and the church of St Peter at Easton. Based on the proximity of the proposed development to these heritage assets we consider there is the potential for an impact which would affect the historic significance of all three due to the change in their setting. We would therefore like to comment on the historic significance of these churches and the nature of this impact as well as suggest how further assessment might establish the degree of impact.	Historic England	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Landscape/Visual	<p>The parish church of St Michael, Hockering (grade I listed)</p> <p>St Michael's church lies to the west of Hockering village with an historic farmstead amidst fields between it and the edge of the settlement. The church has significant work dating from the 13th century, particularly in the chancel, but the nave, north aisle and the grand west tower date from the 15th century and the main architectural characteristic of the building is that of the English Perpendicular style. Internally there is a west gallery dating from the early 19th century, a relatively rare survival. The building is listed at grade I in recognition of its exceptional architectural and historic interest.</p> <p>The village street at Hockering was formerly the main road before the current A47 bypass was built. As noted above, the church stands apart from the village with fields on all sides. Its setting remains predominantly rural although there are trees around the church there are views towards the A47 from the churchyard and traffic on the road is audible.</p> <p>The proposed dual carriageway would be set some 200m further away from the church than the existing A47. There is also proposed to be some landscaping on the north side of the new road (towards Hockering).</p>	Historic England	N	
Landscape/Visual	<p>On the basis of the information so far available we consider that the proposed development could result in harm to the historic significance of the church. However, the precise degree of impact is not yet clear.</p>	Historic England	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Landscape/Visual	5. Heritage Considerations 5.1. In terms of heritage assets within the scheme plan, there are listed buildings in very close proximity to the proposed works in both Broadland & SNC areas which need to be referred to. These are: i. St Peters Church, Easton which is Grade I listed, ii. St Andrews Church, Honingham which is Grade II* listed, and iii. Church Farm & Church House Farm which are both Grade II listed.	Broadland District Council & South Norfolk Council	N	
Landscape/Visual	5.2. Our concern will be that the proposals will affect the setting of the stated listed buildings and the decision maker should, as required by Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990, have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the building or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.	Broadland District Council & South Norfolk Council	N	
Landscape/Visual	With regard to heritage landscapes we note that the scheme will affect land at Berry Hall Estate which is subject to the Government's Conditional Exemption tax Incentive scheme. The land lies south of the existing A47 and adjoins it at Honingham. In the Scheme Assessment Report (SAR), produced in December 2017, Berry Hall was noted in Tables 4.2 and 4.3 in relation to listed buildings and as a visual receptor, respectively. There does not appear to be any specific reference to, or an assessment of impacts on, this heritage landscape in the PEIR.	Natural England	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains a Landscape and Visual Effects chapter and a Cultural Heritage chapter that assess the impacts on historic landscapes and assets, including their setting, and proposes appropriate mitigation.
Landscape/Visual	We note that currently, expected volumes of waste material arising from the scheme are unknown.	Environment Agency	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains a Materials and Waste chapter that assesses the impacts from the estimated waste material and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Landscape/Visual	<p>Hazardous Substance Consent</p> <p>#The presence of hazardous substances on, over or under land at or above set threshold quantities (Controlled Quantities) will probably require Hazardous Substances Consent (HSC) under the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 as amended. The substances, alone or when aggregated with others for which HSC is required, and the associated Controlled Quantities, are set out in The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended.</p> <p>HSC would be required to store or use any of the Named Hazardous Substances or Categories of Substances at or above the controlled quantities set out in Schedule 1 of these Regulations.</p> <p>Further information on HSC should be sought from the relevant Hazardous Substances Authority.</p>	Health and Safety Executive	N	<p>The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains a Materials and Waste chapter that assesses the risks from contaminated land and hazardous materials and proposes appropriate mitigation measures.</p>
Landscape/Visual	<p>We would like to advise on the impact of the proposed development on grade I and II* listed buildings and registered parks and on scheduled monuments, but we would not wish to comment on grade II listed buildings and undesignated heritage assets, including archaeology. We are content to defer to the Local Planning Authority and their archaeological advisors on those matters.</p> <p>The proposed development consists of 9km of dual carriageway with two new junctions at Wood Lane and London Road. The existing roundabout at Easton would be removed as part of the proposals.</p>	Historic England	N	<p>Noted. Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the impacts on historic landscapes and assets, including their setting, and proposes appropriate mitigation.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Landscape/Visual	<p>The parish church of St Andrew, Honingham</p> <p>St Andrew's church lies at some distance from Honingham village and stands immediately to the north of the Norwich Road, the former main route into Honingham which has been upgraded to serve as part of the existing A47. To the west and north of the church are open fields which fall away towards where the River Tud loops around the higher ground on which the church stands. To the east is a sizeable area of woodland. The churchyard extends almost to the roadside with a pedestrian lychgate at its western side and white painted picket fences and gates at the vehicular entrance to the site on the eastern side. While the land on which the current A47 sits is level the church stands slightly above it which, combined by the open aspect of the churchyard makes the church a major landmark from the road.</p> <p>St Andrew's chiefly dates from the early 14th century and this phase of work gives it its most notable features. The tall, elegant west tower with stepped angled buttresses dates from that period. The upper stage of the tower was added in the 15th century and has decorative flushwork panels of high quality and tall pinnacles which lend it a distinctive profile. The building is listed at grade II* in recognition of its high architectural and historic interest. This grade of listing places St Andrew's in the top 5.5% of listed buildings nationally.</p> <p>The setting of St Andrew's church on relatively high ground with the river curving around could well suggest an early date for the establishment of settlement at this site.</p>	Historic England	N	<p>Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the impacts on archaeology, historic landscapes and designated and non-designated cultural heritage assets, including their setting. St Andrew's Church has been considered in this assessment and, following Statutory Consultation, the highway alignment was moved away from the Church, which reduced the impact on its setting.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Landscape/Visual	It is important that detailed assessment of the historic significance of the church and what the setting contributes to that is carried out. However, considerably more detailed plans are also needed for the proposed roads in the immediate vicinity of the church and the new junction, including multiple drawn sections through the development from the churchyard and visual impressions both in close proximity and across the landscape. These would allow assessment of impact and the ability to better consider if the proposed landscaping could reduce that impact.	Historic England	N	
Landscape/Visual	It is important that detailed assessment of this historic significance of the church and what the setting contributes to that is carried out. However, considerably more detailed plans are also needed for the new road to the north of the church. A drawn section through the road from the churchyard and visual impressions both in close proximity and across the landscape would allow assessment of impact and the ability to consider if the proposed landscaping could reduce the impact.	Historic England	N	
Landscape/Visual	In addition, given the proximity of the proposed development to the churchyard the potential for archaeological deposits on the construction site should be investigated. As noted above, we are content to defer to the local authority's archaeological advisors in this matter.	Historic England	N	
Landscape/Visual	We would recommend further, detailed assessment of the impact on the setting of the grade I listed St Michael's church, Hockering and St Peter's church, Easton and the grade II* listed St Andrew's church, Honingham.	Historic England	N	Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the impacts on historic landscapes and assets, including the setting of Listed Buildings, and proposes appropriate mitigation. The

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Landscape/Visual	As well as assessment of the significance and setting, consideration of the impact on that significance should be informed by additional plans and visualisations, as noted above. We would recommend these are produced as a matter of urgency so this assessment can be taken forward. The level of harm to the significance of these heritage assets can then be established and the effect of any mitigation considered.	Historic England	N	assessment is supported by plans and is informed by the visual assessment in Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Amenity.
Landscape/Visual	<p>The potential for views of the scheme is extensive and that carious residential properties and publicly accessible routes will be impacted on a visual scale. The assessment should fully consider these views and the impact they will have on visual amenity; and findings should inform decisions regarding design from the outset.</p> <p>Suitable guidance and best practice has been referred to in terms of methodology including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Part 5 Landscape Effects •Interim Advice Note 135/10 (IAN 135/10) Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment •Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition (Landscape Institute & IEMA, 2013) •An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment (Natural England, 2014) <p>The county council understands the ZTV (Zones of Theoretical Visibility) is still to be undertaken, however the methodology provided for undertaking this appear appropriate. It will be important for this to be verified on site.</p>	Norfolk County Council	N	Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Amenity of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) presents an assessment on views, including the methodology and determination of the ZTV, and proposes appropriate mitigation. Impacts on landscape and visual amenity have informed the appraisal of alternative options and the Scheme design; see the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) and Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) .

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Landscape/Visual	The potential construction and operation effect suggested appear to come from robust investigation and reflect concerns we would share for effects on both the landscape and visual amenity and we agree that the scheme is likely to require a 'Detailed' level of assessment as well as a comprehensive environmental masterplan and detailed planting design to ensure suitable mitigation.	Norfolk County Council	N	
Landscape/Visual	As this proposal is not either located within, or within the setting of, any nationally designated landscape, Natural England has no specific comments to make at this time, other than the proposed mitigation measures should be sympathetic to the local landscape character areas.	Natural England	N	
Mitigation	Ensure that substantial mitigation measures are built into the design of junctions and the side road strategy to guarantee no unforeseen and damaging consequences, but rather real and lasting benefits to these communities.	Weston Longville Parish Council	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the impacts from the construction and operation of the Scheme and proposed mitigation measures for potential significant effects.
Environment	<p>Noise and Public Health</p> <p>Health outcomes and significance of impacts</p> <p>The promoter should revise the statement in the main PEIR document, para. 11.2.3 that the requirement to consider health in road projects came into force in October 2019. The May 2017 changes to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations clarified that 'population and human health' are on the list of topics that must be considered [11]. In addition, the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) (2010), is explicitly framed in relation to impacts on health and quality of life.</p>	Public Health England	N	Noted. Chapter 12 Population and Human Health in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the impacts on of noise on human health from construction and operation of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Environment	<p>PHE welcomes the Applicant's acknowledgment for the potential for road traffic noise to have adverse impacts on human health. The Applicant states that consultation with stakeholders to inform the health assessment has not yet been undertaken (PEIR main, para. 11.2.4). Therefore, PHE reiterates its recommendation made at the scoping stage, that assessments of significance should be based on impacts on health and quality of life, and not around noise exposure per se, in line with the NPSE. Furthermore, PHE expects significance to reflect both the severity of the health outcome and the size of the population affected. For temporary impacts, such as those resulting from construction noise, the duration should also be taken into account when assessing significance.</p>	Public Health England	N	<p>Chapter 12 Population and Human Health in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the impacts on human health during construction and operation of the Scheme. The following standards and guidance have informed the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DMRB LA 112 Population and human health • IEMA Health in EIA: A Primer for a Proportionate Approach • Health Impact Assessment Tools (Department of Health, 2010)
Environment	<p>i. The existing noise exposure of affected communities – in particular the four designated Noise Important Areas in proximity to the Scheme. These are areas with the highest levels of noise exposure at a national level, and require very careful consideration in terms of opportunities for improvement of health and quality of life through noise management;</p> <p>ii. Cumulative exposure to other environmental risk factors, including other sources of noise and air pollution; and</p> <p>iii. Local health needs, sensitivities and objectives.</p>	Public Health England	N	<p>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) presents an assessment of noise impacts on Noise Important Areas. Chapter 15 Cumulative Effects considers the cumulative effects of the Scheme. Mitigation measures are proposed to minimise any potential any significant effects.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Noise	<p>PHE recommends the quantification of health outcomes such as annoyance, sleep disturbance and cardiovascular effects –these can be expressed in terms of number of people affected, Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) and/or monetary terms. PHE recommends the methodologies and exposure response relationships set out in publications by the WHO [1, 2] and the IGCBN [3].The Applicant should also consider potential adverse impacts on areas prized for their tranquillity, as noted in 11.4.42, “Whilst it is well-known that being in nature is beneficial for human mental health, there is a lack of definitive guidance. Further discussion with Highways England will be undertaken to agree the approach to this part of the health assessment.” PHE expects 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 [5-8]. 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]. PHE notes that a number of footpaths and allotment gardens have been identified as noise sensitive receptors. PHE encourages the Applicant to consider using a soundscapes approach [9] to assess any potential impacts of noise on people using these sites.</p>	Public Health England	N	<p>Chapter 12 Population and Human Health in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the impacts on human health during construction and operation of the Scheme. The following standards and guidance have informed the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DMRB LA 112 Population and human health • IEMA Health in EIA: A Primer for a Proportionate Approach • Health Impact Assessment Tools (Department of Health, 2010) <p>Mitigation measures are proposed to minimise any potential any significant effects.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Noise	<p>Mitigation measures</p> <p>PHE expects 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. For interventions where evidence is weak or lacking, PHE expects a proposed strategy for monitoring and evaluating their effectiveness during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>With regards to road traffic noise, PHE welcomes the consideration of low-noise road surfaces and acoustic barriers and expects full details of proposed mitigation to be provided in due course.</p>	Public Health England	N	<p>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) presents an assessment of noise and vibration impacts that considers these issues and is in accordance with approved guidance. Chapter 12 Population and Human Health includes an assessment of the impact of noise on human health. Mitigation measures are proposed to minimise any potential any significant effects.</p>
Noise	<p>Baseline noise conditions</p> <p>PHE notes that baseline noise monitoring was scheduled to take place February to March 2020 (10.4.10). PHE recommends that the Applicant reviews the Institute of Acoustic's recent guidance, "Impact of COVID-19 on the Practicality and Reliability of Baseline Sound Level Surveying and the Provision of Sound & Noise Impact Assessments" in relation to any monitoring that may have been or has yet to be carried out .(Available at the following URL: https://www.ioa.org.uk/sites/default/files/Joint%20Guidance%20On%20the%20Impact%20of%20Covid.IOA%20ANC%20V2.pdf)</p>	Public Health England	N	
Noise	<p>PHE expects the ES to explain how stakeholder responses in relation to noise have influenced the development of the proposal, including any mitigation measures. In addition, the Applicant should propose a suitable strategy to disseminate the findings of the PEIR and ES regarding the effects of noise on health to stakeholders, including communities which may experience a change in their local noise environment as a result of the scheme.</p>	Public Health England	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Noise	The noise assessments include recreational amenity, including noise environment, for outdoor spaces associated with the individual community facilities	Public Health England	N	
People and communities	<p>I have concerns that part of our village will be fully cut off from the rest of the village to pedestrians and cyclists. Pedestrians have a crossing point from the main part of the village to lower Easton, once the roundabout is removed this will no longer be a safe route for pedestrians to cross the A47. It is noted that you have provided an underpass access to Hall Farm NR9 5AS while it has access off a road called The Broadway. It is noted that a further underpass is being provided to another village. Do the residents of Lower Easton not deserve to have the right to remain part of the main village this linkage dates back to 1351.</p> <p>I understand it is a stated aim of Highways England to provide accessible and integrated transport links – so people are free to choose their mode of transport and can move safely across and alongside our roads. If a safe pedestrian crossing point is not provided how will residents use the local bus service, attend the village school, catch the school bus to [REDACTED] and sixth form. This degrades and limited the choice residents have in using other means of transport other than the motor vehicle, at a time when we are facing a global climate emergency, sustainable modes of transport are needed. The Local development plan which has just finished its section 18 consultation phase state that a site in lower Easton was unsuitable as a safe route on foot or cycle was not available over the A47. This again highlights that the current road strategy that is proposed is not fit for purpose in providing safe conductivity within our community.</p>	Peter Milliken	Y	<p>In response to Statutory Consultation feedback, the Scheme now includes provision of a footbridge over Easton roundabout to provide safe access across the A47 for walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>The footbridge would replace the existing crossing of the A47 between Dog Lane and Ringland Lane. The existing crossing does not conform to current design guidelines, nor provide access for all users, and will be closed as part of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>A new walker, cyclist and horse rider route in front (south) of St Peter's Church is no longer proposed.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
People and communities	At present pedestrians have a crossing point from the main part of the village to lower Easton, once the roundabout is removed this will no longer be a safe route for pedestrians to cross the A47.	Easton Parish Council	Y	
People and communities	We have concerns that part of our village will be fully cut off from the rest of the village to pedestrians and cyclists. We note that you have added a new route in front of the church which includes a horse riders route while not engaging with us in relation to this.	Easton Parish Council	Y	
People and communities	The scheme should continue to identify any additional opportunities to contribute to improved infrastructure provision for active travel and physical activity. The developers should explore the acceptability and design of walking, cycling and horse riding routes with local stakeholders and, if feasible, consider providing a range of alternative accessible designs for consideration. It is important to assess the potential of modal shifts to walking, cycling and public transport.	Public Health England	N	Making a Scheme that is safer, accessible, and integrated for cyclists, walkers and horse-riders is a Scheme objective. Section 4.11 of the Case for Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) presents an assessment of the impacts on existing public rights of way and proposed changes, mitigation measures and addition to the local network for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders.
People and communities	Demand for temporary accommodation by the construction work force should be identified and an assessment made regarding the impact on local housing supply and affordability, particularly in relation to homelessness provision of short term housing supply. Given the number of other large developments near the study area the cumulative impact on housing provision should be included. The ES should assess the current and future demand on health and social care services and the subsequent assessment of significance as a result of the DCO. The ES should report on the results of engagement with the local health and social care system and any proposed embedded or additional mitigation. These aspects should be considered at both project level and as part of the cumulative effects assessments	Public Health England	N	Chapter 12 Population and Human Health in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the impacts on local communities and future development during construction and operation of the Scheme. Mitigation measures are proposed to minimise any potential any significant effects.

Topic area	Consultation response	Prescribed consultee (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
People and communities	<p>Hockering Footpath 7</p> <p>A relatively short section of this footpath, approximately 40m, will be 'lost' under the dual carriageway, severing it and its connection to Hockering Footpath 8, as can be seen in Figure 2 in Section 3.56. Footpath 7, also shown in Figure 2, currently provides a link south from Hockering to the well-connected PRoW network to the south (East Tuddenham and beyond) and the current opportunities for short and long circular walks on PRoW and minor roads in this area are good. From a PRoW user's point of view these opportunities will be significantly altered as the proposed diversion is not considered satisfactory. A 40m section of footpath is to be replaced with an almost 2km round trip. Section 11.6.5 of the PEIR states: "in proposing a diversion to a route, the objective has been to limit the additional journey time and length to the alternative facilities" which seems contradictory to what has been proposed.</p>	Norfolk County Council	Y	<p>Section 4.11 of the Case for Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) and Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assess the impacts on public rights of way and proposed mitigation measures. Since statutory consultation, a new A47 underpass has been included called Mattishall Link Road. This has had walker and cycle provision included to help provide a replacement connection between Hockering and the circular footpath network south of the River Tud.</p>
People and communities	<p>Hockering Footpath 12</p> <p>Here there is a very short section of footpath leading south from the A47 to a private road just east of Oak Farm. This will need to be stopped up as no diversion is possible.</p>	Norfolk County Council	Y	<p>This short legacy remnant of Hockering Footpath 12 will be permanently removed as part of the Scheme.</p>
Property prices	<p>This will affect the life and homes of all residents in Rotten Row and Church Lane.</p> <p>The value of all these properties will be greatly reduced and some will become unsaleable.</p>	East Tuddenham Parish Council	Y	<p>Highways England has engaged with the affected landowners and will provide appropriate mitigation or compensation; for example, the junction of Rotten Row and Church Lane will be widened to maintain existing HGV access.</p>

2.2 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):
Compensation	If he needs to sell his property [REDACTED] and/or being unable to live independently there should be some way of compensating him if he is unable to sell his house.	14590	N	HE Land Team is engaging with all affected landowners to discuss compensation for temporary and permanent effects to their land and business.
Compensation	I should like the farm to have some communication with Highways England as to what compensation for compulsory purchase and loss of livelihood will be available.	11702	N	
Compensation	As a result of both the loss of access and loss of buildings, the current livestock enterprise on the smallholding will become unviable and therefore we propose that Highways England should purchase the holding in its entirety to allow our clients to move their livestock enterprise to a comparable holding.	13797	N	
Consultation	There has been a lack of face to face consultation from Highways England.	14398	N	
Consultation	It has been unclear whether HE have taken any notice of any comments made.	15259	N	The Scheme design has changed in response to the Statutory Consultation (e.g. removal of proposed side road connection changes). The Consultation Report accompanying the DCO application outlines how the Scheme design has taken into consideration feedback from the Statutory Consultation.
	It appears that anything said must be repeated in writing for the formal consultation.		N	Requesting responses in writing ensures Highways England correctly captures consultee views, not their written interpretation of consultee views discussed with a representative of Highways England at a public consultation event.

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	It is not clear whether HE have considered any alternatives to their proposals.		N	Alternative options for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement were reviewed and reported in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017), made available on the Highways England website during the statutory consultation.
	There has been no explanation of the relationship between NCC and HE		N	Highways England are responsible for the Strategic Road Network, with Norfolk County Council (NCC) being responsible for the local highway network. Highways England has engaged with NCC in regard to the North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme and has produced a Statement of Common Ground. Highways England has also been engaging with NCC in relation to the Norwich Western Link Scheme and jointly present at the Local Liaison Group meetings
Consultation	Access to information of contacts or understandings between HE and NCC has still not been forthcoming.	11417		The consultation material provided contact details for Highways England and the application documents indicate how Norfolk County Council has been engaged in the development of the Scheme.
Consultation	The consultation process has not been fit for purpose. We own land on the route that is being severely impacted and have been kept in the dark.	14398	N	Highways England held two stages of consultation, engaging with the public and stakeholders, including those with an interest in land, to update them about the proposals and provide an opportunity to give feedback. Highways England's statutory consultation with land interests was delivered in line with the Planning Act 2008, as set out in Chapter 3 of the Consultation Report (TR010038/APP/5.1). This Report also provides details of the project information Highways England made available and how it notified people of the consultations. Highways England has continued direct engagement with this contact since the statutory

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				consultation to discuss his interest in relation to the Scheme.
Consultation	It has not felt the communication has not been totally transparent and there has been little justification on why the chosen scheme has resulted. Despite asking specific questions to Highways England, responses on these specific matters have not been voiced. This has been very frustrating. We are not happy about the lack of responses and justifications from Highways England about the proposed scheme.	15258	N	The justification for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017) which was available on the HE scheme consultation website during the Statutory Consultation.
Consultation	There has been a lack of consultation with both our client and us on this matter. Changes have been made to the proposed scheme since the first drafts where discussed, but these have not been communicated to either our client nor us.	14337 14336 14335	N	Highways England proposed meetings with these consultees in advance of the statutory consultation and have been engaging throughout the development of the Scheme due to the requirement to conduct ground investigation surveys on land parcels owned by the consultee. During the engagement regarding ground investigations, up to date plans were presented and an update was provided. A further meeting was proposed following the Scheme engagement in December 2020

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation	Due to the Covid-19 outbreak and Government guidance regarding social distancing and the subsequent national lockdown, our scheduled site meeting with Highways England could not happen. As a result, we have not had the opportunity to discuss issues on site and would request that no plans are finalised until a meeting of this nature has happened.	14337 14336 14335	N	Due to Covid-19 restrictions Highways England has proposed virtual meetings to discuss concerns.
Consultation	The complete lack of onsite face to face consultation has meant the current proposed plans are impractical.	14336	N	Due to Covid-19 restrictions Highways England has proposed virtual meetings to discuss concerns during statutory consultation and the update engagement in December 2020.
Consultation	It appears that little has been achieved by any discussions with HE before the formal consultation process.	11417	N	Highways England has held a previous round of non-statutory consultation that supported the Preferred Route Decision. There has been ongoing engagement between the Non statutory consultation and the statutory consultation to help inform design development and this will be detailed in the Consultation Report.
Consultation	While this system of public consultation appears positive, it's hard to believe that the concerns raised by the local communities will have any effect on the planned works. I think this 'consultation' is only to pay lip service to our views.	14388	N	The Scheme design has changed in response to the Statutory Consultation (e.g. removal of proposed side road connection changes). The Consultation Report accompanying the DCO application outlines how the Scheme design has taken into consideration feedback from the Statutory Consultation.
Consultation	No communication with locals before potential routes are created!	14384	N	Highways England has conducted a non-statutory consultation on the options considered at Stages 1 and 2, then a statutory consultation. Highways England have also met with all directly affected parish councils, and attended the local Liaison Group, and South of the A47 taskforce meetings throughout the development of the Scheme to engage with locals.
Consultation	It has taken far too long to obtain details of the process and the timetable.	11417	N	A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) was available on

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation	There has not been adequate explanation of the process and its timing.	15259	N	the Highways England project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation. The website and consultation materials produced also provided details about the consultation and the deadline for feedback.
Consultation	There is a view - not helped by statements made by HE at consultations - that HE considers its Brief to be solely the provider of the main road, no more than that, and that it is the job of the County Council to deal with the effects on the side roads. This should absolutely not be the case - the scheme needs to give a holistic solution to the traffic issues and problems of both the main road and of the residents on the side roads.	10574	N	Highways England is responsible for the strategic road network, with the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council, responsible for managing the local road networks. Highways England have been working closely with Norfolk County Council throughout the design development on the local road network, and will continue to engage and support as required.
Consultation materials	What information has been provided has been lacking detail.	14337	N	Highways England provided a number of documents at the statutory consultation offering different levels of information. The consultation brochure provided an overview of the Scheme proposals. Other more technical documents such as the Preliminary Environmental Impact Assessment set out the Scheme's effects in more detail. Highways England's application for a Development Consent Order now includes further comprehensive information about the Scheme.
Consultation materials	Detailed maps of junctions were only provided shortly before the consultation process started.	11417	N	Highways England published all the consultation materials at the beginning of the consultation period, allowing enough time to consider the Scheme proposals and provide feedback.
Consultation materials	I did notice that in your photographs of how this section would look you did not give a true representation. It looked as though north of the east bound lane was all arable/meadowland. Somehow the houses and cottages badly affected were air brushed out.	11702	N	The rendered visualisations provided at Statutory consultation were provided as indicative views only. The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains the Landscape Visuals where the effects on areas are demonstrated.

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation materials	First of all I would like to state how shocked I am that an 81 year old man has been sent information on a memory stick. My father does not use a computer (as is the case for many his age). If he did use a computer the amount of information on the disk is overwhelming. Secondly is states in your letter that a paper copy of the consultation material can be supplied for a charge of £250. My father lives alone and is a pensioner. He would not have had access to the information if he didn't have my help.	14590	N	Highways England provided contact details in its letters for people to use should they have any questions about the consultation or materials. In the consultation brochure and the consultation response form, Highways England invited people to contact it should they need help accessing materials. Highways England has continued direct engagement with this consultee and family since the statutory consultation, to discuss the land interest and the effects of the Scheme.
Cost	We are aware that significant funding has previously been allocated to this project but in light of the Covid-19 outbreak and as a result the increasing cost of building materials and contractors we question whether this funding will be sufficient. Given the way resources are being reallocated by both central and local government to fight Covid-19, will additional funding be available if required? The cost of the Norwich Northern Distributer Road ended up significantly higher than was budgeted for. We would like to know what Highways England's contingency plans are for this scenario.	14336 14337	N	Highways England has been allocated committed funding for the Scheme in the RIS1 and RIS2 budgets. The costs of the Scheme and funding allocation are discussed in the Funding Statement within the DCO application (TR010038/APP/4.2).
Cost	The cost of the Norwich Northern Distributer Road ended up significantly higher than was budgeted for. We would like to know what Highways England's contingency plans are for this scenario.	14336	N	
Design – access	We are concerned there are so many side junctions and connecting roads which take up so much land.	15258	Y	The need for, location/extent and design of the junctions and side roads was presented at consultation in the 'A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Junction & Sideroad Strategy Report' (February 2020). Statutory consultation feedback has led to a review of the connecting side roads, with an associated reduction in the final design seeking consent.

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design - access	All of the existing A47 should be kept open to local traffic as well as to walking, cycling and horse riding.	15259	N	In line with the commitments given in the Preferred Route Announcement (PRA), the existing A47 will be de-trunked and utilised for local road connections where possible. Where feasible, walking & cycling routes have been provided adjacent by reducing the width of the existing road to facilitate the creation of new walking & cycling routes.
Design – access	Where the proposed A47 dual carriageway is going will mean I am cut off from my surgery. I will have a road either side of my property. It will be difficult for me to get to Dereham and Mattishall. I will no longer be on a direct bus route.	14590	Y	The Scheme contains a new side road providing a link road from the existing A47, travelling below the proposed new A47 to Mattishall Lane. This link road provides a link to existing facilities in Mattishall.
Design – access	The lack of access to the church is appalling. No easy safe access to the church. Original public footpaths will be inaccessible.	14384	Y	<p>The Scheme has been revised to provide improved access and provide further landscape mitigation around the church location.</p> <p>A safe segregated walking & cycling route has been provided, maintaining a connection along the existing route, via an underpass below the proposed A47.</p> <p>A new concrete pad will also be provided for the farmer, and it will be up to the church to arrange access under agreement as per the current situation.</p>
Design – access	In addition to their own land, our clients are tenants on land directly to the south of Hockering and land off Church Lane. Both parcels of land will be bisected by the proposed route leaving the land inaccessible during and after construction.	14335		Highways England is engaging with the landowner on this matter.

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – access	The old road on your plans terminates at the church. Perhaps someone on the committee could inform the farm how they are to access this arable land. What is left of it (The field the western side of St. Andrew's Church).	11702	Y	<p>The Scheme has been revised to provide improved access at this location. There will be a secured gate provided after East Lodge, which will be accessible by the landowner and church to gain access.</p> <p>An access track will provide agricultural access to the field, adjacent to the proposed walking & cycling route.</p>
Design – access	There will however also be an impact before the road is completed. It is unclear how access from the current A47 will be achieved during construction. This is a concern that has already led to regular guests questioning if they will book holidays at Riverside Farm in the coming years for fear of being caught by the construction works.	14319	N	The construction of the Scheme will be phased to maintain vehicle access along the A47 and to all local properties during the construction period. When access to Riverside Farm via Church Lane from the north is stopped up, access from the south via Mattishall Road will be maintained.
Design – access	- The proposed route for the scheme will cut the access to the current A47, along Mill Lane, leaving the land land-locked.	14336	N	The design presented at consultation showed properties along Mill Lane located south of the new A47. These will be provided with a new access track to Mattishall Lane to avoid landlocking.
Design – access	- There is a proposed new access route to Mattishall Lane, but at this stage it is unclear whether it will be suitable for lorries and whether, due to the timings of construction there will be any disruption to the business.		N	The proposed Mattishall Lane Link Road and new access track to the property at the southern end of Mill Lane would be able to facilitate the safe movements of articulated heavy goods vehicles.
Design – access	- We do not know who will own this access?		<p>Long-term ownership / access rights and security arrangements to the new access track would be agreed as part of on-going land negotiations as Highways England will also need access to the proposed attenuation pond.</p>	
Design – access	- We do not know who will have right of access?			
Design – access	- We do not know what the security arrangements will be?			
Design – access	- We do not know what the construction type will be?			
Design – access	- We do not know what the construction type will be?			

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – access	- Aside from the additional access it is unclear if Mattishall Lane itself and the surrounding lanes are suitable for 36 tonnes articulated lorries.			
Design – access	- The location of the proposed balancing pond will restrict access to retained land to the south of due to the ground conditions.			
Design – access	The new road's proposed route would also sever the existing access from the current A47 along Gypsy Lane.	13797	Y	Land at the southern end of Gypsy Lane will be connected to Church Lane in the east, via a new access to Jack's Lane.
Design – access	-damage to the ProW through the estate, which is best mitigated by aligning the road as far south as possible.	13995		The Scheme has sought to minimise any diversion where possible.
	-adverse impact from noise, affecting houses and the quiet enjoyment of the estate		N	A noise impact assessment and associated mitigation measures are reported in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) .
Design – access	In addition to their own land, our clients are tenants on land directly to the south of Hockering and land off Church Lane. Both parcels of land will be bisected by the proposed route leaving the land inaccessible during and after construction. On the current proposed plan some land will end up land locked. Some of the remaining parcels may also be of a size and shape that mean it is uneconomical to farm them.	14335	N	As part of negotiations with affected landowners, Highways England will explore provision of alternative access or permanent acquisition amongst the options to manage parcels of land that may become landlocked or uneconomical to farm.
Design – access	It should be ensured that the junction and side roads provide adequate ability to access the surrounding agricultural land for agricultural vehicles and machinery whether through direct connections, or an ability to connect into the new network.	13838		Local authority sideroads have been designed, and reviewed by Norfolk County Council (NCC) who will be the adopting local highway authority for handover of sideroads.

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – access	We would wish to ensure that suitable vehicular access is retained for agricultural equipment throughout to ensure land can be suitably accessed and maintained.	13841		<p>All Local Highway Authority sideroads have been designed to Class B (6m wide) or Class C (5.5m wide) in agreement with NCC.</p> <p>All existing farm accesses have been retained where possible, and new accesses where required have been proposed to the owning landowner.</p>
Design – access	As the proposed plans are currently drawn the access from the farm buildings to the north which joins the A47 and the access from the Hall and Hall Cottages to the east which joins Berry's Lane are being severed by new or altered roads. At this stage it is unclear how these access routes will once again join the highway.	14337		<p>The Scheme will see the closure of all direct accesses to the proposed dual carriageway with access points provided to the dual carriageway at the proposed Wood Lane and Norwich Road Junctions.</p> <p>Berrys Lane will be closed to through traffic with access to the dual carriageway being via Mattishall Road to the Honingham Roundabout where users can either travel west to Wood lane Junction or East to the Norwich Road junction.</p>
Design – access	We are concerned about the number of roads left closed and the opportunity for those to be occupied by third parties.	15258	Y	<p>The design has been adapted since Statutory Consultation leading to significant reductions in the number and length of closed road sections, such as the existing A47 north of Honingham.</p> <p>Where roads are being closed to through traffic, we will be implementing measures to mitigate against this issue. Where roads are being closed, these will be returned to landscape and form part of the Scheme landscaping works.</p>
Design – access	The double roundabout here is going to be disastrous for the local lanes and habitats.	14384	N	The Scheme alignment has been undertaken in keeping with the existing landscape environment

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – alternative	The Western Link Road junction should go over, not under, the dualled A47. Likewise, a new single-track overbridge to provide access to Hall Farm could also be used by walkers. These changes combined with low-noise road surfacing and suitably positioned earth berms would significantly mitigate noise issues. Likewise, a new single-track overbridge to provide access to Hall Farm could also be used by walkers.	14373		<p>with the A47 marginally below / above existing ground. The junction locations have been set at the low level to minimise landscape impact, and visual intrusion to the parishes of Hockering, Honingham and Easton. The junctions will be lit, and having the junctions below the dual carriageway further mitigates the impact of light intrusion to surrounding parishes and landscape.</p> <p>The Scheme maintains access to Hall Farm via a new access road travelling from the existing de-trunked A47, under the new dual carriageway. This underpass also provides continuity of the restricted byway providing WCH connectivity.</p>
Design - alternative	<p>1 - tweak the alignment of the south-east arm of the south roundabout (i.e. the one that connects to Easton), so that it is closer to the red line shown in the consultation plan. This is to achieve a potential new access to the FEP directly from the A47, via the south roundabout and a new access point;</p> <p>2 - tweak the alignment of the south-west arm of the south roundabout (i.e. the one that connects to Honingham) so that it bends south to form a new access road to the potential new residential settlement. The slightly realigned link to Honingham would form a priority junction to this arm south of the roundabout.</p>	13838	N	<p>Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer.</p> <p>The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design - alternative	<p>A solution would be to move the Norwich Road junction further east and closer to the Easton roundabout which it replaces. This would be more convenient for Easton, it would release pressure on Honingham and still give access to the Food Enterprise Zone.</p> <p>Can HE give any compelling reasons for rejecting this solution?</p> <p>This solution provides much closer access for the two side roads, Church Lane and Norwich Road which it needs to accommodate. It also saves some 2 miles of new side roads connecting Easton and Honingham.</p> <p>Why would HE reject a junction closer to the original roundabout?</p>	11417	N	<p>In line with Scheme objectives, in order to provide a more free-flowing network, the existing Easton roundabout is to be removed.</p> <p>It is not possible to locate the required form of junction, a fully grade separated junction, at the intersection of Church Lane / Dereham Road in the proposed scheme. The junction was positioned taking into account constraints, such as the Grade 1 listed St Peters Church, the Orsted pipeline route, Food Enterprise Zone development, Easton village and topography.</p>
Design - alternative	<p>The whole junction would be far better moved nearer to Easton.</p>	14403 15259		<p>The Junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation outlines the junction design in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) and based on the traffic modelling for the opening year (2025) and design year (2040).</p> <p>Traffic modelling demonstrates that the provision of a larger roundabout (an at-grade solution) is not permissible within the current design standards, due to the A47 traffic flows, which have required the provision of a two level (grade separated) junction in accordance with the UK DMRB.</p>
Design – alternative	<p>A47 noise levels are already high across much of Honingham. The dualling proposals will generate exponentially more noise particularly tyre noise from more and faster vehicles, whilst raising the dualled A47 on embankments north of Honingham in the current proposals is rather like putting the A47 on a stage so we can hear it better! I recommend that the dualled A47 be kept at lower vertical alignment west of the River Tud and placed in a cutting as it continues past Honingham,</p>	14373	N	<p>A noise impact assessment has been undertaken and informed the design through associated mitigation measures, where applicable; these are reported in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1).</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	keeping to the north of the existing A47 until it goes under the new bridge in 1.ii.			
Design – alternative	The existing A47 and other local roads do not need junctions with the dualled A47 at Wood Lane or Norwich Road. Local traffic going to or coming from the West should join/exit the dualled A47 at the existing North Tuddenham A47 junction. Local traffic going to or coming from the East should have slip roads onto the dualled A47 near Easton.	14373	N	The justification for the route alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017) which was available on the Highways England project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation and is also available on the Highways England Project website.
Design – alternative	Our client is proposing that the scheme, and junction in particular, be moved approximately 100m to the north on to open farmland, which does not have the same environmental and historical attributes. Therefore this would allow the tree shelter belts to be retained and the impact on this historic Estate be minimised.	14337	N	The preferred route was announced in August 2017 indicating locations for the proposed junctions, and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).
Design – alternative	Many Honingham villagers view the complexity of the current proposals with horror. Instead, the only junction on the proposed dualled A47 North Tuddenham to Easton should be with the proposed Western Link Road, at a location north & east of the currently proposed junction.	14373	N	The Junction & Sideroad Strategy presented at Statutory consultation explains how the scheme has been developed, in alignment with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (UK DMRB).
Design – alternative	The only junction on the proposed dualled A47 North Tuddenham to Easton should be with the proposed Western Link Road, at a location north & east of the currently proposed junction.	14373	N	The proposed junctions are designed based on the traffic modelling for the scheme opening year (2025) and design year (2040).
Design – alternative	Building 8 lanes of adjacent new highway to practically replicate the same existing links to the A47 is odd in the extreme.	10574	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – alternative	The existing A47 needs dualling – there is no need to take a completely new/separate route through arable land.	12143	N	
Design – alternative	From the Estate's viewpoint, the unnecessary land take for a dual carriageway could have been avoided by routing any improvement in-line. Although we hope the current route could be mitigated, any realignment northwards would have a greater detrimental impact on the farm and estate and should be avoided.	13843	N	
Design – alternative	If the north-south section were to be moved to the west slightly, it could follow the route of the existing road, therefore reducing the need to take further productive arable land out of production.	14335	N	
Design – alternative	If there have to be two junctions then the Norwich Road/Easton one should be closer to Easton than currently planned otherwise there is virtually no space between the entering lane from Wood Lane Roundabout to exiting lane for Norwich Road Roundabout.	13831	N	<p>The Norwich Road Junction was sited after consideration of the Scheme constraints and engagement with stakeholders.</p> <p>Through further engagement with Historic England, and stakeholder feedback, the junction was located 145m east to further mitigate the landscape visual impact on St Andrews Church.</p>
	To move the Blind Lane roundabout further east and closer to Easton.		N	<p>St Peters Church is a Grade I listed building, and careful consideration was given to maintaining a sideroad link for Easton whilst providing a junction to safely access the A47.</p> <p>The location was selected after assessing the junction connection points and the locations of the proposed slip roads.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – alternative	The single-carriageway A47 should be left as a de-trunked local distributor road with: i) a connection to local roads at North Tuddenham/Hockering as shown on the current proposals, ii) a new bridge (suggest perpendicular or near perpendicular alignment) over the dualled A47 near Sandy Lane, with the dualled A47 then running to the north of the existing A47, iii) a new bridge taking Wood Lane over the dualled A47, iv) a new section south of the dualled A47 near Norwich Road/St Andrews church with a new overbridge taking Norwich Road over the dualled A47 and a slip road on the north side for local east-bound traffic joining the dualled A47 and connection to local roads north of Easton	14373	N	The justification for the route alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017) which was available on the HE project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation.
Design – Berry's Lane	We have land around these parishes and a lengthy alternative route is an unattractive and costly option for our business.	11185	N	The justification for the route alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017) which was available on the Highways England project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation.
Design – Berry's Lane	The additional 'land take' required to establish the link road will require further encroachment down Church Lane over and above that needed for the new dual carriageway itself, thereby causing an even greater environmental and amenity impact on the residents of Church Lane and Rotten Row.	14384	Y	In response to Statutory Consultation feedback, the proposed side road connection between Wood Lane Junction and Church Lane was removed.
Design – Berry's Lane	Berry's Lane cannot handle the traffic that will be using these junctions. It will increase rat running through country lanes and important habitats in order for the south of the county to be accessed.	15289	Y	In response to various Statutory Consultation feedback and subsequent direct engagement with the Local Liaison Group (Norfolk County Council and Parish Councils), Residents and landowners around Berrys Lane, access to Berrys Lane will be closed to through traffic and will be for local access only. This removes the risk of rat running via Berrys Lane while maintaining access for
Design – Berry's Lane	Berry's lane should not be closed. A connection here is an asset to the local residents and it provides efficient access to agricultural land farmed by Honingham Thorpe farms.	14399	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – Berry's Lane	Please do not close Berry's Lane Honingham as we need it for farming.	11578		residents and landowners along Berrys Lane. The existing PRoW will be upgraded linking Berrys Lane with Dereham Road to improve walking & cycling connectivity.
Design – Berry's Lane	To close Berry's lane will disadvantage the farm's activity, slow and therefore add cost to farming activities.	14399		
Design - Barnham	Rat running deterrents should be put in place in Barnham broom.	14399	N	This is not required with the closure of Berrys Lane to through traffic. Further mitigation measures would need to be pursued with the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council.
Design – Blind Lane	The level and type of vehicular traffic that will be seeking access and egress from the FEP will require a road connection that is substantially better than the current configuration of Blind Lane. In addition, there are existing employment at Honingham Thorpe Farm Business park (300 staff) as well as the farming activities that would need to be accommodated at this junction.	14327	N	Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer. The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to
Design – Blind Lane	Why has HE ignored Broadland District Council commitment to closing Blind Lane? Why is a major junction required with Blind Lane which is anyway single track?	15259	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – Blind Lane	<p>At present with the proposed Blind lane junction where it is, it is perfectly placed to serve both the Food Enterprise Park and the Honingham Thorpe Farm and Business Park. We ask it is not moved at all from its current position. Any move to the East will further the already significant costs of connecting to it for our sites and reduce our ability to create jobs in the area. Honingham Thorpe Business park has circa 300 employees on site already with aspirations to grow greatly between now and 2040. We also operate a contract farming business serving numerous surrounding villages, some across the A47 and also land served by using the A47. Both require suitable safe access on roads fit for purpose. To remove current HGV and Agricultural traffic from minor local roads will hugely benefit local residents and improve the safety of our roads, cyclists, riders and walkers. Food Enterprise Park Ltd is currently marketing further plots of fully consented and serviced land on the FEP and to reposition the access renders this near on impossible as further access and spine roads need constructing in the coming months. We have already installed roads, foul, surface water drainage and water mains in accordance with the existing drawing to enable the operation of the new Colman's Mustard facility. Further master planning and progress is to be carried out in the coming months and to relocate the junction has a huge negative impact on this and the sale of plots and job creation at the FEP a key priority of the local enterprise partnership.</p>	11184	Y	<p>through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.</p> <p>The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.</p> <p>Highways England has reviewed the responses in regard to the location of the junctions to derive what it believes to be the most suitable location given the constraints in the area.</p> <p>In response to statutory consultation feedback, the proposed Norwich Road junction has moved further East to reduce the impact on St Andrew's Church Honingham.</p>
Design – Blind Lane	<p>The location of the blind lane junction should not be moved further east or anywhere. If moved it will increase the visual impact upon surrounding properties particularly at Taverham Road and have a greater impact upon the soon to be expanded village of Easton.</p>	11187	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – Blind Lane	the link to Bind Lane, currently taken from the south-east arm, could instead be taken from the realigned south-west arm via a new roundabout or a priority junction.	13838	Y	
Design – Blind Lane	If it is necessary to retain Blind Lane, it is likely to be better without direct access to the roundabout.	13843	Y	
Design – Blind Lane	Suggestion to move the Blind Lane roundabout further east and closer to Easton.	11417	Y	
Design – Blind Lane	A condition for the planning permission of the FEP was that Blind Lane be closed. This should absolutely not be flouted.	14403	Y	
Design – Church Lane	It is also unclear what the access provisions will be regarding Church Lane and whether the Church Lane underpass will still be open to vehicular traffic.	14335	N	Following statutory consultation feedback, the side road connection, turning area and underpass at the northern end of Church Lane has been removed with access now only via Mattishall Road to the south.
Design – Church Lane	I feel that the proposed turning area in Church Lane if kept should be repositioned on the field opposite as this field will become a dead area due to the link road	14357	N	
Design – Church Lane	It is essential both ends of Church Lane remain open. Articulated/agricultural vehicular access on Rotten Row will be removed without new sup rd; grain store on my farm will become redundant if A47 end is closed.	14579	Y	With access only available from Mattishall Lane to the south, the junction between Church Lane and Rotten Row is to be widened to cater for articulated vehicle access from the south.
Design – Church Lane	Reassured by your thoughts about installing a gated access to St Andrews' Church access road. There is a fair bit of local concern that you should not create potential enclaves for travellers, late night revellers (we do get them on the lane), fly-tipping etc.	14613	N	A secure gate is proposed which will provide secure access to the church and farmland at the juncture with the residential access.

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – Church Lane	We are concerned that in discussions with representatives from Highways England it was suggested that the proposed south-western side road, connecting the new Wood Lane junction to Church Lane, would not be required. However, we wish to stress the importance of retaining this in order to provide access for our client to their land. Should this proposed road be removed it would render our client's land useless and remove a not insignificant portion of profitable agricultural land from his holding, impacting the viability of his business. We would OBJECT to the proposals under those circumstances.	13841	N	The change followed analysis of Statutory Consultation feedback and further engagement with the Local Liaison Group, which included Norfolk County Council and parish councils.
Design – Church Lane	But if they are going to put pedestrian underpass at the top of church lane which I think is a waste of time, why not make it wide enough for a single vehicle access along the lines of the one between Bowthorpe and Easton under the A47, I use this route a lot and it works well. I would doubt it would become a rat-run, as it only goes under and does not join the A47 as would a slip road. If this is a disregarded then so should the provision of the pedestrian underpass. So a definite no to a slip road joining to church lane.	15289	Y	Following statutory consultation feedback, the side road connection, turning area and underpass at the northern end of Church Lane has been removed with access now only via Mattishall Road to the south.
Design – Church Lane	Church Lane is a single-track road and unnecessary rat running or increased traffic among it should be avoided, particularly for the safety and quality of life of the residents.	15304 15285 15294 15306 15284 15282 15289	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – Church Lane	If the property at grid reference [Editor's note: personal details removed] is glen acres via the Berry's Lane roundabout there is no need for this slip/connecting road, as all residents in Church Lane and Rotten Row will still have the necessary access. To be clear, I do not want a slip/connecting road running parallel with the A47 between Church Lane and Berry's Lane, as I can access my property/business by turning onto Church Lane from Mattishall Road, and I can access the A47 toward Dereham or Norwich via the proposed roundabout at Berry's Lane.	15294 15304 15285 15306 15284 15282 15289	Y	
Design – complexity	Why is a completely new junction of this size and complexity required?	15259	N	<p>The justification and design for the route alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017) which was available on the Highways England project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>The preferred route was announced in August 2017 indicating locations for the proposed junctions, and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p> <p>In line with scheme objectives, to provide a more free-flowing network, the existing Easton roundabout is to be removed. The proposed new junctions have been designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges</p>
Design – complexity	The road between Easton and Blind Lane, together with the multiple roundabouts, has the making of a Norfolk Spaghetti Junction. That example is already being experienced at Postwick – a gigantic and bewildering layout which seems to take one in a direction one instinctively knows is not the direction one wants to be heading! Surely this type of expansive junction is not suitable for a rural setting such as this.	14613	N	
Design – Easton	Why get rid of the Easton roundabout rather than utilise it?	14384	N	
Design – Easton	We strongly urge you to reconsider the proposed removal of the Easton roundabout and its relocation as two roundabouts for a 'level grade' access at Blind Lane. It seems a very peculiar design decision to move the present roundabout location (where it is accepted as part of Easton) to a mile west (where it will spoil an area in open countryside and be close to other existing houses). To then build 8 lanes of adjacent new highway to practically recreate the same existing links to the A47 seems odd in the extreme.	14613	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – Easton	Why has HE ignored its 2017 commitment to a junction north of Easton church? What discussions have taken place since 2017 concerning location of this junction?	15259	N	(DMRB), to cater for the traffic in the opening year (2025) and design year (2040).
Design - Easton	You don't answer our first question about exactly why Easton roundabout has been removed and then relocated and – whatever you say about the free flow of traffic – the net result still has the appearance of a spaghetti junction.	14613	N	The Junction & Sideroad Strategy report presented during statutory consultation, outlines the junction design hierarchy in accordance with the UK DMRB.
Design – Norwich Road	The A47 preferred route announcement by HE in 2019 emphasised that it would 'route to the north of the existing junction at Easton to maximise the chance of the local road reconnection being alongside and to the north of the church at Easton. The local road reconnection now appears to be a mile or so away at the Norwich Road junction. What has made HE change its mind on this?	11417	N	The location of the junction at Easton was determined based on the requirement for a fully grade separated junction, whilst taking into account the existing constraints such as the Grade 1 listed St Peter's Church, existing accesses and sideroads, Orsted cable route, Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) planning permission and local topography.
Design – Honingham	It is too close to Honingham and much too complex a junction.	15259	Y	The preferred route was announced in August 2017 indicating locations for the proposed junctions, and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) .
Design – Honingham	1) What agreement has been reached with NCC for the need for this junction location? 2) Why are two new junctions needed both so close to Honingham?	15259	N	
Design – Honingham	Honingham will be squeezed between two new junctions, Wood Lane and Norwich Road, less than a mile apart. Why has HE decided both junctions are necessary?	11417	Y	The Junction & Sideroad Strategy presented at Statutory consultation explains how the scheme has been developed, in alignment with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (UK DMRB). The proposed junctions are designed based on the traffic modelling for the scheme opening year (2025) and design year (2040).
Design – Honingham	Why has HE ignored the Honingham Parish Council objections to this junction?	15259	N	Highways England has reviewed the responses in regard to the location of the junctions to derive what it believes to be the most suitable location given some of the constraints in the area.
Design – Honingham	The western link of the NDR joining the dualling is just another nail in honinghams coffin. A lovely, quiet community being swamped in all directions by unnecessary development.	14384	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>Subsequent to statutory consultation the junction has moved further East to reduce the impact on St Andrews Church Honingham.</p> <p>The NCC proposed Norwich Western Link scheme plans to connect into the proposed A47 scheme at the Wood Lane junction; however, the A47 is a standalone scheme, with committed funding in place and being progressed via a separate planning route.</p>
Design – land take	Regarding land we own we question amount of land taken for Lyng Road junction Why do you need to come into field? What is wrong with road already there. Nothing being done about width or state of Fox Road to Mattishall.	11166	N	The proposed scheme includes a new side road connecting the existing A47 single carriageway into Hockering with the inclusion of a new T-junction at Lyng Road. The junction is designed in accordance with current design standards, with the road cross section agreed with Norfolk County Council.
Design – land take	We are not happy about the extent of works which are proposed at Brook House Farm, as this will destroy the farm land to the south of the A47.	15258	N	The Scheme has minimised land take in this area where possible, and we will continue liaising with this landowner.
Design – land take	What limits has HE considered to the area of agricultural land being expropriated?	15259	N	The design has sought to minimise agricultural land loss and the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the impacts of the Scheme on agricultural land.
Design – land take	In none of its documentation has HE calculated or does it recognise the extent of agricultural land it will use for these two major junction complexes. Is HE oblivious to the size of this loss of land in traditional rural Norfolk?	11417	N	
Design – land take	From the Estate's viewpoint, the unnecessary land take for a dual carriageway could have been avoided by routing any improvement in-line. The impact of the proposed route through land take, injurious affection and severance will be significant and must not be made worse by alignment of the route further north	13995	N	The justification and design for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017) which was available on the Highways England

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	which would only exacerbate the damage and make the situation more difficult to mitigate.			project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation.
Design – land take	<p>The key adverse effects of a more northerly route would include amongst others: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -significant land take and severance of the Easton estate -disturbance to the main centre of farming operations and severance of the buildings and houses from land they are occupied with -a substantial reduction in the area of workable agricultural land -loss of and damage to sites of ecological importance including areas of Ancient Woodland and candidate County Wildlife Sites -severance of and damage to the Honingham Landscape Park -severance of and damage to a fine, mature lime avenue within the park -adverse impact on the local landscape character, particularly the Tud valley -the loss of landscape features and a reduction in the tranquillity of the landscape -adverse impact on views from local rights of way, roads and properties 	13995	N	
Design – Norwich Road	<p>Fundamentally disagree with location of the Norwich Road Junction:</p> <p>1) The junction is on Blind Lane which is a single track road. The closure of Blind Lane was mandated by Broadland District Council in 2017 as a condition of the Local Development Order approval for development of the Food Enterprise Zone.</p>	11417	Y	<p>Highways England has reviewed the responses in regard to the location of the junctions to derive what it believes to be the most suitable location given some of the constraints in the area.</p> <p>Subsequent to statutory consultation the proposed</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	Why has HE ignored the Broadland District Council ruling?			Norwich Road junction has moved further East to reduce the impact on St Andrews Church at Honingham, and will also see the closure of Blind Lane to through traffic.
Design – Norwich Road	We reaffirm our support of the grade separated junction in this position as part of the A47 highway improvements and these additional comments merely seek to finesse how it could link to existing and proposed development to the south. The additional information relates to the attached plan indicating our ideal solution for providing access to the existing designated Food Enterprise Park and the proposed sustainable settlement, Honingham Thorpe, to the south of the proposed Norwich Road junction. We would emphasise that this plan indicates the basic principles of how we consider the junction will need to operate in the future.	14327	N	Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer. The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.
Design – setting	This junction and the Wood lane Junction will completely change the rural / agricultural setting of this part of Norfolk. Is this necessary?	15259	N	The justification and design for the route alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017) which was available on the Highways England project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation.
Design – Taverham Road	In 2019 the Norwich Western Link / Norfolk County Council rejected route D down Taverham Road to a Norwich Road junction as the final link to the A47. They opted for a link at Wood Lane / Berry Lane. Why has HE re-established the Norwich Road junction?	11417	N	
Design – Taverham Road	Why is a major junction required with Taverham Road which is single track?	15259 14403	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p> <p>The Junction & Sideroad Strategy presented at Statutory consultation explains how the scheme has been developed, in alignment with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (UK DMRB). The proposed junctions are designed based on the traffic modelling for the scheme opening year (2025) and design year (2040).</p>
Design – Taverham Road	<p>The Norwich Road junction connects with Taverham Road which is also a single track road. The junction will clearly encourage the growing use of Taverham Road as a rat run to the A47.</p> <p>Why is HE encouraging the further development of this rat run?</p>	11417 15259 14613	Y	<p>Statutory Consultation concerns about north-south traffic flows were fed back and discussed during the Local Liaison Group and the South of the A47 Taskforce forums. Both forums included representation from directly affected Parish Councils and those within the locale of the Scheme. This led to proposed changes to the local side road network and connections to roads south of the A47 along with the introduction of traffic management controls, where appropriate, to reduce the risk of this problem occurring.</p> <p>Highways England will continue to work with Norfolk County Council and stakeholder groups, to support where possible, mitigation measures on the local road network.</p>
Design – Taverham Road	I would suggest Blind lane /Taverham Road not be directly on the roundabouts but rather are t- junctions off the side roads.	13831	Y	
Design – Taverham Road	We remain concerned here – as do many – that the issue of curbing rat-running on the adjacent local roads hasn't yet been clearly addressed and any strategy outlined. I do understand that this is to a large measure in Norfolk County Council's area, but I know you are talking with them and would hope you will both conclude and explain a very clear strategy soon. Our particular worry, as you will appreciate, is our local lane – Taverham Road – and its connection north through to Ringland and onwards.	14613	Y	
Design – Taverham	Rat-running traffic and heavy vehicle use must be discouraged and preferably prevented. This might be achieved, for example, by closing or controlling some of the road links to and from Taverham / Ringland village.	10574	Y	
Design – traffic	Measures should be installed in villages to the south to deter rat running.	11184	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – traffic	The country lanes will turn into rat-runs if too many are linked to the new road.	14388	Y	
Design – Western Link	We would welcome confirmation that Highways England will not make the proposed works more intrusive than already proposed to enable the A47 Easton to North Tuddenham improvement based on what may happen with Norfolk County Council's road strategy.	13995	N	The final Scheme design has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council to align with the road strategy.
Design – Wood Lane	To move the Wood Lane junction north would cause greater impact, sever more of the better land and larger field patterns leaving the area south of the new road inefficient as well as increasing visibility of the road.	13995	N	The design has sought to minimise its extent as allowed by Department of Transport road design guidelines.
Design – Wood Lane	We accept the need to link Wood Lane to the existing roundabout, but if NWL does not happen, Wood Lane would be better connecting directly into the roundabout and Sandy lane connecting to that.	13843	N	The separation of Wood Lane from the junction is in response to public feedback to mitigate north-south traffic movements.
Design – Wood Lane	What are the constraints to moving Wood lane Junction some metres to the north and west to release pressure and environmental issues arising from it being so close to Honingham?	11417	N	The junction is minimised as much as possible but has to meet Department of Transport road design standards, such as the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB).
Design – Wood Lane	In order to support further future growth to the west of Norwich it would be prudent to provide an option to access the proposed new settlement from Wood Lane.	13838	N	The Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) outlines compliance with planning policy and development growth objectives. Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) presents the assessment of cumulative effects.
Design – Wood Lane	Wood lane should not be closed, rat running should be discouraged by measures implemented between Wymondham and the Berry lane junction. A connection here is an asset to the local residents.	11187	N	In response to various Statutory Consultation feedback and subsequent direct engagement with residents and landowners around Berrys Lane, access to Berrys Lane was amended to remove the risk of rat running via the Lane while maintaining acceptable access for residents and landowners currently using Berrys Lane.

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Landscape	-severance of and damage to the Honingham Landscape Park -severance of and damage to a mature lime avenue within the park.	13843	Y	Land take was minimised as much as possible, such as removing National Grid pipeline works from the parkland and creation of an open surface water drain to the River Tud outfall.
Environment	- There is a population of bats in the icehouse.	14337	N	Noted. Impacts on bats have been assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) .
	- There are a number of ancient hedges on the Estate including those which are proposed to be removed on Berry's Lane.		N	Noted. Any hedgerow removal has been assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) . Replacement landscape planting as part of the Scheme is presented in the Landscape Masterplan.
	- The woodland on the Estate is highly rated and used regularly for visits by the Royal Forestry Society, Woodland Heritage and the Association of Professional Foresters. - At a time when the government is committing the country to planting billions of trees to ensure we are carbon neutral by 2050 it seems counterproductive to remove a belt of trees shielding a road."		N	Where possible, woodland areas will be retained as part of the Scheme. Where this is not possible, this has been assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and compensatory planting is proposed.
Environment	The results of comparative Qualitative Option Assessments show the original "option 13" of the initial assessment which passes on a route partially like the former northern options 1 and 4, as "red" for environment passing through habitats that have been identified as being of biodiversity importance. Our on-site investigations have brought to attention other sites along the northern alternatives that have been classified as County Wildlife Sites, which need to be considered. To relocate the Wood Lane roundabout increases the likely impact on the County Wildlife site and Ancient woodland bordering Wood Lane and increases further, the risk to these from a future Norwich Western Link. Having assessed more northerly alignments, northern	13995	N	Country Wildlife Sites have been considered and any impact risk to them assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) . Where possible, woodland areas will be retained as part of the Scheme. Where this is not possible, compensatory planting has been proposed.

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>routes should be categorised as red in environmental terms as demonstrated in the attached biodiversity review.</p>			
Environment	<p>There are many more environmental issues other than those outlines in the mitigation. Regular turtle doves and the red kite winter roost for example! You've only got to look at the lack of environmental surveys undertaken for the Western link of the ndr!</p>	14384	N	<p>Statutory environmental bodies (Natural England, Environment Agency) and local authorities (including Norfolk County Council) were consulted on the scope of the environmental assessment, including the receptors to consider.</p>
Environment	<p>The new junction would also take between 10-15 acres of land (8-12% of the Estate), significantly impacting its integrity and threatening the reasons for its status as a heritage asset.</p>	14337	N	<p>The junction is minimised as much as possible but has to meet Department of Transport road design standards, such as the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB).</p> <p>Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) presents the assessment of impacts on heritage assets.</p>
Landscape	<p>Adverse impact on the local landscape character, particularly the Tud valley. The loss of landscape features and a reduction in the tranquillity of the landscape</p>	13843	N	<p>A landscape and visual impact assessment and associated mitigation measures is reported in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1).</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Environment	Add tree belt to redundant land 5 on map as acoustic and light shield to properties.	11451	N	Landscape planting and noise barriers proposed as part of the Scheme to manage effects identified in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) , such as noise and visual impacts on residential properties, are presented in the Landscape Masterplan.
Environment	The PEIR provides an extensive list of new studies that will be undertaken. It does not appear to make any commitment, other than the studies themselves:	11417	N	The purpose of the PEIR is to outline Highways England's understanding of the affected environment and likely environmental effects / mitigation measures. No commitments were made as those can only be made in the final Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) once the full impact assessment of the final Scheme has been developed post Statutory Consultation.
	To protect the landscape and the agricultural setting of this part of Norfolk and no effort is suggested to minimise the areas of land taken for the road and junctions.		N	A value management exercise has been undertaken to minimise the areas of land required for building the road. The landscape masterplan in the DCO submission identifies landscape planting and ecological habitat creation where it is not possible to return the land to agriculture.
Environment	We are not familiar with the details of the drainage, ecology, landscape and habitat mitigation measures which will have to be clarified and damage mitigated.	13843	N	Mitigation measures are reported within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) .
Environment	We are not certain of the extent of the study area. There are more culturally important aspects on the Easton estate than are referred to, which need to be protected.	13843	N	The study area extents are reported within each technical environmental assessment within the Environmental Statement. The cultural heritage study area is outlined in the respective chapter of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) .
Environment	The old A47 should be removed and trees planted along its route to mitigate some of the environmental damage done by the new road.	14388	N	Some sections of the existing A47 and side roads which would be unusable as a result of the Scheme would be grubbed up and planted where appropriate. However, some sections of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				existing A47 will remain open to facilitate travel between communities.
Environment	We would note the need to make these more attractive through additional landscaping and potentially lighting. Enhancements to biodiversity should be made along these routes, together with enhancements to the separation from the new A47 so as to improve tranquillity.	13841 13838	N	The landscape proposals are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9). This identifies landscape planting and ecological habitat creation where it is not possible to return the land to agriculture.
Further engagement	We will be pleased to continue to work towards a Memorandum of Understanding in relation to mitigation.	13843	N	Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer.
Further engagement	We support our neighbours proposals to establish a constructive discussion regarding how the southern roundabout may be modified.	13841	N	The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.
Further engagement	We together with our client, Clarion, wish to engage in a constructive discussion regarding how the southern roundabout may be modified to provide better access to our proposals and the FEP.	13838	N	The proposed local sideroads have been designed in accordance with Norfolk County Council requirements for a Class B (6.0m wide) or Class C (5.5m wide) and agreed with the local highway authority.
Further engagement	We would also seek clarification on dimensions of the junction and the side roads to be designed. In light of the above points, we would like to stress the importance of collaborative working to deliver the best possible scheme.	13838	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Further engagement	We would like to discuss the traffic flows to understand the impact of closing one of these routes.	13843	N	Highways England has met with the landowner to discuss and understand the impact on the holiday business.
Further engagement	To help minimise disruption to holiday businesses whilst construction duration is in progress, any new information at your earliest convenience would be greatly appreciated.	14579	N	
Further engagement	We are conscious of the alternatives outlined in the original Road Investment Strategy for East Area 6 and the current proposal which runs across the Trustees land severing the site. We welcome discussions to finalise an agreed Memorandum of Understanding at an early stage.	14543	N	<p>The justification and design for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017) which was available on the HE project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>HE conducted a non-statutory consultation and continued to engage with the parish councils prior to the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Highways England has proposed virtual meetings to discuss the Scheme in advance of the DCO submission</p>
Further engagement	We are awaiting further details to explain the reasoning behind this new configuration.	14335	N	
Further engagement	We would also like a site meeting before work starts.	14357	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Further engagement	As we noted throughout this form, we would propose some collaborative work between ourselves, Transport Planning Associates and Yourselves to deliver the best scheme to take into account the needs of the local existing and future communities and businesses.	13838	N	The requested was notes and the Applicant has engaged with and is meeting with the Royal Norfolk Agricultural Association.
Further engagement	The Highways Agency has carried out environmental surveys but neither we nor our client has seen these. We request they are sent to us.	14337	N	The environmental surveys were ongoing throughout 2020 so were not fully available at Statutory Consultation, but the results have been presented in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) accompanying the DCO application.
Further engagement	We are not aware of any environmental surveys having been carried out on this land and, if and when any are, we request the results of such surveys.	14336	N	
Heritage	Listed buildings and SSSIs seem to be insignificant in the proposals.	14384	N	Listed buildings and SSSIs have been assessed in the Cultural Heritage and Biodiversity chapters of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) , respectively.
Hydrology	We also believe we need to have further discussion regarding the precise location of the attenuation lagoon proposed on our client's land at the Church Lane end of the proposed side road.	13841	N	The proposed drainage basins are located based on topography, the alignment levels of the proposed roads, and outfall locations. Highways England is engaging with the landowner further on this matter.
Hydrology	The large attenuation pond is too close to 48 Dereham Road.	14384	N	Following statutory consultation, the connection between Wood Lane junction, Berrys Lane and Dereham Road has changed, which has allowed the attenuation pond to be moved north of the existing A47.
Hydrology	This lagoon so near the river will slip and run off into this river causing pollution.	11702	N	The drainage basins are designed in accordance with the relevant standards, and are subject to engagement / consultation with Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority.
Hydrology	We are very concerned also about the pond that's proposed to be near to our property.	14387	N	The drainage basins are designed and maintained to a standard to not flood and will be integrated into the landscape. The basins will also only hold

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				water in times of rainfall and will be dry at other times.
Landscape	The plans, as currently proposed, site the new Wood Lane junction approximately 250m from Berry Hall itself and destroy the tree shelter belts.	14613	N	Where possible, woodland areas will be retained as part of the Scheme. Where this is not possible, compensatory planting has been proposed.
Landscaping	We would also like to have heard a bit from you about the amount of landscape planting anticipated.	10574	N	The landscape proposals are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9) .
Landscaping	HE do no favour to selling their design proposals by giving no visual indication at all of the extent and nature of the landscaping proposed.	14337	N	
Mitigation	It will be vital to ensure that there are not significant adverse impacts upon local residents from noise or air pollution. Suitable landscaping and biodiversity work is key to ensuring the success of the project.	13841	N	Noise and air quality has been assessed within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) , within the DCO application, and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to reduce significant effects. Landscaping and biodiversity mitigation is proposed and designed in the environmental masterplan.
Mitigation	In building the slip/connecting road there is also an environmental cost with even more countryside being built upon. Not only would it adversely affect the countryside that residents have chosen to live in for many years, it would also have a further negative impact on wildlife and would bring roads even closer to peoples' properties.	15304 15285 15294 15306 15284 15282 15289	N	Assessments will take place to ascertain the required mitigation for wildlife and receptors such as residential properties which will be included in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) .
Mitigation	The proposed mitigation for the Norwich Road Roundabout and the adjacent section of the new A47 do not have enough mitigation to prevent traffic noise and visual pollution as the traffic seems to be both seen and heard from our property as the new A47 will be elevated on to our eyeline particularly from upper windows. I would like to see higher banks and a very effective natural planting scheme to minimise this impact on my property.	13831	N	Noise and air quality has been assessed within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) , within the DCO application, and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to reduce significant effects. Landscaping and biodiversity mitigation is proposed and designed in the environmental masterplan.

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Mitigation	We are really looking forward to seeing some imaginative landscape mitigation proposals when your reviewed scheme is next presented to the public.	14613	N	The landscape proposals are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9) .
Mitigation	Just ensure please that the planting is increased, not reduced!	11451	N	Compensatory planting is proposed as part of the Scheme. The planting consists of both tree planting and wider species planting. The landscape proposals are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9) .
Mitigation	Specifically, we have not yet seen any landscape proposal and would expect to see much more than the generic 'edge of road' hedging so often installed on new road schemes. There are opportunities here to create / extend areas of woodland (e.g. the creation of a buffer wooded area at the Taverham Road junction) which will not only contribute to the countryside, but also assist noise reduction and light spread from the junctions to adjacent neighbours. These are comparatively inexpensive in the scheme of things and should definitely not be subjected to cuts to save money. Use your imaginations and contribute to the new spirit of the climate crisis age.	10574	N	The landscape proposals are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9) .
Mitigation	You should use substantial earthworks / barriers, reduced levels and lots and lots of dense landscape planting to mitigate the traffic noise for local residents and to (as best possible) hide the road (and headlights blazing across the countryside). We really are not convinced that the HE team at present really understands the sensitivities of this landscape and the love of it by those who chose to live here.	10574	N	Noise impacts have been assessed within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and any mitigation measures (including noise barriers/fences) are proposed as part of the Scheme to reduce any residual effects. The landscape proposals are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9) .
Mitigation	Before Work commences our property boundary should be protected from noise and dust by erecting acoustic fencing around our boundary using concrete posts so panels can be replaces as necessary. And any further protection against dust and noise pollution as deemed necessary.	14357	N	Construction noise and dust (see air quality) impacts have been assessed within chapter 5 (Air Quality) and chapter 8 (Noise & Vibration) of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and appropriate mitigation measures are proposed to reduce any residual effects.

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Mitigation	You should use dark sky-friendly lighting where lighting is unavoidable. The present Easton roundabout currently shines out like a beacon over the dark skies of adjacent countryside.	10574 14613	N	Lighting will be designed to ensure glare and upward light spill is minimised. Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) has assessed the impacts of temporary lighting during the construction phase and the permanent lighting provision during operation of the Scheme.
Mitigation	You should use noise suppressing road surfacing. This was promised at our public consultation meeting in Honingham.	10574 14613	N	The proposed A47 mainline will use low noise asphalt road surfacing.
Mitigation	Make specific commitments to protect the environment.	15259 11417	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) presents mitigation measures to avoid or reduce adverse effects on the environment.
Noise	In addition, the new road location is significantly closer to our house and as it is duelled is likely to create greater noise and air pollution than there is currently	15409	N	Air Quality and Noise have been assessed within chapters 5 and 8 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and any mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to reduce any adverse effects.
Noise	A47 noise levels are already high across much of Honingham. The dualling proposals will generate exponentially more noise particularly tyre noise from more and faster vehicles, whilst raising the dualled A47 on embankments north of Honingham in the current proposals is rather like putting the A47 on a stage so we can hear it better!	14373	N	
Noise	The design is far too complex and the double roundabouts are far too large and will result in a massive increase in noise and air pollution.	14388	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Noise	Concern that mitigation won't be sufficient to prevent traffic noise and visual pollution due to raised road.	13831 14579 13831 14373 14387 14384 11417 11072 13843 13995	N	
People and communities	This will cause great disruption to their farming business and impact on their ability to claim farming subsidies in the form of the Basic Payment Scheme. This also brings added uncertainty at a time when the future of farming subsidies is being reviewed and may have a detrimental impact on their ability to participate in any new schemes.	14335	N	The Highways England Land Team is engaging with all affected landowners to discuss compensation for temporary and permanent effects to their land and business.
People and communities	The current alignment is only approximately 200 metres away from several houses and the farm complex. Considering the road corridor width and landscaping, the distance is unlikely to be more than 100 metres and very intrusive being situated along the top of the river valley rather than hidden from view within it. This appears to be as close as any other dwellings and so close to the complex that it will be difficult to mitigate impact from noise, headlight sweep and inconvenience generally.	13995	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) presents mitigation measures to avoid or reduce adverse effects on the environment, including noise and visual.
People and communities	Moving the route further north on any of the previous alignments whether as a result of a wholly altered route or the impact of moving the Wood Lane junction north also has an acute impact on the Hall Farm buildings and houses complex separating the bulk of the land from the buildings and introducing noise and visual interference very close to the main residential and farming hub of the estate.	13995	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
People and communities	Don't move junctions further east... which would make them directly visible to residents.	11451	N	
People and communities	The Farm and Business Park at Honingham Thorpe needs as direct and short a connection to the trunk road as possible for their numerous significant businesses and staff on site. Any move east will disadvantage them adding cost to the connection. This is a hugely important existing employment area locally and its importance is furthered by the new emerging food park there.	11187	N	<p>Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer.</p> <p>The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.</p>
People and communities	<p>As for any road scheme across a holding there will be significant detrimental impact on farming operations, whichever route is taken.</p> <p>The routes were schematic so impact could not be assessed with precision, however a more northerly alignment provides challenges caused by increased severance and reduced efficiency in accessibility and field sizes and shapes.</p> <p>The further north the road is aligned, more land is separated from the remainder holding whether in the area near Easton, north of Honingham church or north of Wood Lane compounding the situation.</p>	13995	N	<p>The justification for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017) which was available on the Highways England project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>The preferred route was announced in August 2017 indicating locations for the proposed junctions, and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p>
People and communities	We farm at Ringland and Honingham and Colton we need Taverham Lane open with a safe crossing please! This links 1000 Acres with 3,000 Acres!	11578	N	Taverham Road will remain open.

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
People and communities	We have never had provision for cycling and horse riding up to now so why do we now need provision.	14357	N	The Scheme has an objective to support Government aims to increase active travel.
People and communities	It is self evident that the proposals would provide further facilities for walking, cycling and horse riding. This can be achieved by fencing on one side of the existing A47 to separate a walking, cycling and horse riding path from the road itself. Has HE considered this?	11407	N	The Scheme provides segregated routes where possible and ensures the design meets safety standards.
People and communities	With the new road I feel it is unsafe to have horses nearby.	14341	N	Secure fencing will be provided where fields are severed, along with vegetation screening.
People and communities	We currently live on a public footpath which the new road will sever stopping us being able to access the green lane to opposite side of the river that we use.	15409	N	As part of the wider network review safe crossings of the new A47 have been provided while keeping PRow connectivity.
People and communities	Despite easier connections for pedestrians etc leaving the old A47 just to the church will be an ideal place for the travellers to set up another camp. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] again this position does not bear thinking about.	11702	N	The existing A47 will be de-trunked and altered to a create a Class B side road with a reduced 6.0m carriageway width. Consideration has been given to not providing turning heads, to mitigate the risks associated with dead end roads, where adequate alternative turning by local landowners exists.
People and communities	Important to remove any dead-end tarmac/ hardstanding to prevent the creation of very undesirable traveller sites!	11185	N	Where existing sections are left redundant these will be landscaped.
People and communities	I am nervous that the old a47 is too large for this job and these wide areas may be abused and used for illegal pitches if measures aren't included to prevent this.	11187	N	For example, access to East Lodge was reduced to a single lane access with a secure gate placed at the junction with East Lodge to limit onward access to St Andrews Church and parking on farm land.
People and communities	I suggest these areas of dead ends should be dug up and removed and returned to their natural state to discourage this. Physical measures such as barriers, fencing and bunding should be used to reduce the scope for misuse.	11184	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Consultee	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Pollution	The lagoon is far larger than proposed. Takes in more of wildflower meadow land. The 2 large roundabouts are opposite the family house, light pollution and noise doesn't bear thinking about.	11702	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) presents mitigation measures to avoid or reduce adverse effects on the environment, including noise and visual.
Pollution	Scant mention is made of the increase in light pollution this development will have on the local area.	14388	N	
Property prices	The most worrying concern is how my home, land and business will be seriously de-valued now and when completed.	14579	N	Highways England has published the process for Part 1 claims that may potentially be eligible to properties near to the Scheme, thus compensating its potential effects.
Safety	As currently planned, this junction and the Wood Lane junction are dangerously close.	14403	N	The junction locations are designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).
Waste	Our clients are concerned what the impact of the proposed layby will be with regards to litter etc.	14336	N	The A47 will be maintained according to Highways England's standard operational maintenance regime.
Wildlife	There are populations of bats on the site. There are populations of reptiles on the site. Our clients are concerned that the construction work in the development of the road and eventually the road itself will disturb or destroy this habitat.	14336	N	Impacts on bats, reptiles and other habitats have been assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1). A landscape masterplan is presented within the DCO application to present proposed landscape and ecological improvements.

2.3 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):
Access	There is an important need to maintain access to Mattishall from Hockering. The GP surgery is there, and I have to walk when I go to the surgery. This Scheme will prevent my doing so. An underpass/bridge is an absolute necessity.	Y	In response to feedback on the importance of a direct connection between Hockering and Mattishall, an underpass was added to the Scheme near where the new A47 crosses the existing Mattishall Lane.
Access	I note there is no road to Mattishall from Hockering which is a vital link to the doctors the other proposed routes especially fox lane are not fit for purpose and as I understand there is only a foot underpass for Mattishall lane this should be made into small vehicle route so villagers can get to the doctors	Y	
Access	The proposed access for road traffic between Hockering and Mattishall does not consider the volume of journeys that take place and an opportunity to improve this situation has been missed by this Scheme. People travel regularly between Hockering and Mattishall to use facilities such as the school and doctor's surgery	Y	
Access	There is no provision for the residents of Hockering to easily travel to Mattishall. The doctors' surgery in is Mattishall and not everyone drives so a 3-mile walk at the moment will become a much longer walk. Drivers will travel about 5 miles further each way so adding to vehicle running costs and not exactly helping the environment.	Y	
Access	Mattishall is the biggest village in Breckland. It's a 'hub' village (approx 3000 inhabitants) and will be affected by the Scheme. It's important that Mattishall residents can easily access the new road in both directions. At present several small roads from N and from S of existing road meet the current A47. Which of these will be blocked off? Mattishall Road from the Alder Carr roundabout is very variable in width and needs upgrading. Does the Alder Carr roundabout where the road from Mattishall meets the currents A47 disappear?	N	The existing A47 roundabout east of Honingham is retained to facilitate a connection to the new Norfolk Road junction.
Access	Need to ensure buses from Dereham to Norwich are still be able to stop in/near Hockering so people can get to college/work from Hockering easily/safely	N	The Scheme maintains access to Hockering and no impact on public transport is predicted in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Access	The Norfolk Local Access Forum is concerned with the ability of people to access the countryside through public rights of way and other publicly open routes. The proposed changes affect that access.	N	An assessment of impacts on public rights of way and proposed mitigation or improvement measures are presented in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).
Access	Thank you for your reply to my concern about keeping access to both pieces of land on the A47. The use of the plots, Access to the River Tud and Woodland for maintenance of river banks and trees, access for JCB Digger and tractor and trailer and 4x4 vehicle and trailer, access to Stables and Fields, Horse box access in and out, access for JCB Digger and tractor and trailer and 4x4 vehicle and trailer for maintenance grass and boundary hedges , Frequency of access to plots. when required and at all times, type of vehicle currently accessing the plots Horse box access in and out, Access for JCB Digger and tractor and trailer and 4x4 vehicle and trailer. Is plot access available from a secondary point. access from Richmond Close by footpath from side my house, to Field with Stables, no access to Woodland and River Tud other than main gate A47 please refer to attached Map any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.	N	The existing A47 north of Honingham is now being retained for use as a local road, so access can continue from this road.
Access	The road will also cut walking routes from the village to the river requiring long detours next to busy traffic.	N	An assessment of impacts on public rights of way and proposed mitigation or improvement measures are presented in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).
Access	Getting to our church? How? We are a small village with and elderly population, those that go to church, or tend family graves, cannot be expected to walk miles to get there. A lot of villagers do not drive, and you are cutting them off from their church.	N	A new walking and cycling path will be provided to maintain access to St Andrew's Church from Honingham.
Access	Concerned about the removal of the access to Easton to and from its western side Its eastern side. The only access I could find to Easton is on its eastern side next to show ground (Editor's note: one word illegible) While the Church Lane (Editor's note: one word illegible) is remaining travelling east from Mattishall road is very complicated	N	Easton is connected on the western side via a new side road between Dereham Road and the proposed A47 Norwich Road junction.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Access	We are also concerned about Easton itself. At present there are about 27 houses within 0.75 km of the north side of the Dual carriageway. At present, if on foot, the residents have 2 options to get into the main village street with its bus stops and the few other facilities of the village, including a primary school. It should be remembered that it is likely that a proportion of these residents will not have independent access to motor transport or a bicycle may be inappropriate for the distance they need to travel and the hilly terrain.		
Access	In general, we support the proposed dualling. However, the Preferred Route for the A47 Dualling removes the western access to the A47 from Easton Village at Church Lane. The implications of this for Easton, the Royal Norfolk Agricultural Association (RNAA), and most particularly Longwater Interchange are not assessed in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Consultation documents which is of major concern.	N	Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) considers effects on the Easton community, while Longwater Interchange forms the eastern extent of the assessment of journey travel times in Chapter 4 Transport Assessment of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1). Highways England have engaged with representation from the Royal Norfolk Agricultural Association (RNAA).
Access	The FEZ is included under development land at Table 12.1 in the SR. Paragraph 12.7.12 then states "No impacts are anticipated to arise effecting development land within the study area". The removal of the Easton roundabout is a major impact as it takes away the only permitted access to the FEZ.	N	Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer. The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Access	I expect the scheduling of works to be done in a manner which will never completely block off current access to the roads to the north of the project, e.g. the current road which connects Easton with Taverham, a road which, for some reason has seen a major growth of traffic since the perimeter road to the east of Norwich opened	N	Taverham Road will be accessed via the proposed Norwich Road junction, which will be connected to Easton via a new side road from Dereham Road. An Outline Traffic Management Plan (TR010038/APP/7.5) is presented in the DCO application and, prior to commencing construction, would be developed into a full plan for managing construction traffic to minimise disruption and disturbance risks. Norfolk County Council, as the local highway authority, would be consulted during the development of the traffic management plan.
Access	The lack of access to Ringland etc is something that needs to be reconsidered. With the proposed plans that area is completely cut off unless you take long detour on the new side road, going over the new roundabout complex and then back the same distance on another side road which is ridiculous.	N	Access across the A47 between Easton and Ringland has to be via the proposed Norwich Road junction so as to achieve free flowing traffic on the A47 and reduce safety risks. The location of the junction is at Blind Lane and Taverham Road junction due to constraints preventing it being closer to Easton (e.g. between Dereham Road and Church Lane due to proximity of St Peter's Church and residential properties).
Access	However, I have continuing concerns that the Scheme ignores the long-standing connections N and S of the new Scheme, particularly in the section between North Tuddenham and Wood Lane.	Y	In response to feedback on the importance of a direct connection between Hockering and Mattishall, an underpass was added to the Scheme near where the new A47 crosses the existing Mattishall Lane.
Access	As the Scheme cuts off all N/S traffic between North Tuddenham and the Wood Lane junction there needs to be a way for inter-village journeys to be maintained. Traffic flows from Mattishall/East Tuddenham to Hockering are particularly affected by the Scheme.		
Access	As is stated at 5.4.3 of the Junction & Sideroad Strategy PCF STAGE NO. 3 document, Mattishall is a hub for the local communities and residents, north of the existing A47 and people also travel from Hockering/East Tuddenham to Dereham utilising the A47. This is stated but then ignored. No meaningful mitigation is proposed to overcome this issue.		

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Access	If no provision is made for vehicle access to mitigate the issues identified in 5.4.3 of the Junction & Sideroad Strategy document, then this will cause significant problems for residents of Hockering particularly and will impact on North Tuddenham as well. The route from the Fox Lane junction into Mattishall is narrow and mostly only side enough for one vehicle at a time. Passing places of sorts have been created, but mainly as pitted muddy sections carved out of edges and fields. They are rutted at present.		
Access	It is essential that the contractor or contractors have, as part of their mission statement, a clear statement on the timing of the completion of the whole project. Too often we see an under-resourced contractor cause major disruption to traffic flow for an inordinately long time. Work needs to be 24 hours a day and 7 days a week otherwise the overall cost of the project, INCLUDING THE COST OF DELAYS TO ROAD TRAFFIC AND ASSOCIATED BUSINESSES, will prove unacceptable. Please bear in mind that a holistic approach is required and contract prices should not reflect just the cost of the work. How often do we drive after 4 pm or at weekends only to find that no-one is working on site!!	N	<p>The project is being resourced to meet the government's target to open by the end of 2024, but 24/7 working is not proposed to avoid disturbance to the local environment and local residents of night-time working.</p> <p>The economic costs of construction are considered in Chapter 5 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p>
Access	No proposal should be allowed to go through at all. How can you justify spending all this money when disabled people are suffering by county council cuts? It is immoral.	N	Highways England has provided provision for walking, cycling and horse riding as part of the Scheme and have looked to support access for vulnerable user groups
Access	The Scheme will impact on road networks and communities beyond the A47 but there does not appear to be a joined-up approach between Highways England and Norfolk County Council which would minimise the negative impacts of this Scheme.	N	Highways England has been working with Norfolk County Council throughout the A47 scheme development.
Access	I fully understand and support the strategic requirement for the road, but believe that despite acknowledging the impact upon the communities most affected by the route, the Scheme fails to mitigate that impact in any meaningful way for the communities and also to use the Scheme as a way of promoting new modes of travel.	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) presents mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to identify positive and negative effects, including on local communities, then identify means to avoid or reduce adverse effects.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Access	Not relevant to your immediate plans and consultation, but of considerable importance, is the fact that Norwich and Norfolk Councils are drawing up plans to add another 4,000 plus properties to this area (despite it being reported (E.D.P/ 01.04.2020) that there are 500 plus vacant properties within the Norwich area). If this goes ahead before the A47 is completed it will cause extreme disruption to the road as it stands at present and will be unmanageable when road developments proceeds. Government should insist that any further house development in that area be out in hold until the A47/Norwich Western link are complete.	N	The scheme traffic modelling accounts for natural and planned growth within the traffic model uncertainty log. All developments, regardless of size, within 2km of the A47 corridor between the scheme sections which are classified as certain or more than likely have been included. All development with more than 50 dwellings or 50 jobs within 5km of the scheme which are classified as certain or more than likely have been included. The model contains natural growth factors in line with national standards, accounts for developments under construction and those with planning permission in place.
Access	As there will be no roundabout for Ringland resident to go to Easton or Longwater as the chairman got his own way to have the roundabout at the top of the Church Lane to be removed.	N	Access to Easton or Longwater is provided via Taverham road to the proposed Norwich Road junction. The existing Easton roundabout is removed as part of the scheme objectives. The junction and sideroad strategy report presented at statutory consultation outlines the junction design hierarchy in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges; and the scheme traffic modelling for the opening year (2025) and design year (2040).
Access	The new roundabouts need to be moved in their entirety towards Easton. The present positions are impractical due to the positions of St. Andrews Church, Church Farm and associated buildings and the woodland. Movement east could solve the problems of the proposed roundabout locations. St Andrew's Church needs parking space for 200 vehicles. (present parking will be removed)	N	The location of the Norwich Road junction is at the existing Blind Lane and Taverham Road junction due to physical constraints preventing it being closer to Easton (e.g. proximity of the Grade I St Peter's Church and residential properties immediately adjacent to Easton roundabout where the Scheme needs to tie back into the existing A47).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Access	Those leaving Taverham wishing to access the A47 will on the current proposal travel through Ringland village, then Honingham Lane and Taverham road. Those doing the reverse journey will do likewise. This is because the current normal journey over ringland hills (which bypasses the village) now adds considerable distance, caused by the removal of the Easton roundabout and the new side road to this new junction.	Y	<p>Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3).</p> <p>In response to feedback at statutory consultation, and Local Liaison Group, the proposed scheme now includes a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) for Honingham Lane only, with Taverham Road remaining open to traffic.</p> <p>This would allow the option to temporarily close Honingham Lane to through traffic in the interim period between the opening of the A47 Scheme and the proposed Norwich Western Link to control the risk of traffic passing through Ringland.</p> <p>Including the TTRO within the DCO will allow its implementation if it is deemed the right thing to do following further discussion with the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>However, it does not preclude the option not to implement the closure if it is not supported by the local planning authority.</p> <p>Highways England continues to engage and support Norfolk County Council in regard to the local road network and NWL scheme.</p>
Access	As any direct access for the FEZ is therefore a considerable major benefit to the private owner of the FEZ, we ask, in the public interest, whether the proposed designs for the A47 improvements would have been different had there not been a requirement to provide this alternative access to the FEZ particularly noting the unsuitability of Blind Lane for traffic. Should this	N	<p>Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>be the case, we request under the Freedom of Information legislation an estimate of extra over costs associated with the Norwich Road Junction to service the FEZ.</p>		<p>with the County, District Council and the developer.</p> <p>The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.</p>
Air quality	<p>I have concerns that if the dual carriageway goes ahead there will be an increase in noise from increased traffic. Increase in pollution, increase in speeding on this stretch of road. Also loss of trees and hedges which screen noise and pollution. I am not convinced enough planting has been agreed</p>	N	<p>Impacts from noise, air quality, landscape and visual impacts have been assessed within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to reduce any residual effects. The landscape proposals are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9) The masterplan identifies proposed landscape planting and ecological habitat creation.</p>
Air quality	<p>I live here in close proximity to the new road which will completely change the beautiful landscape surrounding my home and increase noise and pollution to an unknown degree.</p>	N	
Air quality	<p>I am concerned that traffic will go through Ringland village from Taverham to access this junction. The road is not suitable for this level of traffic as Ringland has no footway or street lighting and has very narrow lanes with buildings that abut the road. It will be detrimental to health through respiratory problems.</p>	Y	<p>Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3).</p> <p>In response to feedback at statutory consultation, and Local Liaison Group, the proposed scheme now includes a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) for Honingham Lane only, with Taverham Road remaining open to traffic.</p> <p>This would allow the option to temporarily close Honingham Lane to through traffic in the interim period between the opening of the A47 Scheme and the proposed Norwich Western Link to</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			<p>control the risk of traffic passing through Ringland.</p> <p>Including the TTRO within the DCO will allow its implementation if it is deemed the right thing to do following further discussion with the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>However, it does not preclude the option not to implement the closure if it is not supported by the local planning authority.</p> <p>Highways England continues to engage and support Norfolk County Council in regard to the local road network and NWL scheme.</p>
Air quality	No absolute answers to sound and pollution screening with fencing and massed planting of trees and shrubs. It simply is not good enough to expect me to agree to this, when you have not confirmed that fencing and planting will create a wide, fully planted screen between village and A47. Using evergreen and other types of trees to fully 100% infill the space between village and road is a solution. But it needs to be written into plans. Planners verbal assurances mean nothing.	N	Impacts from noise, air quality and traffic have been assessed within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to reduce any residual effects. A landscape masterplan is presented within the DCO application. The masterplan identifies proposed landscape planting and ecological habitat creation.
Air quality	The surrounding villages have local amenities only such as small village shops, country pubs and care homes, they do not need extra traffic or fumes.	N	
Air quality	I do not believe for one minute that the environment, or our village of Honingham, will not be damaged by emissions from traffic using these 2 unnecessary roundabouts.	N	
Air quality	I would much prefer a solution(s) not dictated by further use of cars and other vehicles. More roads always result in more pollution,	N	
Air quality	The most significant element of the preliminary environmental impact assessment is the prediction of increased CO2 emissions. Nothing in the mitigation package comes close to addressing this.	N	A carbon impact assessment has been completed within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to reduce any residual effects.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Air quality	I thought the target for 2050 was for the UK to be carbon neutral Don't see any reference to the Scheme reducing vehicle exhaust emissions because of the elimination of roundabouts on the A47, thus eliminating some slowing/speeding up of traffic. Don't see any reference to managing speed limits to reducing vehicle emissions. Refer to data from sections of road that are managed on an average speed basis. It reduces unnecessary speeding and provides a calmer driving experience at peak times.	N	A carbon impact assessment has been completed within Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to reduce and residual effects.
Air quality	Thus even though traffic data for the Scheme is not available (full PEIR # 4.2.1), 'A review of the likely road alignment changes associated with the Scheme suggests there is potential for both a positive and negative impact on air quality; however this will be determined [only] by conducting a full dispersion modelling study' (# 4.7.3).	N	Air quality impacts have been assessed using a dispersion model method. Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) presents the results and any proposed mitigation measures to reduce significant adverse effects.
Air quality	Improving road capacity would attract more traffic and increase journey speeds with the effect of increasing carbon emissions. This outcome is acknowledged by the Preliminary Environmental Information Report which says that construction and operation of the Scheme would probably result in further carbon emissions. This is inconsistent with the declared climate emergency and the UK legal requirement to achieve net-zero carbon by 2050.	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains assessments on air quality (Chapter 5), human health (Chapter 12) and carbon / climate (Chapter 14).
Air quality	Car use is killing us in two ways the first by pollution see this report by the Royal College of Physicians: https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/projects/outputs/every-breath-we-take-lifelong-impact-air-pollution and the second by moving us away from methods of active transport into our cars causing obesity, see this publication by the NHS https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/statistics-on-obesity-physical-activity-and-diet-england-2019	N	
Air quality	Additional car-dependent housing and developments which would inevitably follow increased speeds and road capacity locks us into increased dependence on private car use, with added carbon emissions, and a retrograde shift from active transport (walking, cycling) to private motors.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Air quality	Therefore, a roads first approach is likely to continue for the foreseeable future leading to ever more congestion and pollution. At some stage we must actually do something positive to affect this modal shift where the private car is no longer the dominating factor rather than glibly repeat the aspiration.	N	
Alternative transport	Proper thorough transport policy for an integrated public transport service for Norfolk and adjacent counties. Better railways carry more people at less cost to the environment.	N	<p>The Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) presents the need case for the Scheme supported by a transport assessment (Chapter 4) and economic assessment (Chapter 5).</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains assessments on air quality (Chapter 5), human health (Chapter 12) and carbon / climate (Chapter 14).</p>
Alternative transport	Cars are not an efficient mode of transport and the volume of money proposing to be spent on this road should be spent on public transport such as light rail. If you put an efficient attractive public transport system in place, people will use it. It's too easy to walk out of your door, into your car, get to where you are going and get out of your car and hardly move. It is time to move away from this, encourage to be more active and use public transport.	N	
Alternative transport	We should spend the money on improving walking and cycling routes for us all, to enable us reduce car use. This would be line with the governments stated aim of carbon zero and the NCC own declaration of a climate emergency.	N	
Alternative transport	Better to improve existing roads with safer speed limits, traffic lights at the junction, public transport and facilities for cycling. These would reduce the need for additional road space	N	
Alternative transport	We need to be encouraging other forms of travel. We cannot keep expending our car use, we should spend money on decreasing car use and improving other transport infrastructure. This needs to be the county council's policy, part of the measures to tackle climate change and ecosystem restoration	N	
Alternative transport	Creating more road capacity will generate more trips. Local rail has not been investigated as a movement option to support short and medium distance trips in Norfolk. Strategic land use planning should focus growth in public transport accessible locations rather than implying daily commuting by all household members which creates demand for damaging road infrastructure such as is proposed.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Alternative transport	In the face of climate emergency, we should be spending the money on public transport and safe cycling and walking links, setting an example for reducing car use.	N	
Alternative transport	Building extra road capacity to open up greenfield sites for development would increase reliance on car use. This is contrary to the stated aim of the DfT's 'Decarboning Transport' to make public transport, walking and cycling the preferred choice of travel for daily activities in order to radically cut transport carbon.	N	
Alternative transport	The proposal to spend between £100 million to £250 million on this Scheme should be better spent on greening the economy such as investment in broadband and public transport.	N	
Alternative transport	If improved communications links are needed, the I believe the focus and investment should be directed towards public transport Schemes that will reduce the environmental cost per journey,	N	
Alternative transport	Increasing traffic volume is also counter to the Government's stated priority, in the "Decarbonising Transport" paper of March 2020, of focusing on public and active transport as the mode of first choice.	N	
Alternative transport	Spend the money on transforming our communities away from dependencies on our cars. Let's have a meaningful consultation on that instead and show some proper leadership	N	
Alternative transport	Generally traffic on the A47 could be substantially lessened by opening the railway Dereham/Wymondham/Norwich to regular passenger traffic while NOT dualling the A47.	N	
Alternative transport	Failure to explore local rail as a more sustainable movement option coupled with a land release model to limit trip generation leads to environmentally damaging Schemes such as this one.	N	
Alternative transport	Such Schemes anticipate future movement growth by means of car.	N	
Alternative transport	Some expected Impacts on local road network. a)Only route across valley is via B1535 – this would need improving – but modal shift to public transport required and a bus route would be needed through Queens Hill to Longwater, (which was originally envisaged years ago when Queens Hill was planned).	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Alternative transport	We need to build proper traffic-free cycle and footpaths linking every village and town and stop spending money on roads. 40,000 people die in the UK due to air pollution. COVID-19 hasn't killed that many and yet we have shut schools and workplaces why don't we do something to stop polluting the air we all breath?	N	
Anti-social behaviour	Would encourage illegal encampments and fly tipping.	Y	Following Statutory Consultation feedback, Highways England has increased the extent of the existing A47 to be integrated into the local road network, which will help reduce this risk.
Berry's Lane to Dereham Road	Why couldn't the A47 go over the existing roundabout on the Dereham Road, then have a slip road coming off that to join the A47 rather than the new side road. This would then also allow access to Ringland to remain as it is.	N	<p>The justification and main design parameters for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic, and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017).</p> <p>Highways England has engaged with the Local Liaison Group, South of the A47 Taskforce and parish councils. Taking into account feedback from the Statutory consultation, the proposed scheme now closes Berrys Lane to through traffic.</p>
Berry's Lane to Dereham Road	As aforementioned, I think the overall design that is proposed is excellent. I frequently access/exit the A47 at this junction heading to/from Norwich and my home in Guist via Wood Lane/B1535 and then the A1067. The proposed roundabout with slip roads is well thought out, although I don't know if the north and south roundabouts for Wood Lane/Berry's Lane should be bigger in diameter so as to accommodate more traffic.	N	
Berry's Lane to Dereham Road	<p>The design for the Wood and Berrys lane junctions onto the new bypass looks to be a standard dumbbell design, I must ask if any modelling of traffic has been undertaken for south of the A47? From a previous meeting I understand it has not been completed to date and therefore must be taken into account when designing the new road layout. Barnham Broom, Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe must not become the next Ringland Hills rat run as an unintended consequence of road design.</p> <p>Please give this further thought and I suggest blocking off or limiting access to Berry's Lane enabling local traffic to access the new A47 at a Honingham junction. The current design looks basic and does not take into account these important factors for the surrounding area. Please redesign it as a matter of urgency.</p>	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Berry's Lane to Dereham Road	There does not seem to have been any contact between Highways England and Anglian Water who laid a new water main from Berry's Lane X roads up the side of Berry Hall pasture which from the map will be overrun by parts of the roundabout for the new junction. The pipe continues on that field, across the top of the farm track and across the next field to the point at (Editor's note: illegible word) roughly where the 'scoping boundary' reach me (Editor's note: personal details removed) to on the east side. It is then tunnelled under the (Editor's note: one word illegible) end of this property and continues down Church Lane or beyond with an inspection point marked by 4 wooden posts roughly where the suds pond is marked on the environmental map.	N	Highways England is actively engaging with Anglian Water to ensure the design caters for the need to divert any Anglian Water assets.
Berry's Lane to Dereham Road	The problem that will be caused by the connection to Berry's lane is that the traffic will be moving onto a small road, with a tight bridge over the river Tud. It is probable that heavy lorries/arctics will use try to use this road, as a short cut - and cause major traffic problems.	Y	In response to Statutory Consultation feedback, Local Liaison Group sessions, meetings with the South of the A47 Taskforce group and direct engagement with residents and landowners, Berrys Lane will be closed to through traffic as part of the scheme.
Berry's Lane to Dereham Road	Its a shame we have to have any access at all from Berrys Lane to the NWL or Wood Lane, to prevent a rat run through Barnham Broom to Carleton Forehoe and Wymondham and the A11	Y	
Berry's Lane to Dereham Road	You cannot devise a Scheme in isolation to the impact it will have on Berrys Lane. You must have joined up working with NCC. To cast aside serious concerns is not good working practice. Weight limits, no HGVs, concern for Berry Hall, ancient trees, old people's home are paramount and everyone's responsibility.	Y	
Berry's Lane to Dereham Road	I think you may need to consider an improvement to Berry's Lane. I know it is owned by NCC, however the changes that Highways England are proposing will put significantly more traffic onto that road, which isn't really wide enough to accommodate this.	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Berry's Lane to Dereham Road	If the C class Berry's Lane is connected to the new A47, directly to the new roundabout or by a junction with Dereham Road, it will open a rat run from the A47 through Barnham Broom, Carleton Forehoe onto Tuttlles Lane in Wymondham. This route would be used by vehicles, particularly HGVs, seeking the 5-mile shorter route between the new Norwich Western Link Road (if built) and the A11 towards Thetford. It will use narrow C Class lanes crossing 2 hump back bridges, one on Berry's Lane and a single track bridge in the village of Carleton Forehoe, with 2 potentially dangerous crossroads - Mattishall Road and the B1108 in Carleton Forehoe which is a known accident Black Spot – and difficult tight junctions to cross the Norwich Road in Barnham Broom and to turn into Wymondham Road in Rush Green. Ignoring Wymondham Road will channel traffic via Kimberley, Wicklewood and over the narrow bridge into Tuttlles Lane in Wymondham. Either way, the rat run will spill traffic into Wymondham which is becoming increasingly busy because of local housing development.	Y	
Berry's Lane to Dereham Road	This route would be used by vehicles, particularly HGVs, seeking a shorter route between the new Norwich Western Link Road and the A11 towards Thelford. It will use narrow C class lanes crossing 2 hump back bridges, one on Berry's Lane and a single track bridge in the village of Carleton Forehoe, with 2 potentially dangerous crossroads - Mattishall Road and the B1108 in Carleton Forehoe which is a known accident Black Spot - and difficult tight junctions to cross the Norwich Road in Barnham Broom and to turn into Wymondham Road in Rush Green. Ignoring Wymondham Road will channel traffic via Kimberley, Wicklewood and over the narrow bridge into Tuttlles Lane in Wynmondham. Either way, the Rat Run will spill traffic into Wymondham which is becoming increasingly busy because of local housing development.	Y	
Berry's Lane to Dereham Road	My main concern is the proposed connection enabling traffic from wood lane to travel straight over onto Berry's lane thereby creating a north south link road cross country via Barnham Broom to Tuttlles Lane Wymondham and the A11. The current design encourages traffic to take the shortest route north south from wood lane to Wymondham via Berry's Lane and the surrounding villages. where roads are too small, there is virtually no	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	traffic calming and disruption to local businesses and residents will be significant.		
Berry's Lane to Dereham Road	Berrys Lane is not a suitable road for HGV or significant volumes of traffic and is similar to the connecting country roads serving Barnham Broom, Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe. Travelling along the A47 to Thickthorn for the A11 to go south is 8 miles longer. In the event of delays or accidents on the A47 traffic will flow off through Colton and Barnham Broom to use the B1108 which is currently the case causing chaos during rush hour. I farm in the local area and find the volume of traffic disrupts our operations and increases accidents. The scenic landscape, wildlife and old road network does not lend itself to high traffic volumes.	Y	
Berry's lane to Dereham Road	Why couldn't the A47 go over the existing roundabout on the Dereham Road, then have a slip road coming off that to join the A47 rather than the new side road. This would then also allow access to Ringland to remain as it is.	Y	
Berry's Lane to Dereham Road	Re-designing Wood Lane junction in a similar style to close that access to Honingham and Berry's Lane. Both could be accessed via the Norwich Road junction adding less than 500 m to the route already currently adopted by most of the local traffic for safety and convenience.	Y	
Biodiversity	I am deeply concerned, both for the ongoing impact on the environment that road development implies.	N	Impacts on ecology are assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to avoid and/or reduce significant effects.
Biodiversity	We should not be wrecking more ecosystems to build yet another road when faced with massive ecosystem destruction. We need to be conserving wherever we can and restoring lots too.	N	
Biodiversity	I believe the focus and investment should be directed towards public transport Schemes that will reduce the environmental cost per journey, rather than increasing both the environmental cost per journey and, in all likelihood, the overall number of journeys made.	N	Where possible, woodland areas have been retained as part of the Scheme. Where this is not

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Biodiversity	7.6.26-as per our comments on paragraph 7.6.23, we are concerned at the likely success rates of this proposed mitigation measure. Translocation is regarded as a last-ditch measure when all other option shave been exhausted, and we are concerned that many of the plants moved will be lost. Should this option be pursued further in the ES, then we would expect it to be accompanied by robust evidence demonstrating the success levels expected and the preceding alternatives that have been considered.	N	<p>possible compensatory planting has been proposed. A landscape masterplan is presented within the DCO application to identify replacement landscape planting and ecological habitat creation.</p> <p>The landscape masterplan aims to achieve no net loss of biodiversity value as part of the Scheme and retain habitat connectivity. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9).</p> <p>The mitigation measures outlined in the Biodiversity chapter of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) have been tried and tested and therefore best practice is being followed to mitigate the effects on the environment.</p>
Biodiversity	Again, like improvements for walking and cycling, I don't believe that 'environmental mitigation' will offset the environmental losses caused by the Scheme.	N	
Biodiversity	There is bound to be some environmental disruption. It appears that the designers have attempted to offset the impact of this as much as possible - but it remains to be seen if this will be completely effective. Only time will tell.	N	
Biodiversity	I am concerned about the impact on biodiversity in a farmland area where vegetation mosaics are limited. There is heathland and woodland. Red kites, barn owls' bats and newts a I have no knowledge of plant life in the area but would hope this is being properly considered, particularly in an area prone to monoculture known in area. I am concerned about making these islands of habitat made smaller by the road works.	N	
Biodiversity	It is perhaps unfortunate that the River Tud joins the Wensum and the two provide an ecological corridor into the heart of the City and similarly outwards. Dualling imposes a minimum "killing zone" of 30 metres and greater when swales and boundaries are taken into account. Connectivity across the landscape is forever interrupted and river valleys are probably the major zone for species variety and transit.	N	
Biodiversity	Page 26 of the Public Consultation document states ". . . mitigation measures may include the creation of replacement habitats. . ." The "may" is very disappointing. The loss of natural will be considerable and there should be a absolutely firm commitment to its replacement.	N	
Biodiversity	Although a little concerned that your proposal says 'mitigation measures MAY include the creation of replacement habitats? Water voles, in particular, are on the endangered species list.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Biodiversity	Highways England Preferred Route Announcement in August 2017 advised that an amended version of Option 2 (on-line dualling) would be worked up, but the Scheme presented involves off-line dualling which would result in greater land take, loss of habitats and protected wildlife species which cannot be mitigated.	N	The preferred route was announced in August 2017 and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) .
Biodiversity	Moving the A47 to the south of Hockering and north of Honningham would take the road closer to the ecologically sensitive River Tud valley which connects to the international important River Wensum, with likely loss of protected species due to loss of habitat, noise and disturbance and the potential for risk of contamination to the river, tributaries, and water table.	N	The Biodiversity chapter of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) has considered the River Tud and valley as well as the River Wensum as a part of the assessment.
Biodiversity	In similar vein, 'The results of the ecological surveys will help to identify [future] mitigation measures, with a view to safeguard' species of nature conservation importance which could be impacted by the Scheme (# 1.10.2),	N	Ecological surveys have been carried out, the results of which are summarised in the Biodiversity chapter of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) .
Biodiversity	I spoke to the environmental representative at the consultation. She showed me there was only a 500m? buffer from the road that surveys had been completed. I do not feel this is enough. There was nothing showing the 20 plus red kites, (which used to be until recently on the endangered list), living in Honingham.	N	The study area used for the biodiversity assessment differs depending on the ecological receptor. These study areas range from 30km to the DCO Boundary area.
Biodiversity	The original proposal from Highways England was for on-line dualling but the PEIR is different, instead proposing offline dualling which would seriously damage wildlife habitats and countryside.	N	The justification and main design parameters for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017).
Biodiversity	More effective measures could be taken to lessen the amount of traffic, therefore keeping the area untouched allowing wildlife to be left undisturbed.	N	
Biodiversity	Off-line dualling will lead to the harming of wildlife habitats and their associated species. It will lead to damage to the River Tud which feeds into the River Wensum. The latter is a chalk-fed river with the internationally important designation of SAC. This is primarily due to the presence of endangered Annex II species White-claw Crayfish (and Desmoulin's Whorl Snail, Brook Lamprey, and Bullhead). The Scheme will lead to loss of biodiversity and exacerbate the extinction emergency.	N	The Scheme has been designed to minimise any adverse effects on the natural environment, in particular at the crossing of the River Tud. The Habitat Regulation Assessment and the Biodiversity chapter of the Environmental

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Biodiversity	The impact on the natural surroundings along with animals and other wildlife is far to high. The NDR is bad enough with animals littering it, especially deer.	N	Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the potential impact to the sensitive areas.
Biodiversity	The proposed off-line Scheme would adversely harm wildlife habitats and protected species such as Red Kite, otters, water voles and barn owls. It would also damage the River Tud which feeds into the internationally important river Wensum. The planet is suffering from a biodiversity emergency and the Scheme would result in a net loss to biodiversity.	N	Where possible, woodland areas have been retained as part of the Scheme. Where this is not possible compensatory planting has been proposed. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9).
Biodiversity	7.6.23- whilst we support the ambition to compensate for loss of habitats through landscape planting, we are concerned at the scale of the impacts to a wide range of important priority habitats and protected species along the route, as well as permanent reductions in habitat quality in remaining habitats within at least 200m of the route due to pollution. Several of the areas to be lost are of fragile habitats such as fen which are extremely hard to replicate elsewhere in any realistic timescale. Where areas of woodland are proposed to be lost, it should be noted that new tree planting is highly unlikely to be able to compensate for any loss of mature trees, or impacts on protected species such as bats dependent on the features mature trees provide, leaving compensation effectively impossible. In addition, compensation proposals should address those areas impacted through severance, and also the permanent loss in habitat quality on land adjacent to the road from the indirect pollution that will arise.	N	Where possible, woodland areas have been retained as part of the Scheme. Where this is not possible, compensatory planting has been proposed. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9). Planting to provide benefits to biodiversity is provided as a part of the Scheme.
Biodiversity	The current route doesn't support the County Council's own brief for finding the route with the least environmental damage, although the junction proposed on the A47 plans would support an alternative Scheme to 'finish' the A1270 that has much less of an environmental impact. It is my belief - along with that of the CPRE and many other local and national organisations - that what Norfolk County Council is proposing to finish the A1270 is grossly negligent towards environmental concerns and would have a permanently devastating impact on the river Wensum (which has SSSI status and is a unique chalk river valley) as well as on local ancient woodlands and other wildlife sites. I therefore implore you to please help	N	The Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) presents a summary of the route options appraisal process, which included consideration of environmental impacts, and why the preferred option was chosen. The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains assessment of environmental impacts and mitigation measures

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	Norfolk County Council (NCC) choose an alternative route and not to endorse it in any way.		for significant effects, including biodiversity (Chapter 8).
Biodiversity	Option 2, on-line dualling, was preferred by Highways England in August 2017, but off-line dualling is now being proposed. The latter will lead to more pollution, the possible local extinction of protected species and urbanisation and building in the wrong places.	N	
Biodiversity	Although the plans for the dual carriageway include verdant trees, hedgerows etc for wildlife, this will not be the case for many, many years to come. Native saplings, no doubt wrapped in plastic, will, in no way, compensate for the loss of established habitat for all types of wildlife currently in place.	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains assessments on biodiversity (Chapter 8) and landscape and visual amenity (Chapter 7).
Biodiversity	Where, with all this going on, is the wildlife supposed to go? Where there are acres of countryside for them live soon it will be reduced to small, managed plots of land. There is fast becoming a time when Britain's wild creatures can only be seen in a zoo.	N	
Biodiversity	The proposed NWL would have a major detrimental impact on the River Wensum valley and its complex of fragile habitats and protected species such as otters and water voles. Norfolk County Council have not made a case for the road.	N	
Biodiversity	The junction has been partly designed to facilitate the Norwich Western Link which the Green Party also opposes. The proposed NWL would have a major detrimental impact on the River Wensum valley and its complex of fragile habitats and protected species such as otters and water voles.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Blind Lane	<p>Blind Lane/Taverham Road Junction.</p> <p>A Grade Separated junction was proposed in the side road and junction strategy for Option 2 [Option 3 in the SAR] dated 20 October 2016 in the position of the existing Honingham roundabout and not at Blind Lane/Taverham Road.</p> <p>The Scoping Report submitted to the Planning Inspectorate states that the eastern junction will be between Blind Lane and the existing Easton roundabout.</p> <p>Referring again to paragraph 2 page 2 of your letter dated 6 April 2020, you state that the two grade separated junctions were considered prior to the PRA and predate the Local Development Order (LDO) for the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ).</p> <p>Again, if this second junction had previously been considered why was it not shown on the PRA?</p> <p>In correspondence with Ms Liz Poole of Norfolk County Highways, she confirmed in an e-mail to CPRE Norfolk that there was "a lack of surety of HE proposals concerning the Easton roundabout".</p> <p>If there was an intention for this junction prior to the LDO and this was known to Norfolk County Council (NCC), it begs the question why it then requested a condition in the LDO that Blind Lane must be closed to traffic if and when direct access to the A47 is secured.</p> <p>In your fourth paragraph on page 2 you confirm that Blind Lane may be used to facilitate movement to and from the FEZ which goes against all planning approvals in the area which specifically denies this road to HGV traffic.</p> <p>We trust that your discussions with NCC as local highways authority mentioned in your letter will not be promoting the upgrade of Blind Lane</p>	Y	<p>The preferred route was announced in August 2017 indicating locations for the proposed junctions, and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p> <p>In line with Scheme objectives, in order to provide a more free-flowing network, the existing Easton roundabout is to be removed.</p> <p>It is not possible to locate the required form of junction, a fully grade separated junction, at the intersection of Church Lane / Dereham Road in the proposed scheme. The junction was positioned taking into account constraints, such as the Grade 1 listed St Peters Church, the Orsted pipeline route, Food Enterprise Zone development, Easton village and topography.</p> <p>The Junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation outlines the junction design in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) and based on the traffic modelling for the opening year (2025) and design year (2040).</p> <p>Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	other than by the developer which must include the provision of adequate cycleways.		The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.
Blind Lane	It results in atleast two new side roads which are not necessary and provides connections for Taverham Road and Blind Lane both of which are single track roads anyway.	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Blind Lane	the Blind Lane, Berry's Lane and other junction proposals are certain to create yet more rat-running through the surrounding villages. H.E.'s stated intent to maintain 'local connectivity' needs to be balanced by (NCC?) traffic management plans to prevent an escalation in the rat-running problem. As an example, I know of no local resident who currently needs Blind Lane to access the A47. All the very expensive addition of a new access to Blind Lane from the proposed roundabout will achieve is an unsustainable uplift in the rat running that already blights the area. What discussions has H.E. had with, for example, NCC to prevent this? Blind Lane could easily be closed to through traffic and many locals would actively encourage doing so.	Y	
Blind Lane	Why is there a junction at Blind Lane when this is due to be closed? Nobody is prepared to answer this question in a clear and honest way. Calling it the Norwich Road junction is very misleading and does not represent its location.	N	
Blind Lane	As an example, I know of no local resident who currently needs Blind Lane to access the A47. All the very expensive addition of a new access to Blind Lane from the proposed roundabout will achieve is an unsustainable uplift in the rat running that already blights the area. What discussions has H.E. had with, for example, NCC to prevent this?	Y	
Blind Lane	Hopefully if Blind Lane is to be used as the access for the LDO, the cost should be borne by the developer. Unfortunately, it will be that the £1m grant from the public purse to improve Church Lane and construct an entrance will have been largely wasted.	Y	
Blind Lane	The proposed eastbound section from Blind Lane to the Easton area needs to have a longer onramp. This is due to the large number of vehicles joining at peak morning period from Honingham (currently slowed by a single traffic light at the Honingham roundabout) The large number of joining vehicles will cause the existing eastbound A47 traffic to slow.	Y	
Blind Lane	There will be an impact on other local roads as a result of this Scheme. In particular the Scheme will mean that the large amount of vehicles that currently travel via Ringland Hills to/from Easton roundabout, will have to double back towards the Blind Lane junction, before joining the A47. My	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	worry is that this traffic will travel via the centre of Ringland, along Honingham Lane/Taverham Road to join the Blind Lane junction instead.		
Blind Lane	There is already too much use of this road by traffic wanting to get through to the Watton Road and to Wymondham at rush hour. If you improve access to Blind Lane from the new roundabout this will become worse. Additionally, this access to Blind Lane would encourage large articulated lorries to use it for access to the Condimentum site on Church Lane and Honingham Thorpe Farm.	Y	
Blind Lane	it seems inevitable that the new side road connection to Blind Lane will lead to a considerable increase in traffic through Barford, past its primary school, and through the parish of Marlingford and Colton.	Y	
Blind Lane	There will be a 'knock-on' effect on other local roads as a result of this Scheme. In particular the Scheme, if constructed as planned, will deter the large amount of traffic that currently travels via Ringland Hills/Church Lane/Easton roundabout, as it will have to double back towards the Blind Lane junction.	Y	
Blind Lane	There is already a well-used route, including including HGV traffic, linking the 61108 at Barford to the A47 at Easton: the route is B1108 - Cock Street, Barford - Chapel Street - Cotton Road (to its junction with Blind Lane) - then Red Barn Lane/ Church Lane to Easton. One factor in its attraction for traffic is that it is a priority gritted route - the only such route between the Southern Bypass and the B1135, from Kimberley, on the B1108, to Dereham. Unless the southern part of Blind Lane is closed, it seems inevitable that the new side road connection to Blind Lane will lead to a considerable increase in traffic through Barford, past its primary school, and through the parish of Marlingford and Colton.	Y	
Bridge design	The cost of one bridge by our church should be no more than the saving on Norwich road junction. The bridge will allow the final path of drawing to move further away (west) of our church. Bund lane bridge only needs to be for walking and cycling. If the church bridge is too much money the	N	Following Statutory Consultation feedback, the Norwich Road Junction was moved further east. A pedestrian & cyclist route including an underpass, has also been included linking Honingham to St Andrews Church.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	Highways England should go back to 'our' MP's and ask for an increase in funding to do 'the right thing' after all they found billions from HS2!		
Bridge design	Existing road through Hockering bridged over new road (with no junction) – permits continued access to remains of Gypsy Lane (top portion would be taken by dualled road), Albatross Road, lower half of Sandy Lane (Thompson's scrapyard) and Church Lane E Tud.	Y	Following Statutory Consultation feedback, a new Mattishall Lane Link Road underpass has been provided to allow access between Hockering and the south side of the A47 dual carriageway, such as southern end of Gypsy Lane and Church Lane.
Church Lane	The current proposal for a link road connecting Church Lane and the "dumbbell" roundabouts at the proposed Berrys Lane junction concerns me for the following reasons. The additional 'land take' required to establish the link road will require further encroachment down Church Lane over and above that needed for the new dual carriageway itself, thereby causing an even greater environmental and amenity impact on the residents of Church Lane and Rotten Row.	Y	In response to various Statutory Consultation feedback, the side road connection to the north side of the A47 between Wood Lane and Church Lane was removed.
Church Lane	For example, the views of the people in Rotten Row and Church Lane should take precedence over the views of people further afield regarding the Church Lane to Wood Lane junctions new side road. This is one example where the money saved by not building this unnecessary side road could be used instead to protect the residents of Rotten Row and Church Lane from increased noise, pollution, etc. The provision of banking / funds and trees and other forms of screening for example.	Y	
Church Lane	As the current plans (Dec' 2019) for the dualling of the A47 mean that the crossroads at the top of Church Lane will now be closed to motor vehicles, the people in the village 'proper' of East Tuddenham, i.e, not those living in Rotten Row or Church Lane, will access the new A47 via the Berry's Lane roundabout given that this is the quicker route on better, wider roads. Consequently, the only people that the "slip road / connecting road' along the A47 between Church Lane and Berry's Lane would affect are those living In Church Lane, Rotten Row and the property just off the A47 at grid reference [Editor's note: personal details removed].	Y	In light of Statutory Consultation feedback, the side road between Church Lane and Wood Lane Junction, south side of the A47, was removed from the design.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Church Lane	<p>If the property at grid reference [Editor's note: personal details removed] is glen acres via the Berry's Lane roundabout there is no need for this slip/connecting road, as all residents in Church Lane and Rotten Row will still have the necessary access. To be clear, I do not want a slip/connecting road running parallel with the A47 between Church Lane and Berry's Lane, as I can access my property/business by turning onto Church Lane from Mattishall Road, and I can access the A47 toward Dereham or Norwich via the proposed roundabout at Berry's Lane.</p>	Y	
Church Lane	<p>The additional 'land take' required to establish the link road will require further encroachment down Church Lane over and above that needed for the new dual carriageway itself, thereby causing an even greater environmental and amenity impact on the residents of Church Lane and Rotten Row.</p> <p>Church Lane is already used as a 'rat run' by care and HGV's to access the A47 from the Mattishall-Norwich road. As a single track road with no properly established passing places this already causes significant safety issues for pedestrians and residents of Church Lane and Rotten Row in terms of both visibility and inappropriately high vehicle speeds.</p> <p>The building of a link road between Church Lane and the Berrys Lane junction on the new A47 dual carriageway will inevitably mean that this "rat running" will increase as road users will almost certainly "deem" this to be a "faster" option for missing the Berrys Lane junction particularly in periods of heavier traffic. Whether or not it is in reality "faster" is irrelevant as Highways England will be very aware from last experience that if "rat run" is available it will be used!</p> <p>With these impacts on Church Lane/Rotten Row residents and on the basis of the assumption that the link road is being proposed for their "benefit" is difficult understand the reasons and hence the not insignificant expenditure that will be required to establish the link road.</p>	Y	
Church Lane	<p>Regarding the new proposed road running from Church Lane through to Wood Lane plus the proposed slip road off the new A 47 to the proposed roundabout, it seems there is an unnecessary amount of new road, where one road could have been utilised to cover both scenarios.</p>	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Church Lane	I would like to request, along with the rest of my neighbourhood (Majority agreement), that the proposed slip road/access lane/track, between Berry's Lane & Church lane East Tuddenham should be dropped from the design, as this is going to encourage & send people Rat Running at peak times through this small narrow hamlet, also people also trying to avoid the dangerous Berry's Lane / Barnham Broom Rd /Mattishall Rd Crossroads through this small low level hamlet, which already suffer from serious flooding in times of rain and accidents by people cutting through fast & dangerously during A47 incidents e.g.; RTC's Road works etc.	Y	
Church Lane	Church Lane is already used as a 'rat run" by care and HGV's to access the A47 from the Mattishall-Norwich road. As a single-track road with no properly established passing places this already causes significant safety issues for pedestrians and residents of Church Lane and Rotten Row in terms of both visibility and inappropriately high vehicle speeds.	Y	
Church Lane	Of far more pressing need is the work required to Church Lane itself order to make it a safe and suitable means of access for the residents of Church Lane and Rotten Row. During the winter months Church Lane is often flooded at multiple points with heavy mud deposition due to the constant run-off from the Alston fields due to a complete lack of maintenance of ditches and drainage points. Whilst recognizing that some form of integrated plan is required given the traffic flow changes brought about both during the construction and the operation of the new dual carriageway.his work and hence the funding is a matter for Norfolk CC and not Highways England, common sense should be dictate.	Y	
Church Lane	In building the slip/connecting road there is also an environmental cost with even more countryside being built upon. Not only would it adversely affect the countryside that residents have chosen to live in for many years, it would also have a further negative impact on wildlife and would bring roads even closer to peoples' properties.	Y	
Church Lane	The proposed twin track road would be built over countryside disturbing wildlife and ruining more countryside - I want to be able to see and hear the cuckoo, kites, buzzards and see the hares running through the field.	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Church Lane	The [REDACTED] appears to demolish a small sandpit surrounded by mostly (Editor's note: one word illegible) and trees. [REDACTED] contained a badger set for at least 20 years though it may not be permanently occupied. However, it was occupied in 2019 as an adult badger was a road casualty during the summer [REDACTED]	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains assessments of badger activity in 'Biodiversity Chapter 8' which was informed by badger surveys undertaken.
Church Lane	The closure of the access to the A47 at Church Lane will obviously have a significant impact on how traffic moves through Easton. The proposed new 'Norwich Road' Interchange will be approximately 1.5km west of the existing access to the A47 from Easton at the Dereham Road/Church Lane junction. All people travelling east from Easton will divert to the Longwater Interchange rather than add 3km to their journey to travel through the new 'Norwich Road' Interchange proposed.	N	The location of the Norwich Road junction is in line with a junction proposed west of Easton in the preferred route announcement. It is not possible to locate the required form of junction (a fully grade separated junction) at the intersection of Church Lane / Dereham Road in the proposed scheme. The junction was positioned taking into account constraints, such as the Grade 1 listed St Peters Church, the Orsted pipeline route, approved Food Enterprise Zone development, and topography.
Church Lane	Easton village accommodates a population of circa 900 residents, and also provides access to the A47 from Marlingford, Bawburgh, and from Easton College. Furthermore, there are 900 new homes with planning permission at Easton which are yet to be built.	N	
Church Lane	Diverting all eastbound trips from Easton through Longwater Interchange will have a significant impact on junction operation which has not been assessed in the Consultation documents.	N	
Church Lane	It has long been established by Norfolk County Council that improvements are required in the Longwater and Easton area of Norwich to resolve existing issues on the transport network and accommodate additional traffic arising from planned growth as set out in the adopted Joint Core Strategy for the Norwich area. Assessments carried out by Norfolk County Council in October 2015 concluded that an improvement Scheme costing in excess of £10million was required to avoid unacceptable queueing and delays at the Longwater Interchange in the future. At present there is no funding source identified for the improvements identified. The assessments carried out by Norfolk County Council assumed that the Easton roundabout with the A47 at Church Lane was retained. With the removal of this junction, the predicted issues at Longwater Interchange will be more severe.	N	Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR01003/APP/7.1) presents a transport assessment of the Scheme that considers the effects of the Scheme's interaction with future developments on the local road network. The scheme traffic modelling accounts for natural and planned growth within the traffic model uncertainty log. All developments, regardless of size, within 2km of the A47 corridor between the scheme sections which are classified as certain or more than likely have been included. All development with more than 50 dwellings or 50 jobs within 5km of the scheme

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Church Lane	<p>The 2040 forecasts on page 88 of A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Side Roads Strategy. predict 27 vehicles in the morning peak travelling west from Easton and turning under the A47 to the northern roundabout where they would join the eastbound A47. This is significantly less than the existing flows at the existing Easton Roundabout let alone any growth related to the Easton housing development. The Transport Assessment for the Easton housing development predicts that there would be 126 vehicles making this movement in 2021 with the proposed development in place. By 2040 this number is expected to be higher.</p> <p>The displaced traffic has to go to the Longwater Interchange and yet the A47 North Tuddenham to East Side Roads Strategy includes no assessment of Longwater Interchange.</p>	N	<p>which are classified as certain or more than likely have been included.</p>
Church Lane	<p>The RNAA have first-hand experience of the issues at Longwater Interchange given the proximity to Norfolk Showground and are very concerned about the impact this will have on activities at the Showground and the surrounding area. Furthermore, capacity issues at Longwater Interchange are likely to cause safety issues on the A47 in the event of traffic queues extending onto the dual carriageway.</p> <p>A further concern is the prospect that all traffic from Easton and the proposed new housing will have to travel through Easton village incurring additional Environmental Impacts and a potential increase in safety risks which have not been assessed.</p>	N	
Church Lane (Dog Lane)	<p>With the construction of 1000 new homes in Easton. The new food hub in Easton. resident development at Taverham.</p> <p>If you do not close church lane to lower Easton. this rat run will only get worse. Highways England is well aware of this problem. it has been pointed out by me and other residents on numerous complaints. to no avail.</p> <p>I cannot believe you not taking this opportunity to rectify this problem. when it is so simple. close Church Lane.</p>	N	<p>Following Statutory Consultation and further engagement with the Local Liaison Group and Norfolk County Council, the side road connection between Taverham Road and Church Lane was removed. The proposed scheme now closes Church Lane to through traffic.</p> <p>The scheme traffic modelling accounts for natural and planned growth within the traffic model uncertainty log. All developments, regardless of size, within 2km of the A47 corridor</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			<p>between the scheme sections which are classified as certain or more than likely have been included. All development with more than 50 dwellings or 50 jobs within 5km of the scheme which are classified as certain or more than likely have been included.</p> <p>Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.</p>
Church Lane (Dog Lane)	Given their proximity to the junction improvements at Church Lane and Taverham Road, the PEIR admits (# 5.6.5) that 'There will be an unavoidable impact' on the setting of the Grade I Listed St Peter's and Grade II* Listed St Andrew's Churches, but merely states that 'During design development, mitigation measures to reduce this potential impact will be investigated'	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains assessments on cultural heritage (Chapter 6), including these Listed Buildings, and proposes mitigation measures where required.
Church Lane (Dog Lane)	t Peter	N	The need case and benefits of the Scheme are presented in the Case for the Scheme (TR01003/APP/7.1) .
Church Lane (Dog Lane)	I cannot see the point of reconnecting this notorious rat run. Why are you doing this? Ringland residents can use Taverham road. lower Easton has only a few residents. of which I am one. Most of the resident wish you would close Church Lane. Why are you reconnecting this rat run at great expense and for who?	Y	Following Statutory Consultation and further engagement with the Local Liaison Group and Norfolk County Council, the side road connection between Taverham Road and Church Lane was removed.
Church Lane (Dog Lane)	The proposed side road would just increase the appalling amount of traffic (over 1000 vehicles a day during rush hour 7-9am and 4-6pm that exists at the moment. It would also make it even more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists to access the main village of Easton than it is at present. The new side road would encourage goods vehicles to travel through Lower Easton causing congestion at the various pinch points where the road	Y	The proposed scheme now closes Church Lane to through traffic.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	narrows. Using Weston Road (which exists already) would deter traffic from using the Ringland Hills rat run to get from Taverham to the A47 Norwich southern bypass.		
Church Lane (Dog Lane)	There is already access to the southern end of Taverham Road from Ringland Road as it passes over Ringland Hills and that is Weston Road. Allowing traffic to continue to flow down the entire length of Ringland Road to use Church Lane and then a new side road will only make the rat running worse through Lower Easton. We who live here have suffered enough with 30ton articulated lorries struggling past our houses on this single-track lane.	Y	Following Statutory Consultation and further engagement with the Local Liaison Group and Norfolk County Council, the side road connection between Taverham Road and Church Lane was removed. The proposed scheme now closes Church Lane to through traffic.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Church Lane (Dog Lane)	<p>I feel that there has been a total lack of thought or investigation into the impact of the connection of Dereham Road (Easton) to the Norwich Road junction via the new side road.</p> <p>These changes will mean that residents of Easton will now have to go on a journey towards Dereham just to get the new A47 even if they wish to head towards Norwich or further East. this is effectively cutting off one end of the village from direct access to the A47.</p> <p>This I believe will then mean that residents will not use this route but head through the village past the Norfolk showground on the Dereham Road to the Longwater Roundabout complex.</p> <p>This roundabout is already heavily used especially at peak times so this will make it a complete nightmare to use and it will make it gridlocked. It already has traffic coming off the A47 to get to Easton, Costessey, Bowthorpe etc. as well as traffic coming from city on the Dereham Road to get access to the A47.</p> <p>The plans to make changes to this roundabout are also ridiculous and will further create problems. The plan to put a teardrop island on it will make it inaccessible for people from Easton to get to the park and ride, and with the changes in this plan it will make it a complete disaster.</p> <p>In addition, the Longwater Roundabout is completely unable to cope with traffic on Norfolk Show days etc. so these changes to the A47 will only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Additionally, with all the planned new houses that are in the pipeline for Easton (circa 900) I cannot see how these plans will help. It will only result in a major headache for residents.</p> <p>More forward planning needs to be done to look at the future needs of Easton not just today!</p>	N	<p>The preferred route was announced in August 2017 indicating locations for the proposed junctions, and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p> <p>In line with Scheme objectives, in order to provide a more free-flowing network, the existing Easton roundabout is to be removed.</p> <p>It is not possible to locate the required form of junction, a fully grade separated junction, at the intersection of Church Lane / Dereham Road in the proposed scheme. The junction was positioned taking into account constraints, such as the Grade 1 listed St Peters Church, the Orsted pipeline route, Food Enterprise Zone development, Easton village and topography.</p> <p>The Junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation outlines the junction design in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) and based on the traffic modelling for the opening year (2025) and design year (2040).</p> <p>Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR01003/APP/7.1) presents a transport assessment of the Scheme that considers the effects of the Scheme's interaction with future developments on the local road network.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			Plans to upgrade the Longwater junction are not something that the project team can comment on as this is out with the remit of this consultation
Climate	Norfolk County Council has accepted there is a climate and ecosystem emergency, why on earth would you be spending money to build new roads?	N	The Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) presents the need case for the Scheme supported by a transport assessment (Chapter 4) and economic assessment (Chapter 5). The NPS NN Accordance Tables (TR010038/APP/7.2) present a review of
Climate	Increasing road capacity would attract more traffic, increase journey speeds and increase carbon emissions. This is incompatible with the Climate emergency and the UK legal requirement to achieve net zero carbon by 2050.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Climate	Most seriously however, in view of the UK's commitments to achieve 'net zero' carbon emissions by 2050, it is admitted (# 1.16.4) that 'The Scheme is anticipated to generate an increase in carbon emissions during both construction and operation', and though 'Changes in climate have the potential to impact Scheme assets and environmental receptors during operation and pose a potential risk', any substantive mitigation measures are left to be 'outlined' in the Environmental Statement (# 13.6.4-5).	N	<p>compliance with the NPS.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains an assessment on carbon and climate impacts (Chapter 14).</p>
Climate	Greater road capacity leads to more traffic, more speed, and more carbon emissions. The Prelim. Environmental Information Report confirms that that would be the consequence of the Scheme. There is a climate emergency and the Scheme would go against the UK's legal requirement to reach net zero carbon by 2050.	N	
Climate	The Preliminary Environmental Information Report acknowledges the likely outcome of increasing traffic and therefore carbon emissions, at a time when it is vital to move towards government targets for net zero by 2050, rather than away from this legally binding goal.	N	
Climate	In addition, increasing road capacity would increase carbon emissions (even if all vehicles switched to EVs, there is still a very high level of embodied emissions in both the construction of the EVs and of the road). This is incompatible with the need to reduce emissions in the climate emergency.	N	
Climate	Global heating as a result of man-made CO2 emissions is causing an increase in frequency of extreme weather events, flooding, drought and is impacting negatively on all aspects of society. Transport is one of the most significant contributions to UK CO2 emissions and the central focus of transport policy should be to reduce CO2 emissions.	N	
Climate	Building extra road capacity to open up green field sites for development would increase reliance on car use. This is contrary to the stated aim of the DfT 'Decarboning Transport' to make public transport, walking and cycling the preferred choice of travel for daily activities in order to radically cut transport carbon.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Climate	<p>The Court of Appeal decision on Heathrow exposed that aviation national planning policy is not</p> <p>The same is true of the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS). You will be aware the NNNPS was written prior to the Paris Agreement and the Government's new target of net zero carbon emissions by 2050. While the NNNPS acknowledges the benefits of shifting traffic from road to rail and other sustainable modes, it then does little to deter increasing road traffic and emissions. Indeed, if anything the NNNPS downplays the impact new roads will have, stating:</p> <p>"It is very unlikely that the impact of a road project will, in isolation, affect the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction plan targets..."fit for purpose to tackle rising carbon emissions from transport.</p>	N	
Climate	<p>"The Government has an overarching national carbon reduction strategy (as set out in the Carbon Plan 2011) which is a credible plan for meeting carbon budgets. It includes a range of non-planning policies which will... ensure that any carbon increases from road development do not compromise its overall carbon reduction commitments... Therefore, any increase in carbon emissions is not a reason to refuse development consent, unless the increase in carbon emissions resulting from the Scheme are so significant that it would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets."</p> <p>This, we submit, ignores the cumulative effect of the whole roads programme, of which this project is a major part, in driving up traffic and therefore emissions.</p> <p>We would also submit that the Government does not have a credible plan to reduce emissions, from transport, and that new road-building is helping to fuel an increase. We say this with reference to the findings of the Committee on Climate Change that has criticised the Government's lack of progress on tackling climate change, while surface transport emissions have risen over the past 5 years, and are higher now than they were in 1990.</p>	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>We therefore consider the programme is legally challengeable on the same grounds as the Heathrow case. For this and for the other reasons outlined we would kindly urge you to pause this project for immediate review.</p>		
Climate	<p>All four Benefit Cost Ratios (BCRs) at Appendix L of the 2020 consultation documents show an increase in carbon emissions over the life of the road which is contrary to the Government's target of zero carbon by 2050. Surely this is unacceptable.</p>	N	
Climate	<p>The mitigation measures are nowhere near effective enough and, as has been conclusively demonstrated in the case of the NDR, require a vast outlay of public money to achieve nothing much more than 'environmental posturing'.</p>	N	
Compensation	<p>Farmers and local landowners who will be selling some of their land to enable the dual carriageway to be installed should be properly compensated.</p>	N	<p>Highways England has engaged with the affected landowners and will provide appropriate compensation for loss of land.</p>
Congestion	<p>Traffic builds up for a short time only in school term times. Most traffic coming off the already dualled parts of the A47 are exceeding the speed limits causing back up! If a 60mph sign was in place nearing the end of the dualled sections (Easton and Hockering) and speed cameras put in place the problem would dissipate.</p>	N	<p>Highways England aims to create a free-flowing section between North Tuddenham and Easton to alleviate congestion and improve safety on the Strategic Road Network (SRN).</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Congestion	The main reason put forward for the road is the relief of congestion and accidents. The road is currently not very busy outside rush hours. Congestion is caused by the two roundabouts at Mattishall Road and Easton. If these were replaced with traffic-light-controlled junctions, congestion and likelihood of accidents would be reduced.	N	Presently there are 41 direct accesses onto the A47 between North Tuddenham and Easton which directly contribute to increased journey times, congestions and a poor safety record.
Congestion	Also rat-running through villages in the Wensum Valley would be reduced, as motorists would not look for ways to avoid the roundabouts. This could be done quickly and the need for dualling, and its design, done in shorter order.	N	<p>The proposed scheme removes all direct accesses, and provides safe access to the SRN via the new junctions at Wood lane and Norwich Road.</p> <p>The junction and sideroad strategy report, outlines the junction selection criteria in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) and the scheme traffic forecast for the opening year (2020) and design year (2040). At grade junctions with traffic lights do not comply with the DMRB for the modelled flows, or comply with the scheme objectives.</p>
Consultation events	I was unable to attend any of the consultation events as I work away Monday to Friday.	N	<p>Noise and air quality has been assessed within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), within the DCO application, and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to reduce significant effects. Landscaping and biodiversity mitigation is proposed and designed into the environmental masterplan.</p> <p>Highways England held events in the directly affected parish council halls and also held an event on a weekend and in Norwich City Centre to for those who use this section of road to commute to work.</p>
Consultation events	Disappointed that there was no public consultation in Mattishall	N	
Consultation events	this Road is used by drivers right across Norfolk, the consultations were held nearby as if it were a local Scheme. Also, they were all very close together and I was unable to make it	N	
Consultation events	Failure to hold a consultation event in Ringland was a poor decision in view of the implications of the Scheme/Western Link Scheme	N	
Consultation events	I attended two meetings in North Tuddenham Village Hall and was overwhelmed by pictures or what the various junctions and stretches of road would look like but with little indication of which section I as looking at. The slide show did not seem to have any names on it and the pictures could really have been anywhere. I cannot imagine what all this cost. What was needed was precise locations written with important landmarks shown together with clear relationship between the old and new roads.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation events	The process is good, but the consultation event was staffed by people who did not know the area - some appeared to be overwhelmed by any questioning	N	Highways England added parish councils that were not directly affected to the S47 and advertised in the local media to ensure local residents living outside of the Primary Consultation Zone were informed
Consultation events	When I visited public consultation at village hall I asked about sound and pollution screening, visual effect of soundproof fencing. I got no absolute answers to my concerns	N	
Consultation further engagement	Please find attached the A47 Taskforce response to the Highways England consultation. All the parishes south of the A47 have had sight of this document and none have responded negatively to this way forward. We ask that these views be factored into the official HE consultation and ask for a reply to this email.	Y	Highways England has considered the A47 Task Force response and has continued to engage post Statutory Consultation. As a result of this process, the proposed scheme closes Berrys Lane to through traffic.
Consultation further engagement	We need assurances that the budget constraints will not lead to shortcuts on environmental protection.	N	<p>The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), contains an assessment of the direct and indirect effects of the Scheme related to direct loss, severance, air quality, noise pollution, changes in hydrology or drainage (incl. CWSs and pCWSs).</p> <p>The Environmental Statement, contains a biodiversity impact assessment of the construction and operational effects of the Scheme on local wildlife and habitats. Where needed, mitigation measures are proposed to avoid or reduce significant adverse effects.</p> <p>Noise and air quality has been assessed within the Environmental Statement, within the DCO application, and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to reduce significant effects.</p> <p>The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9).</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation further engagement	An overall consideration should be given to this A47 Scheme and with the Norwich Western Link being handled by one governing body (At present yourselves, Norfolk C.C. and Norwich City C. if the latter are involved) especially in view of the size of the whole Scheme. Also, the 'Norwich Western Link' should be viewed as the 'Northern branch' of the A47 complementing the 'Southern branch' completed some 30/40 years ago.	N	<p>Highways England is responsible for the Strategic Road Network and is promoting the improvement to the A47 between North Tuddenham and Easton. The proposed A47 scheme is a standalone scheme, being progressed under The Planning Act 2008, as a Development Consent Order (DCO), and with committed funding in place from the Department for transport (DfT)..</p> <p>The local highway authority, Norfolk County Council is promoting the Norwich Western Link (NWL) scheme, with a proposed connection to the A47 at Wood Lane. The NWL is subject to funding approval and following a different planning route.</p> <p>Highways England has engaged with NCC throughout and will continue to do so.</p>
Consultation further engagement	I understand Breckland D.C. and Dereham T.C. are considering the acquisition of land to the east of the town and joining the western end of the dualled section of the A47. The object would be to ease the considerable traffic bottlenecks in that area that houses 5 major food supermarkets, to allow easier access to and from the A47 going east and west. If this Scheme is going ahead it needs your consideration re this consultation.	N	Noted. The traffic modelling used to inform the A47 Scheme considers new developments in accordance with the Uncertainty principle, as prescribed by the Department of Transport; see Chapter 4 Transport Assessment of the Case for the Scheme (TR0100/38/APP/7.1) .
Consultation further engagement	The Council strongly believe there is still plenty of flexibility within the Scoping Boundary for HE to revise their junction strategy and make all junctions smaller, moving their locations to more appropriate locations at the same time as meeting the objectives of the project.	N	The justification and main design parameters for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, are outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>Consultation further engagement</p>	<p>Further to the multi parish meeting on 19/12/19 and our discussion at this meeting and subsequent e-mails, I have developed a bit further my idea for a new proposal for the WL NDR / new dualled A47 junction. I have discussed this at Honingham PC and separately with David Bishop. This is in line with the council's views which will be published and sent to you separately. I will also share this with the South A47 group. The enclosed map directionally sets out what I am proposing. Please forgive my somewhat amateur attempt to sketch</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The proposed A47 scheme is designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB), taking account of the existing traffic volumes and future modelling forecasts.</p> <p>The technical background to the junction decisions, are contained within the Junction & Sideroad Strategy report which was presented at Statutory Consultation, issued to the Parish council on USB, and is available on the Highways England scheme website.</p> <p>The proposed A47 scheme is a standalone scheme, being progressed under The Planning Act 2008, as a Development Consent Order (DCO), and with committed funding in place from the Department for transport (DfT).</p> <p>The Project Team met with a representative of Honingham Parish Council, at the event in Honingham, discussed the proposals tabled and explained the design approach undertaken in accordance with the UK DMRB.</p>
<p>Consultation further engagement</p>	<p>There is no mention of the impact of the proposed western link which will be far more important than these local links, and which needs to be both more prominent and detailed to allow proper inclusive consultation.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The consultation was for the dualling of the A47 between North Tuddenham and Easton promoted by Highways England. The proposed A47 scheme is a standalone scheme, being progressed under The Planning Act 2008, as a Development Consent Order (DCO), and with committed funding in place from the Department for Transport (DfT).</p> <p>Highways England will continue to work with Norfolk County Council, the promoter of the</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			Norwich Western Link scheme, on the interaction with the proposed A47.
Consultation further engagement	HE needs to decide whether it wishes to apply for a DCO specific to the A47 improvements only or an all-encompassing Scheme to include the changes for the NWL and FEZ. For the latter approach, the public should be provided the opportunity of further consultation to comment on this change of emphasis. Public opinion may change in favour of a preference to a new bypassed dualled section which would leave the whole of the existing road layout for rural traffic and reducing the requirement of feeder roads at the eastern end.	N	<p>The proposed A47 scheme is a standalone scheme, being progressed under The Planning Act 2008, as a Development Consent Order (DCO), and with committed funding in place from the Department for Transport (DfT).</p> <p>The proposed scheme will contain the option for the connection of the proposed Norwich Western Link scheme to the Wood Lane junction. However, if the Norwich Western Link scheme does not attain planning consent, then this connection will not be delivered.</p> <p>Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer.</p> <p>The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation further engagement	It is essential that Highways England engage with and work with Norfolk County Council on the effective mitigation of traffic flow effects outside the 300m area that you are concerned with if this road Scheme is to achieve the desired end result.	N	Highways England has worked with Norfolk County Council throughout the development of the scheme and will continue to do so.
Consultation information/materials	Plan on pages 16-17 do not make clear which is Church Lane, Berry Lane or Wood Lane	N	Comments on labelling of maps is noted and efforts will be made to better label future plans.
Consultation information/materials	It would have been helpful to have the named, affected roads labelled on your maps and the 2 proposed junctions named and eg Church Road (where?) Honingham? Easton?	N	
Consultation information/materials	Norwich Rd is not marked	N	
Consultation information/materials	Proof reading - Church Lane and Blind Lane are in the text and significant but not shown on either map in the consultation response form.	N	
Consultation information/materials	The way in which the consultation proposals and documents are presented excludes many members of the general public from taking part, largely because of the volume of material that has to be sifted through to discover the central points and also because of the overuse of jargon and acronyms.	N	
Consultation information/materials	Where is Church Lane (Dog Lane) on page 18/19 of the Consultation Document? Where is Blind Lane marked on the document?	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
<p>Consultation information/materials</p>	<p>I apologise that it has taken me so long to fill in this form. I have attempted to do so several times but found certain questions impossible to answer due to the impression of the maps. When trying to locate myself on these maps I have been unable to find the obvious landmarks to navigate by - so I have put it all aside in frustration.</p> <p>To explain myself in more detail I am including this letter to explain exactly where I have found the problems. In general, unimportant buildings seem to have been put in at random and very important routes left completely unmarked. The network of pale grey lines surrounding the proposed route are not at all clear or even accurate. I do wonder if any local advice was asked for and if anyone working on the maps came to survey the vital surrounding routed between villages or important buildings for residents. Looking at p. 14 of the Consultation Document, starting with the western/righthand section of the route (which, as you will see from my address, is of most concern to me and the villagers of North Tuddenham) please note the following omissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The bridge over the bypass is not clearly marked - To the north of the bridge, Dereham Rd. (originally the A47) is not marked - The very important route to the A1067 Fakenham Rd. via Lyng is not marked. This has now become an important route for large lorries going between the A1067 and the A47 and these travel at great speed. As a T junction is proposed here to take traffic to and from Hockering, surely this should be clearer? - Hall Lane, off the Dereham Rd. is not marked and on your previous maps was marked as 'Hill Lane'. - South of the bridge, Fox Lane is not mentioned at all. This is an exceptionally busy route already and takes villagers and traffic coming off the A47 into N. Tuddenham and on to Mattishall with its Surgery and school and shops etc. This is already an overused and narrow lane/route with exceptionally deep potholes which will become far worse when traffic to and from Hockering uses this route when the present access roads are cut off. - Low Rd. North Tuddenham is not mentioned and neither are the Church or Village Hall. Instead, various random dwellings are mentioned that are 	<p>N</p>	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>not obvious landmarks at all. They were not familiar to me. In the Hockering section there are very few landmarks of importance or street names indicated for one to navigate by - as above. The same problems exist at proposed Church Lane/Sandy Lane junction. The Response form asks for feedback but on the map, page 16 of the Consultation booklet, Church Lane is not mentioned nor a direction to Mattishall Rd (important route again). With reference to the Berry's Lane/ Dereham Rd/ Wood Lane connections at Honingham I have the following to say. Once again, reading the map, Berry's Lane has not been mentioned and yet you refer to it in the Response form. I also note that the River Tud has not been shown here. Surely this is important?</p>		
Consultation information/materials	It would help if all these access points were clearly marked and named on the map. - Why did this not happen?	N	
Consultation information/materials	Looking at the plans it is difficult to ascertain the locations for walking; cycling and horse riding, this needs to be made clearer on the plans.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation information/materials	You do not show where the pink lines go to and from. What do they link up to? What do you think they will link up to in the future? I am not saying don't do them, but context and explanation would be good.	N	
Consultation information/materials	I have found your maps and diagrams difficult [Editor's Note: 1 illegible word] almost none of the small connecting roads 2 routed or landmark sites have been included so it is difficult to see the relationship between the old road and the proposed new one. There is no logic in what has been included and what has not!	N	
Consultation information/materials	Was there a local person advising on these maps?	N	
Consultation information/materials	<p>There are several issues arising from a review of this document. Side road and junction strategy. Highways England seems to have belatedly understood the complexities of the extensive side road and junction requirements associated with the various options. These requirements were considered for those four options presented to the 2017 Public Consultation only out of the original fourteen options.</p> <p>These side road and junction strategies are only now presented in the Appendices attached to the 2020 Public Consultation despite all being dated 20 October 2016.</p> <p>None of these were presented in the 2017 Public Consultation but we consider these are fundamental for the proper understanding and consideration for the preferences.</p>	N	<p>The preferred route was announced in August 2017 indicating locations for the proposed junctions, and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p> <p>The design has progressed to incorporate a junction and side road strategy that Highways England consulted on in 2020 to inform the final design to be taken through to the DCO submission.</p>
Consultation information/materials	Highways England have been shy in showing the public the large spread and impact of the Grade separated junctions proposed with most people not aware of the dumbbell roundabouts and link roads proposed.	N	Highways England has considered the response

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation information/materials	<p>The four presented options indicated junctions as follows:</p> <p>Option 1 [SAR Option 1] –Junctions to existing dualled carriageway at North Tuddenham and Easton. No intermediate junctions.</p> <p>Option 2 [SAR Option 3] -Junctions to existing dualled carriageway at North Tuddenham and Easton. No intermediate junctions.</p> <p>Option 3 [SAR Option 4] -Junctions to existing dualled carriageway at North Tuddenham and Easton. Intermediate junction at Church Lane/Sandy Lane.</p> <p>Option 4 [SAR Option 6] -Junctions to existing dualled carriageway at North Tuddenham and Easton. No intermediate junctions.</p> <p>No side roads were presented for any of the four options, apart from the retention of the existing single carriageway A47 where unaffected by that particular option, despite preliminary ideas being proposed.</p> <p>Why were the side road and junction proposals not presented within the 2017 Public Consultation? The absence of this vital information is misleading to the whole consultation invalidating the process.</p>	N	at the Statutory Consultation when producing the final design.
Consultation information/materials	Details of the two junctions and their locations only appeared at the last moment just before the Honingham Parish Council consultation.	N	
Consultation information/materials	The Coronavirus crisis is very significantly suppressing local traffic below levels before the NDR was built. Any traffic surveys conducted during the 'lock down' will grossly and misleadingly understate traffic flows in the local area. Any data captured in this period will be badly flawed.	N	Traffic data from pre Covid-19 was used, with supplementary local road traffic surveys undertaken in October 2019.
Consultation information/materials	The Preferred Route selection and announcement are therefore misleading, and the public has only now been offered a chance to comment on the side road and junction strategy for one of the four original options, which we consider to be unacceptable.	N	<p>The preferred route was announced in August 2017 and can be found on the Highways England Website.</p> <p>The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation information/materials	The question here (Editor's note: referring to Question 9a) is inappropriate/misleading, I think – it's a strangely simple question (designed to suggest to responders that the overall issue of Scheme approval or otherwise is a simple one?) for a not-so-simple issue: it allows for no conditionality.	N	Highways England recognised that consultees may want to provide additional information or comment on specific aspects of the Scheme when providing feedback. In these instances, in the consultation response form Highways England provided follow-up open questions (Question 9b and 10b) with text boxes to allow respondents to provide additional information and raise any specific concerns they had about the Scheme plans presented. Highways England also welcomed feedback in other formats such as letters and emails.
Consultation information/materials	This question (Editor's note: referring to Question 10a) is misleading and does not provide a clear opportunity to respond to the strategy for each section of the current A47, each of which is being treated differently.	N	In addition to the technical materials presented at the consultation, Highways England provided a consultation summary brochure. This was written in plain English and provided a short overview with supporting maps to present the Scheme proposals in an accessible way. In the consultation materials Highways England noted that people could contact it if they were having difficulties accessing the consultation information.
Consultation information/materials	The way in which the consultation proposals and documents are presented excludes many members of the general public from taking part, largely because of the volume of material that has to be sifted through to discover the central points and also because of the overuse of jargon and acronyms. There needs to be an abridged version of the proposals in clear language that genuinely sets out to engage those affected.	N	Details of the traffic modelling and consideration of NWL are presented in Chapter 4 Transport Assessment of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) . The scheme traffic modelling accounts for natural and planned growth within the traffic model uncertainty log. All developments, regardless of size, within 2km of the A47 corridor between the scheme sections which are classified as certain or more than likely have been included.
Consultation information/materials	We need to understand the traffic growth figures reflected in the designs and BCRs. Perversely, traffic growth is shown as a benefit in the BCRs as the new road is anticipated to quicken journeys. Nowhere in the documents can we find assumptions of future traffic predictions and whether this will continually increase or the modal shift to other forms of transport in reverse this current trend. We consider that the current Greater Norwich local plan consultations overstate figures for the FEZ. Our understanding is that employment numbers for the LDO area is less than 900 and we would like details to ensure HE are using realistic projections for your designs and BCRs. Also, it is essential to understand your projections of traffic to and from a possible NWL affecting the calculations.	N	Details of the traffic modelling and consideration of NWL are presented in Chapter 4 Transport Assessment of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) . The scheme traffic modelling accounts for natural and planned growth within the traffic model uncertainty log. All developments, regardless of size, within 2km of the A47 corridor between the scheme sections which are classified as certain or more than likely have been included.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			All development with more than 50 dwellings or 50 jobs within 5km of the scheme which are classified as certain or more than likely have been included.
Consultation predetermination	Perfect the whole Scheme has been decided and any comments will be ignored	N	Highways England presented the route options during the public consultation in 2017 and subsequently announced the Preferred Route Announcement in August of 2017 after taking account of the feedback received.
Consultation predetermination	Peoples concerns are too easily dismissed. Remember we live here and have to live with this when you have moved on to other things.	N	
Consultation predetermination	If this proposal is the result of 3 years of various consultations I and most of local parishioners have serious doubts about our views being 'really' considered. Perhaps they will now	N	The design has progressed to incorporate a junction and side road strategy that Highways England consulted on in 2020 to inform the final design to be taken through to the DCO submission
Consultation predetermination	Unfortunately, it does seem that many of the comments made to Highways England before the start of the consultation process have been ignored. Highways England need to be able to show that they do take account of the comments made now!	N	Highways England has considered the consultee responses at the Statutory Consultation when producing the final design.
Consultation predetermination	I feel that the consultation process regarded the needs of pedestrian access from Lower Easton to the village of Easton as an irritation that can be ignored.	N	
Consultation predetermination	At various times over the past three years Honingham Parish Council has made clear its views on nearby junctions. Broadland District Council decided to close Blind Lane. Norfolk County Council decided the place for a junction with Norwich Western Link Highways England proposed a new junction north of Easton Church And now Highways England appear to have decided to ignore all of this. The process has been extremely confusing, and this results in a lack of confidence that the consultation is any more than a paper exercise	N	The revised scheme design takes into account feedback, and has notable changes as a result.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation predetermination	It has been going on for years and still seems to ignore most of the comments that have been made. Hopefully these comments will be repeated and given proper consideration in this consultation.	N	
Consultation predetermination	I am not sure why the word 'consultation' is used to describe this process when HE has not taken account of feedback given during this process. It is very disappointing that you are indicating that the Scheme design is not necessarily going to change	N	
Consultation predetermination	I think you can very cleverly tick the box that states 'have consulted with the public' but there is a difference between that and actually listening to local people and be interested in what they tell you. I firmly believe that you will do whatever you wish and have no regard to local thoughts on this matter.	N	
Consultation predetermination	to be honest i don't have much hope that my voice will be heard - i think people with power and money have done deals and it is fundamentally a corrupt system about making money not about serving the community	N	
Consultation predetermination	In your preferred route Option 2 Document August 2017 you said, key concerns raised by the public regarding Option 2 have influenced a realignment which means it can be built with less impact during construction and the existing road can Remain for local traffic movements, pedestrians , cyclists and equestrians. What happened to that promise to the people of Honingham	N	
Consultation process	we consider the lack of consideration of the side road and junction strategies is a major failing of the 2017 consultation process which should have also included as a base for comparison an option for a non-dualled solution with safety and junction improvements, assuming the 'Do Nothing' scenario is discounted.	N	Highways England considered the concerns of option 2 from the feedback received at the public consultation around noise and also considered the ease of construction and potential for the old

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation process	<p>Selection of the Preferred Option from the 2017 Public Consultation. We appreciate that there were many competing and conflicting opinions and preferences arising out of the 2017 Consultation, primarily concerning the impact on the various villages along the route.</p> <p>It is evident from the 2017 Consultation Report that many respondents supported the Preferred Route Option 2 as it basically followed the existing A47 for most of its route.</p> <p>It is disappointing that Option 2 as proposed in the Preferred Route Announcement (PRA) dated August 2017 is now offline for the majority of this length. In fact, the Preferred Route is more akin to Option 10 in the SAR which was deemed not one of the four most favourable to be presented in the 2017 Public Consultation.</p> <p>The Preferred Route Option also introduced an intermediate junction at Church Lane/Sandy Lane similar to that proposed in Option 3 of the 2017 Public Consultation.</p> <p>Again, we refer to the side road and junction strategy for Option 2 [Option 3 in the SAR] dated 20 October 2016. This shows 2 intermediate junctions, an At-grade at Wood Lane and a Grade Separated junction roughly in the location of the existing Honingham roundabout.</p>	N	<p>A47 to be used for pedestrians, walking, cycling, horse riding and local traffic.</p> <p>The preferred route was announced in August 2017 and can be found on the Highways England Website.</p> <p>The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p> <p>The proposed junctions are designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) taking into account the traffic modelling for the scheme opening year (2025) and design year (2040).</p> <p>This is presented within the junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation.</p>
Consultation process	I have put forward to Jerome Mayhew MP and George Foreman MP. my design for the Easton to Wood lane section. These maps have been given to all concerned including you and [REDACTED], Honingham Parish Council and selected interested parties. A copy is enclosed!	N	
Consultation process	Not nearly enough liaison over the effects on the local road network has taken place, despite assurances. Meetings promised by HE with NCC, parishes, for early 2020 did not take place.	N	Due to Covid-19 restrictions Highways England has offered virtual meetings regarding the side roads.
Consultation process	Highways England and Norfolk County Council are both involved in this section of the A47 dualling because of the proposed NWL, but there is little evidence of these two bodies working collaboratively.	N	Highways England held regular meetings with Norfolk Council and joined the Local Liaison Group meetings enabling a collaborative approach.
Consultation process	Norfolk County Council have not made a case for the road.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation process	The entire process and its lack of coordination with Norfolk County Council, Broadland District Council and Honingham Parish Council does not inspire any confidence in a sensible outcome.	N	Highways England has also held regular meetings with the affected district councils and has obtained Statements of Common Ground, which outline the issues discussed between the parties and whether they have been agreed, are not agreed or are on-going.
Consultation process	Why do you keep having consultations and changing what has been previously agreed?	N	The justification for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017) which was available on the HE project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation. Highways England have held a non-statutory consultation and statutory consultation to obtain the views of the public.
Consultation process	Not nearly enough options were considered in the early stages; not one of the 15+ considered a route N of Hill House Hockering, which would take the road well away from the sensitive R Tud, habitation in E Tuddenham and Honingham, and join easily with B1535.	N	
Consultation process	Nevertheless, we are where we are and an upgrade for this stretch of road has been approved by the Government. We appreciate that Highways England are simply following the agenda set by others to design the road as part of the Strategic Road Network which would be relatively straightforward if we were starting from a blank page and a limitless budget with the aim of achieving a solution without damage to Norfolk's unique countryside. Designing changes to an existing road system which has evolved over hundreds of years was never going to be straightforward as is now apparent.	N	
Consultation process	We have serious concerns that the Public Consultations are woefully inadequate. The information provided in 2017 did not contain important details of the side road and junction strategies or a base non-dualled solution. The responses from the public may be different if this information was known. The PRA proposed an option not presented in the Consultation Documentation and we are now being asked to comment on the development of this proposal with little or no chance of making fundamental changes or indeed going back to other options.	N	The preferred route was announced in August 2017 identifying the route to be further developed and indicating locations for the proposed junctions. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) .

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation process	The needs of people in local villages outside the area immediately affected have not been considered.	N	Letters were issued to all residents of the parishes affected by the Scheme, thereby reaching people beyond the immediate Scheme; the extent of coverage is explained in the Consultation Report (TR0100/38/APP/5.1) .
Consultation process	We are relatively newly moved to the area so we may have missed early phases in this consultation, but my overall feeling is that the plans as they are now are too far advanced for the consultation to have any real impact	N	Statutory Consultation feedback has influenced the design, as reflected in the Consultation Report (TR010038/APP/5.1) .
Consultation process	More importantly, there is no clear evidence of effective coordination between Highways England responsible for the A47 and Norfolk County Council responsible for the (still unfunded) Norwich Western Link Road (NWLR)	N	Highways England have held regular meetings with Norfolk Council, the Norwich Western Link development team and are part of the Local Liaison Group meetings enabling a collaborative approach.
Consultation process	The consultations cannot and must not be separate especially regarding to the Wood Lane junction since traffic there will greatly increase because of the NWLR. That increase in traffic will affect the villages south of the A 47. The issues must be addressed holistically not separately.	N	Highways England consulted on route options during the public consultation in 2017
Consultation process	More consultation required on the effects of the proposed route on traffic, residents and businesses south of the A47. Without this any decision taken is misguided.	N	Highways England considered feedback from the parish councils including the East Tuddenham parish council in relation to Church Lane.
Consultation process	The points raised by residents who are most impacted by the proposals should carry more weight than comments from groups further removed from the route. For example, the views of the people in Rotten Row and Church Lane should take precedence over the views of people further afield regarding the Church Lane to Wood Lane junctions new side road.	N	Highways England also engaged with Norfolk County Council regarding impacts on traffic movements in regard to the A47 dualling and the Norwich Western Link.
Consultation process	A Scheme such as this is presented as the only option for dealing with congestion, but I'd like to see a much wider range of ideas put forward for consultation.	N	
Consultation process	It is essential that consultation responses from the affected local communities, in particular their Parish Councils, are not only listened to but incorporated into the proposals where possible.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation process Covid 19	No one can attend public events now do you should stand this aside for at least two years from when pandemic ends and think it through properly. Hopefully by then you not the government will have the money to proceed it will all have been used up protecting people to keep them alive. Just as it always needed to be	N	<p>Despite Covid-19, Highways England successfully completed the consultation events for the Statutory Consultation held in 2020 and all consultation material has been available online.</p> <p>The Scheme still aims to deliver the objectives and support economic growth as detailed in the Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>The scheme has committed funding in place which will not be affected by the current pandemic.</p> <p>The traffic modelling and scheme economics consider low & high growth scenarios when assessing the schemes value for money.</p>
Consultation process Covid 19	The long-term impact of coronavirus on the economy, population and human health is unpredictable. However, a major economic downturn is generally agreed to be inevitable, and any resumption of previous activity will be seriously delayed. There may be other spending priorities Therefore, the decision could easily be delayed until demand becomes more predictable	N	
Consultation process Covid 19	In view of COVID19 the face to face consultations can no longer take place but perhaps these could be rearranged or placed online?	N	
Consultation process Covid 19	As for what happens next, I imagine circumstances have changed so much with Covid 19 that all this may have to be put on hold?	N	
Consultation process Covid 19	After the corona virus crisis, we will have so many important things to spend our money on and our society will be broke, broken, and the last thing we need is another dual carriageway!	N	
Consultation process Covid 19	The coronavirus pandemic is likely to have an impact on future travel with potentially more people working from home.	N	
Consultation process Covid 19	In the midst of the coronavirus pandemic I think it would be wise to wait and see the long-term effects on society, as there may be a permanent change in the way we live, work and travel.	N	
Consultation process Covid 19	Covid-19 may render all previous research and planning irrelevant - for example there may be long term effects on home working, work flexibilities, school runs, and lessons may be learned about reduced traffic reducing pollution. It would seem sensible to defer a decision until those effects can be taken into account. Delay could also mean that the planning/consultation could take place at the same time as the planning/consultation for the western link (Northern Distributor Road to A47 bypass) which would be logical.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation process Covid 19	The current C19 pandemic is showing how the need for travel can be massively reduced by an increase in homeworking and it is far from certain that the number of car journeys will rise to pre-pandemic levels after the lockdown. There further casts doubt on the argument that road capacity needs to increase.	N	
Consultation process Covid 19	in the light of cover-19 it is likely there will be a permanent reduction in commuter travel at busy times now that people have learned the value of online meetings and home working. So it should at least be postponed and need re-evaluated in 2 years.	N	
Consultation process Covid 19	In March 2020 traffic markers were places on roads -Berry's Lane, Mattishall Road, etc, and removed April 2020 they were placed on Barnham Broom Road. 'COVID-19 has obviously reduced traffic volume and the figures will be skewed.	N	Highways England is not responsible for traffic surveys being conducted by Norfolk County Council for the Norwich Western Link scheme. Norfolk County Council have presented these findings to the Local Liaison Group and South of A47 taskforce and outlined the methodology used to baseline their findings.
Consultation promotion	POOR Communication from HE & East Tuddenham Parish Council who seems to want to be ignored & ignore the whole thing.	N	Highways England has considered the feedback submitted by East Tuddenham parish council and has continued to engage post statutory consultation.
Consultation promotion	Norwich Green Party responded to the A47 dualling consultations in Spring 2017. Although we received an electronic acknowledgement upon submitting our responses using the HE on-line forms, we have never been contacted in any form since then. We wish to be kept up-to date with developments please, preferably by letter and email, rather than having to rely on catching newspaper reports.	N	Highways England has engaged with Norwich Green Party when conducting post statutory consultation engagement.
Consultation promotion	This was the first I'd heard of the proposed dualling Scheme. I live in Norwich and maybe I'd missed some sort of notification, but it does feel as though more effort should be made to publicise the plans and the consultation procedure.	N	Highways England provided statutory notices in the local and national paper to advertise the Statutory consultation and included adverts on social media.
Consultation promotion	The Statement of Statutory Consultation should be copied to parish councils involved, for comment, not just county and District Councils	N	It is not a legal requirement to formally engage with parish councils on the Statement of Community Consultation.
Consultation promotion	Time is needed to read all the documentation; some of which was not deposited in Norwich Library, nor even on the website, and I had to ask	N	Highways England provided documentation on the Scheme website during the consultation and

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	specifically for, and only received 2 days ago; no time to read before this response had to be submitted.		<p>extended the consultation to allow additional time for individuals to submit a response in case of difficulties due to Covid-19.</p> <p>Hard copies of consultation materials were available at the statutory consultation events, public information points and via request to Highways England.</p> <p>Highways England provided statutory notices in the local and national paper to advertise the Statutory Consultation and included adverts on social media.</p> <p>Highways England has a downloadable response form but also offers the option to complete the form online to support with this process.</p>
Consultation promotion	It has been disappointing that the consultation dates were not more widely advertised especially via social media as well as the local papers etc, hence we were not aware of the process or the plans open for discussion.	N	
Consultation promotion	This consultation was launched with very little notice. HE personnel were unduly un-co-operative, unwilling to divulge the purpose of booking meeting halls. This was totally unnecessary secrecy, because they knew that their promises to hold meetings to develop design fix B in advance of statutory consultation had been broken.	N	
Consultation promotion	The post card did not arrive until the day of the consultation - other people did not receive theirs until the day after!	N	
Consultation timescale	Give adequate notice of Intention to hold any consultation, including statutory consultations. Time is needed to read all the documentation; some of which was not deposited in Norwich Library, nor even on the website, and I had to ask specifically for, and only received 2 days ago; no time to read before this response had to be submitted.	N	
Consultation timescale	Too slow/long/drawn out.	N	
Consultation website	<p>I found your website very confusing, and when I finally worked out how to fill in the form, and return to it later, it disappeared, so I had to enter the text again. I then managed to print the completed form and download it as a document, but now I find that the document is blank. If others have experienced the same difficulty, I imagine there will be plenty of people who have given up and decided not to bother. The system does need to be improved.</p> <p>I am sending, therefore, a copy of the entries I made to the on-line form, by freepost. If it arrives after the deadline, I ask that you accept it, as the delay was caused by difficulties with your website arrangements.</p>	N	
Cost	The size, complexity and cost of the proposed road and junctions are difficult to justify.	N	<p>The Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) sets out the value for money, safety, and environmental benefits of the Scheme.</p>
Cost	The dumbbell junction with the new road and the proposed NWL is badly designed. Both the A47 and the NWL will be very busy dual carriageways carrying a large amount of long-distance traffic.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Cost	All that money to save 5 minutes off a journey time. Improve safety measures instead and increase public transport	N	
Cost	Given the current issues the country and world are experiencing I strongly feel there are better uses of Public Money. The road as existing is functional. I frequently travel this road and bar the usual congestion - the road is suitable and adequate.	N	
Cost	That, particularly after the corona virus crisis we will have so many important things to spend our money on and our society will be broke, broken, and the last thing we need is another dual carriageway!	N	
Cost	After the huge waste of NDR the last thing we need are more hyper expensive road Schemes when social and health services have had huge cuts.	N	
Cost	The proposal to spend between £100 million to £250 million on this Scheme should be better spent on greening the economy such as investment in broadband and public transport.	N	
Cost	the delays caused by rush hour does not justify the immense damage and cost this road building will cause	N	
Cost	The current situation (Virus lock up) shows just how much travel is not essential. The easier it is made the more people travel the bigger the roads the more cars. More cars more pollution more land used up and ruined. More money wasted.	N	
Cost	I also cannot fathom how the savings in journey time have been arrived at. To say that it will increase further between 2025 and 2040 seems to totally ignore the proposed building plans for Easton (circa 900 houses) which will increase the volume of traffic for the village by nearly 3 times! (Editor's note: one word illegible) with this increase in size of Easton this would totally wipe out these savings. Again, these plans are looking at today whereas they should be looking at future needs as well. By doing this it will save both time and money in the long run as there won't be a need to revisit it again.	N	<p>Details of the financial saving are presented in Chapter 5 Economic Assessment of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p> <p>The scheme traffic modelling accounts for natural and planned growth within the traffic model uncertainty log.</p> <p>All developments, regardless of size, within 2km of the A47 corridor between the scheme sections which are classified as certain or more than likely have been included.</p> <p>All development with more than 50 dwellings or 50 jobs within 5km of the scheme which are classified as certain or more than likely have been included.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Cost	<p>I wish to submit a further response in relation to the proposed cost of the Scheme and the now out-dated traffic model.</p> <p>The Highways England information shown on the webpage for this Scheme states that the Scheme is costed at between £100m - £250m. This is a very large range which must be narrowed to enable the public to decide whether the Scheme represents value for money.</p> <p>I raised this matter by email with the project manager who replied that a more accurate cost figure lies between the range £100m - £150m. However, I query whether this is the case given that the Scheme involves two substantial grade separated junctions.</p>	N	<p>The costs and benefits of the Scheme, including the BCR, are presented in Chapter 5 Economic Assessment of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p>
Cost	<p>Also, the traffic model will need updating in the light of future travel behaviour and the likelihood that more people will work from home, resulting in lower car commuting flows at peak hours.</p> <p>The cost of the Scheme (likely to exceed £150m), together with lower traffic flows would give a different BCR which could take the Scheme into the low value for money category.</p> <p>The BCR should be re-calculated before the Planning Inspectorate accepts the Scheme for taking through the NSIP application stages</p>	N	
Cost	<p>i think whilst there may be good honest people involved the main reason this road is being proposed is to make a great deal of money for a few people with little benefit for the local community and the less well-off people - I really hope the economic fallout from covid-19 leads to the project being abandoned and for us to find better ways of living and being together</p>	N	<p>The benefits of the Scheme, for both the wider region and local communities, are presented in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p>
Cost	<p>In its entirety, this junction will be similar in size and layout to the Longwater junction. However, there is no guarantee the NWL will be built, there is currently no planning and no funding, especially now as we enter a global recession.</p>	N	<p>The A47 Scheme is a standalone Scheme with committed funding in place and is not dependent upon the proposed Norwich Western Link scheme achieving funding or planning consent.</p>
Cost	<p>Highways England are proposing to push ahead with these two junctions with Norfolk County Council mitigating the negative impacts for the local community, after the new A47 is built. This mitigation may be delayed, piecemeal and much more costly, both financially and environmentally, than redesigning the junction to be fit for purpose at this stage thereby reducing costs for the taxpayer, reducing environmental impacts and meeting local needs.</p>	N	<p>The A47 Scheme will mitigate any significant effects it unavoidably causes. The proposed scheme also provides provision for the connection of the proposed Norwich Western Link scheme into the Wood Lane junction; thereby achieving cost efficiency for the public and avoiding future environmental impacts. If the</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			Norwich Western Link scheme does not attain funding or planning consent, then this connection will not be delivered.
Cost	Our objection on principle is that the success of a privately owned speculative development for a Food Enterprise Park which is in a totally unsuitable location is also dependent upon public funds both in the £1m grant it has received from the local Enterprise Partnership and HGV vehicular access to the Strategic Road Network which is now to be funded as part of the A47 improvements.	N	<p>Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer.</p> <p>The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.</p>
Cost	<p>Economics –Value for Money.</p> <p>The minutes of Highways England project meeting of the 14 June 2017 as attached to the 2020 Public Consultation (Appendix O)raise concerns on whether the Scheme is affordable.</p> <p>Item 5.1 confirmed a budget for this Scheme of £130.9m.</p> <p>Item 6.6 presents the cost estimates for the four options presented to the 2017 Public Consultation which gives option 2 as £92.76m to £238.42m with the most likely as £138.8m.</p> <p>There is already a potential for costs to exceed the budget by over 75% based on these known figures and we are concerned that this will result in short cuts in the environmental protection measures and/or reductions in measures to maintain the social cohesion of the villages.</p>	N	<p>The costs and benefits of the Scheme, including the BCR, are presented in Chapter 5 Economic Assessment of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1). A Funding Statement (TR010038/APP/4.2) explains how the Scheme will be funded.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Cost	<p>As reported in the minutes, the Scheme has already been 'Value Engineered' (Item 5.1) with the assumptions for two at-grade roundabouts reflected in the estimates. These are now proposed as two major grade separated junction increasing the risk of budget overspend.</p> <p>The Benefit Cost Ratio calculations at Appendix R of the 2020 Consultation appear to reflect the minimum construction costs as presented in the minutes and an update of the BCR for Option 2 appears to be essential reflecting the implications of the current design and the side road strategy.</p> <p>What happens if the known costs exceed the budgets?</p>	N	
Cost	<p>If, as assumed, it is intended to include these associated works under the DCO application, with the changed emphasis for local requirements resulting in material changes to the development proposals from the initial strategic design, one must also question whether the original selected modified option 2 is now the best choice for the A47 improvements and the SRN.</p> <p>The two major junctions now shown at Wood Lane and Norwich Road are situated less than 2.5km apart with an increased land take and considerable additional costs. HE has commented on numerous occasions regarding budget constraints and we therefore request assurances that any costs arising from incorporation of these local projects will not be funded from the A47 budget resulting in cuts to the six A47 Schemes.</p>	N	<p>A Funding Statement (TR010038/APP/4.2) explains how the Scheme will be funded.</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) explains how the Scheme remains part of a wider programme of works to improve the A47 corridor, but each Scheme is to be developed, justified and funded as a standalone Scheme.</p>
Cost	<p>It is appreciated that you have been placed in a difficult position concerning the FEZ for which the LDO was approved by Broadland District Council on 31 October 2017. The current S106 Agreement for this LDO limits development with 60% of the permitted development being conditional upon direct access to the A47. Unless and until direct access to the A47 is in place, access to the site must be via Church Lane from the existing Easton roundabout. The approval to the LDO was despite the fact that it was public knowledge that this roundabout was planned to be removed as part of the A47 improvements as exemplified by confirmation from HE staff at the Marlingford and Colton parish council meeting of 12 September 2017. It must therefore be assumed that the decision by</p>	N	<p>Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer.</p> <p>The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	Broadland anticipated that HE would be obliged to provide and fund an alternative		per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.
Cost	There's a junction with the proposed Norwich Western Link (extension of the 'Broadland Northway' A1270) which could be a good thing so long as Norfolk County Council's currently favoured option is canned in favour of something cheaper and less environmentally damaging.	N	Norfolk County Council is responsible for justifying and acquiring consent for the proposed Norwich Western Link.
Cost	I recently heard that there was a grant given to the Highways Authority in the 80/90s to upgrade the whole stretch of road between Peterborough and Great Yarmouth to a dual carriageway but due to delays etc. the monies were not utilised correctly and over the years it became too expensive to upgrade the road. Given the amount of road tax and council tax we pay and the risk this poses to the local community who have no choice but to use this road to access schools, work in Norwich and the surrounding area and amenities to earn a living, this needs to be treated as a priority!	N	The Scheme has committed funding in place from the government as part of their Road Improvement Strategy 2020 to 2025 (RIS2).
Cost	We suggest that urgent consideration is given to updating the costs to reflect the full side road layout and grade separated junctions accounting for the extra expenditure arising out of the increased land-take and the ground conditions of working in the flood plain of the River Tud.	N	The economic assessment of the Scheme has taken into account the costs associated with the side roads, grade separated junctions and ground conditions along the route.
Dereham Road (Easton)	On the North side, turning right onto the old Dereham Rd. from the bridge, visibility is extremely bad. This is of course worse when the trees are not cut back but is always a problem due to the barrier causing a blind spot. I do not know if these specific problems will be the responsibility of Highways England or whether they will be looked at by the local council or Norfolk County Council? They are recognised local problems already and will become far worse when the road becomes substantially busier.	N	Maintenance of the local road network is the responsibility of the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Dereham Road (Easton)	<p>My technical knowledge of these matters is extremely limited, but as a layman I have one or two observations to make that I hope can and should be fully considered.</p> <p>1) The Honingham Junction in this form depends fully on the Norwich Western Link being agreed at this point. If it is not agreed the northern part of the junction will have to be reconsidered. If NCC in their deliberations place the Link elsewhere there will be major future disruption. Does this mean that the A47 proposals will be put on hold until this link is agreed?</p>	N	<p>The A47 Scheme is a standalone Scheme with a commitment to be delivered by end of 2024 and is not dependent on the proposed Norwich Western Link gaining funding or planning consent.</p> <p>The proposed scheme provides provision for the connection of the proposed Norwich Western Link scheme into the Wood Lane junction; thereby achieving cost efficiency for the public and avoiding future environmental impacts. If the Norwich Western Link scheme does not attain funding or planning consent, then this connection will not be delivered.</p> <p>The junction has been sized in accordance with the traffic modelling and junction design requirements in the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB).</p>
Dereham Road (Easton)	Dereham Road (Easton) to new road connection seems to be very close to the north side of the parish church. Would a road south of the church be possible? Has this been considered?	N	The road is being kept north of St Peter's Church to reflect the current setting of the Grade 1 Listed Building.
Dereham Road (Easton)	Former example, the road leading to Easton Village heading east also will serve the Royal Norfolk Showground which is used generally throughout the year and traffic is especially heavy around the two days of the RNS, have allowances been made for this road to be suitably wide enough to cope with heavy lorries and heavy traffic?	N	The side road connection between Norwich Road junction and Dereham Road (Easton) has been designed to cater for HGVs and existing and future traffic growth.
Design	I think the junction is overcomplicated and not considerate of the impact it will have on local commuters	N	The options appraisal and selection of the preferred design for the junctions, including type and size, was presented at consultation in the 'A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Junction & Sideroad Strategy Report' (February 2020). The approach is in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB). The report demonstrates that the required form of junction
Design	The junctions look too complicated. I was expecting a dualled road with the odd sliproad on and off. I have been told that the junction are as they are due to safety rules, but have their junctions been overdone.	N	
Design	It appears that as the route is E/W the designers of the road can only think E/W and not N/S. So there is provision to use and enhance the existing A47 (E/W) but no attempt has been made to do so for N/S travel.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design	I hope that you have learned your lesson about putting roundabouts on this road as the one at Honingham on the existing A47 is a complete disaster please no more roundabouts	N	for the modelled traffic flows is a fully grade separated junction.
Design	Having reflected on the various discussions at your helpful presentation I am still of the view that this Scheme needs some more fundamental re-design. You are making decisions that will fundamentally impact the nature and character of this area for many decades and I think it is important that today's new realities are reflected in the Scheme.	N	
Design	Is it possible to include 'a diversion system' should one side of the new road be blocked that precludes going through local villages on very narrow roads.	N	The retention of the existing A47 as a local road would facilitate this if required.
Design	Please do not use the wire central barrier like the a11. It's like cheese wire when you're a motorcyclist	N	A steel central reservation barrier is proposed.
Design	This is strictly speaking outwith the remit of the Scheme but please consider improving the Fox Lane junction and the junction on the eastbound carriageway of the A47 to the west of Fox Lane (just off the edge of your map). Both these junctions have very short slip roads and very tight bends. There are frequent crashes at both of them and I believe there have been fatalities. They're basically dangerous and unsuitable for modern traffic. Improvements to these two junctions will improve safety and thus traffic flow along the whole route of the A47 between Dereham and Easton.	N	An assessment of Fox Lane junction has been undertaken and improvements have been deemed not required in light of the wider traffic changes associated with the Scheme.
Design	I am hopefully attaching two alternative plans herewith for your consideration. I am of course working from home and so please let me know if the technology fails to work as I can always put copies in the post. [Editor's Note: Personal Details and References Omitted] Covid-19 has shown us all what can be done with a little extra thought and the public at large might now be more receptive to our ideas as all the walkers, cyclists, and horse riders are once again enjoying the local road network to the north of the A47. [Editor's Note: Personal Details Omitted] PS. Option A provides for a slightly wider underpass at Wood Lane to accommodate the B1535 which could come in useful if the planned capacity of the junction needs upgrading at a later date as it could then be	N	Alternative scheme layouts have been reviewed and considered. The alternative layouts provided would not be achievable without significant additional land take to accommodate the necessary grade separated movements at the Wood Lane junction whilst maintaining the existing A47 fully for local traffic movements. Further, the layouts would require the proposed mainline to be raised in height and would therefore result in substantial additional construction works and impact to the wider area in terms of the route in its setting.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>easily converted into a junction like the A1/A66 without too much expense as once the Western Link is built there will be no need for the B1535 to connect to the A47.</p> <p>NCC only need a connection now in case for whatever reason the Western Link is not built.</p> <p>[Editor's Note: 2 Maps attached]</p>		<p>Meanwhile, Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) demonstrates the improvement to the walking, cycling and horse riding network this Scheme offers.</p>
Design	<p>I realise this is a lost cause, but the existing A47 runs far too close to St Andrew's Church and cuts it off from the village it has served for hundreds of years. You should take this opportunity to rectify that mistake, made when the existing road was built.</p>	Y	<p>Following Statutory Consultation and discussions with Historic England, the proposed junction location was moved further east to reduce the effect St Andrews Church. A more direct walking and cycling connection has also been provided to better connect the church with Honingham via an underpass below the proposed A47.</p>
Design	<p>I believe it is feasible to have a flyover at the existing roundabout as you have enough elevation existing on the Norwich side. There would be no need for ANY Junction on to the A47 dialling between the proposed Wood Lane and Longwater if you keep local traffic using Easton Roundabout. Everyone including our MP having seen my proposal sees NO downside. For you it's got to be the least disruptive to the whole community and is probably economically more viable. I know you have some seriously qualified staff working on this project. However, I spent 10 years as a civil engineer with British Rail and help designed the track for the original Tilting High Speed Diesel Train. Very similar issues.</p>	N	<p>The location of the Norwich Road junction is at the existing Blind Lane and Taverham Road junction due to constraints preventing it being closer to Easton (e.g. proximity of the Grade I St Peter's Church, Orsted cable route, Food Enterprise Zone and residential properties immediately adjacent to Easton roundabout where the Scheme needs to tie back into the existing A47).</p> <p>The proposal suggested would require the A47 mainline to be significantly raised to pass over the existing Easton roundabout. This would have significant environmental effects on the residents of Easton, in an area which is already subject to a DEFRA Noise Improvement Action Area.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design/safety	I propose a westbound banked slip road & single lane bridge, going up & over & down into Norwich rd Hockering where the existing junction is now, with a ground level eastbound slip road joining the Norwich bound A47. This would eliminate the need to build a two lane road between Sandy lane and Wood lane north of the proposed A47 and a single lane road between Church lane & Berry's Lane to the south, effectively creating 7 potentially 8 lanes of traffic for wild life to cross, not to mention the width needed.	N	Following Statutory Consultation, the local road network has been reviewed and some roads removed, including Church Lane to Wood Lane junction, thereby reducing the number of roads in this area.
Design/safety	I assume two roundabouts and a link road is a cheaper alternative to the one large roundabout that incorporates 2 bridges, but the latter is simpler to manoeuvre and much better long term, This would be a much better option. I hope these points can be considered	N	The type and size of junctions proposed follows guidance and thresholds defined by Department of Transport approved highways design guidance.
Design/safety	I am not a Civil engineer but have some of the slip roads and existing local roads could be merged, on the same level so that you can see the other traffic over a good distance this would be very safe, and would save some of the extra local road extensions.	N	The Scheme has been designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB).
Design/safety	A model should be the B1135 Junction to the A11 at Wymondham (shown below) which is the main access route into Wymondham for both eastbound and westbound traffic where the roundabout on the southeast side of the A11 is small; Spinks Lane is a very minor unused track.	N	Noted. The basis for the modelled scenarios is discussed in Chapter 4 Transport Assessment of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) .
Design/safety	Road bridges (can be just one) over dualled road give access to and from westbound road, to and from B1535. It would be possible to create a slip-road from B1535 to eastbound dualled road, in absence of NWL.	N	The arrangement of the B1535 is influenced by its need to remain part of the local highway authority HGV network until such time as the Norwich Western Link scheme is delivered.
Design/safety	I am in full agreement with Honingham Parish Council. The Council would like to see a complete overhaul of the design of the Wood Lane junction which would reduce the impact on the local environment and reduce the impact on the local road network by removing the opportunities for rat running between the A47 and the A11 from Honingham to Wymondham.	Y	Following Statutory Consultation and engagement with the Local Liaison Group, the side road connections at Wood Lane junction were amended to reduce the impact at Honingham village, through the closure of Berrys Lane to through traffic, change in priority of Dereham Road and the inclusion of gateway features on the approaches to the village.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design/safety	The junction should be located to the north of the existing A47 where there are fewer residents and the impact on East Tuddenham (it is in danger of being surrounded by the dualling of the A47, the link with the Northern Distributer Road and the Colton Hub development) lessened	N	The justification for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017) which was available on the Highways England project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation. The preferred route was announced in August 2017 and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) .
Design/safety	Better to improve existing roads with safer speed limits, traffic lights at the junction, public transport and facilities for cycling. These would reduce the need for additional road space	N	The preferred route was announced in August 2017 and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) . The scheme objectives are focused on addressing the existing well documented congestion problems, lack of resilience, and poor safety record.
Disruption	It is essential that the contractor or contractors have, as part of their mission statement, a clear statement on the timing of the completion of the whole project. Too often we see an under-resourced contractor cause major disruption to traffic flow for an inordinately long time. Work needs to be 24 hours a day and 7 days a week otherwise the overall cost of the project, INCLUDING THE COST OF DELAYS TO ROAD TRAFFIC AND ASSOCIATED BUSINESSES, will prove unacceptable. Please bear in mind that a holistic approach is required and contract prices should not reflect just the cost of the work. How often do we drive after 4 pm or at weekends only to find that no-one is working on site!!	N	The programme expectation is for the road to be open end of 2024.
Disruption	There are still issues regarding what will happen locally, from a traffic point of view, when construction takes place and some local roads are closed.	N	The Traffic Management Plan (TR010038/APP/7.5) will be developed further in liaison with the local highway authority to

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	You will be familiar with them and I have raised them with [Editor's Note: Personal Details Omitted] as well.		minimise impacts on local traffic during construction.
Dual existing road	Seems illogical to build a whole new road Scheme whilst there is an existing single carriageway which could be made into dual carriageway	N	<p>The justification for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017) which was available on the Highways England project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>The preferred route was announced in August 2017 and can be found on the Highways England Website.</p> <p>The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p> <p>The proposed junctions are designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) taking into account the traffic modelling for the scheme opening year (2025) and design year (2040). This is presented within the junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation.</p>
Dual existing road	The A47 needs to be dualled eventually from Gt.Yarmouth to Peterborough. It is a main trunk road from the East of England to the Midlands and has been neglected in this respect over the decades.	N	
Dual existing road	I certainly feel, as already said, that the impact on new land is far too great and that you should have used more of the existing road, which we originally built with widening in mind.	N	
Dual existing road	It is, as previously noted, disappointing that a Scheme originally promoted as involving the dualling of the existing A47 should now involve building a new dual-carriageway road largely in parallel to - rather than adding an additional carriageway to most of - the existing road. Although there may be a social case for 'bypassing' Hockering and Honingham villages (in order to improve the 'residential amenity' of villagers), any dual-carriageway bypass could in either case depart from and re-join the existing road – to which a second carriageway would be added – at points much closer to the villages than the present Scheme proposes. (There would appear little justification for moving the route of the proposed new dual carriageway so far north of the existing A47 at the proposed Wood Lane and Norwich Road junctions).	N	
Dual existing road	New road south of existing, closer to Hockering village –possibly even a widening of the existing road – in cutting to reduce visual and noise impact. Some land would have to be taken and maybe even one or two houses.	N	
Dual existing road	Existing road around Honingham widened. Existing bridge over Tud to be widened by minimum – least impact on the river and valley. New road extending that from Honingham to provide access to Easton – new construction. No access to Food Hub from here.	N	
Dual existing road	I am also not at all clear why you are building new roads rather than widening the existing one given that the new roads will eat into a large chunk of very beautiful countryside down near the river.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Dual existing road	If the proposed new twin roundabout/flyovers junctions are built over the current road and resurface the length, it would work just as well, with massive savings to be spent else where along the system.	N	
Effectiveness	We do consider that road building in itself, does not solve the traffic issues as has been continually proven by such Schemes as the M25 orbital. In general, the jam is just moved somewhere else.	N	Noted. The Scheme has assessed the potential impact to the environment. This is presented within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) .
Effectiveness	Assuming that economic growth of the past will continue to drive traffic growth into the future (especially car use) is I think a very dubious assumption.	N	
Effectiveness	We need a Scheme substantially reduces the total volume of traffic, while protecting our valuable wildlife: this is the opposite of these disastrous proposals.	N	
EIA	First and foremost, the Scheme needs earlier and more significant net environmental gain and the easiest way of achieving this is to reduce the environmental loss from the plethora of unnecessary link roads and the resulting complexity and scale of the junctions.	N	<p>Impacts on ecology are assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and mitigation measures are proposed as part of the Scheme to avoid and/or reduce any significant effects.</p> <p>Where possible, woodland areas have been retained as part of the Scheme. Where this is not possible, compensatory planting is proposed. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9).</p> <p>The landscape masterplan aims to achieve no net loss of biodiversity value as part of the Scheme and retain habitat connectivity.</p> <p>The mitigation measures outlined in the Biodiversity Environmental Statement chapter have been tried and tested and therefore best practice is being followed to mitigate any effects on the environment.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
EIA	It is assumed that these works will all form part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) as "Associated Development" which will require consideration as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). In view of these major changes to the Scheme, we believe that the "Applicant should give consideration to requesting a new EIA SO (see paragraph 2.3.9 of the current SO).	N	Consultation has been undertaken with the relevant statutory consultees including the Planning Inspectorate on the updates to the design since statutory consultation. Consultation has not identified the requirement for a new Scoping Opinion.
Environment	I would like to see an environmentally sustainable alternative to dualling the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton, based around reducing road traffic and small road safety improvements which include traffic lights at the main side road crossings and closure of minor side road junctions.	N	The justification for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017). The preferred route offered the least environmental impact on balance with other requirements.
Environment	I do think that Honingham should have as much protection from noise, pollution, and eye contact from the A47 dualling as has ever been invested. i.e. no cost cutting.	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) has assessed the potential impact to Honingham as a result of the Scheme. In particular, the Scheme moves traffic, (and subsequently noise and pollution) further away from Honingham village. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9) .
Environment	I need 100% confirmation in writing that the area of land between village and A47, will have soundproof fencing, trees and shrubs to screen visual effect of fencing. Also, to screen sound and fumes from village	N	A noise assessment has been undertaken to determine the requirement for noise fencing. Where this is required, it has been included as part of the Scheme and reported in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) , submitted within the DCO application. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9) .
Environment	The trees and plants must be a 3 to 4-year size when planted and not 12' saplings which will fail when contractors have left site and will not be replaced. This has happened on so many other projects. So a firm written commitment to water and maintain planting for 3 years would convince me	N	The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9) . The plan has identified a mix of sapling and

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			heavy standard trees to provide the required mitigation. The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) outlines the requirements for monitoring the mitigation measures proposed as part of the masterplan
Environment	I am concerned about the impact on biodiversity in a farmland area where vegetation mosaics are limited.	N	Impacts on ecology are assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to avoid and/or reduce significant effects. Where possible, woodland areas have been retained as part of the Scheme. Where this is not possible, compensatory planting has been proposed. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9) . The environmental masterplan aims to achieve no net loss of biodiversity value as part of the Scheme and retain habitat connectivity.
Environment	Green roundabout is revised NDR WL / new dualled A47 roundabout including Wood Lane. This needs to be further enough North to make the revised slip roads work. Per your existing Fix A proposal I would envisage a banked up dualled A47 with the roundabout passing under the new A47 and as needed cut into the landscape.	N	The justification for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017).
Environment	The Wood Lane junction could be designed better to reduce the impact on the environment and countryside also to reduce the cost of such development.	N	The A47 dual carriageway is proposed to pass over the junction, which has been set at the low level into the ground to reduce visual impact on the landscape. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9) .
Existing A47	Connecting Wood Lane to the existing A47 is likely to encourage drivers heading for the A11 to short-cut via Berry's Lane which is unsuitable for increased traffic volume and unsuitable for heavy vehicles.	N	Following Statutory Consultation, access to Berrys Lane from Wood Lane junction has been removed, closing Berrys Lane to through traffic.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Flooding/drainage	We have concerns that the underpasses at the two major grade-separated junctions will create natural watercourses with an increase risk of flooding.	N	<p>The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) includes a flood risk assessment and drainage strategy to prevent an increase in flooding. The project team have engaged extensively with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority during scheme development</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) includes a flood risk assessment and drainage strategy to prevent an increase in flooding. The project team have engaged extensively with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority during scheme development</p> <p>Drainage detention basins have been designed to reduce any impact from surface water flooding and road runoff during storm events.</p>
Flooding/drainage	Also, will the water run off to River Tud flood my land at Mill Lane Honingham, as River Tud has fallen trees to restrict flow.	N	
Flooding/drainage	There is also the consideration of increased flooding, we already have a problem and changes in the surrounds will always have a knock-on effect. We are a small village but we have as important needs as anyone else but I worry we will be forgotten.	N	
Flooding/drainage	The more hard surfaces the worse the flooding and while there are those who will celebrate arriving at their destination a few moments earlier there are others who will have to live with the consequences like noise and light pollution and flooding in their daily lives ever after. Are those extra minutes so very important when the cost is so high.	N	
Flooding/drainage	I am concerned about the volume of surface water from these new roads and roundabouts/ junctions. Recent flooding has shown the river Tud/ flood plains and Wensum struggling with existing surface water run-off.	N	
Flooding/drainage	- Surface water and drainage does the design incorporate more than what is planned additional pond/alternation areas to prevent local flooding.	N	
Flooding/drainage	Indirect impacts will include pollution (noise, air, light and chemical run-off into watercourses), impacts on the floodplain hydrology	N	
General comments	Weight restrictions to be applied to Fox Lane to reduce cross country HGV traffic from Mattishall	N	No changes to Fox Lane are proposed as part of the Scheme.
General comments	Mitigation is not enough. we need to protect our planet now and stop building roads.	N	The need case is detailed in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).
General comments	As a consequence, CPRE calls for adoption of a 'smarter travel' hierarchy, and that the current Road Investment Strategy should focus on keeping roads in good repair and reducing their environmental impacts, rather than increasing capacity. "Building even bigger roads should be the last resort - not the default choice" (Ralph Smyth, CPRE Head of infrastructure and legal.)	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
General comments	as I am fundamentally opposed to the building of the road i can't really endorse any proposals because if you didn't build it wouldn't need mitigation - it's just lip service - like the fact that the other proposed road linking the NDR has ignored the bat sites	N	
General comments	My disagreement with items 8a, 8b, 8c and 8d flows from my overall objection to the A47 dialling Scheme as a whole.	N	
Habitat	Its got to happen, compensate those negatively impacted and take steps to make sure it's environmentally neutral. Kill a newt or two, or some birds. But create somewhere else for similar animals to thrive.	N	<p>Impacts on ecology are assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to avoid and/or reduce significant effects.</p> <p>The mitigation measures outlined in the Biodiversity Environmental Statement chapter have been tried and tested and therefore best practice is being followed to mitigate the effects on the environment.</p> <p>Proposed CWS have been assessed as a CWS site within the biodiversity assessment.</p> <p>The Phase 1 habitat survey was undertaken in line with the relevant guidance and methodologies: CIEEM's Guidance for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, and JNCC's Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey - a technique for environmental audit.</p> <p>The Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA), (TR010038/APP/6.9) submitted as a part of the DCO application outlines the assessment methodologies used on designated sites.</p>
Habitat	As such, we would expect the final application to take a precautionary approach following best practice, with a detailed ecological baseline, and for any ecological mitigation and compensation proposals to be accompanied by robust evidence of their likely success rates, particularly where translocation is proposed.	N	
Habitat	Table 7.1-given the potential for air pollution impacts to occur at greater distances than 100m, we recommend that the Phase 1 habitat survey is extended to at least 200m from all elements of the proposal (the road, junctions and any lay-bys), supported by more detailed Phase 2 surveys where greater botanical diversity is indicated. This is necessary to ensure that impacts on notable plant species and priority habitats are assessed fully.	N	
Habitat	7.4.2-we note the comment that other sites may be designated in the future to their diversity. It should be noted that the surveys that precede CWS designation can only be carried out with landowner permission, so it is possible that other areas of CWS quality may occur within the zone of influence of the proposal. We therefore recommend that botanical surveys of land potentially impacted by the proposal(where access permission is available to HE), should be surveyed in sufficient detail to evaluate them against the CWS designation criteria.	N	
Habitat	7.6.3-we support the inclusion of a Habitats Regulations Assessment in order to determine any adverse effects on the River Wensum SAC. This should include an assessment of the likely impacts in-combination with the Western Link proposal.	N	
Habitat			

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			Cumulative effects with other developments have been assessed as part of the HRA. The 'other developments' include the Norwich Western Link road.
Habitat	7.7.3-we recommend that the ES includes a robust assessment of alternative measures to address traffic problems that would avoid the loss of priority habitats, an assessment of the cumulative impacts alongside the Western Link proposal, and an increase in the scope of botanical, reptile and bat surveys, as detailed above.	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) has considered and reported on the alternatives to the preliminary design alignment of the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme. An assessment of the cumulative impacts in combination with other Schemes has been assessed in the Environmental Statement. These assessments are presented within the DCO application.
Habitat	CPRE Norfolk is concerned about the loss of connecting habitats such as hedgerows and tree lines. Mitigation measures will need to be thorough and robust to reduce these harms.	N	<p>Impacts on ecology are assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to avoid and/or reduce significant effects.</p> <p>Where possible, woodland areas have been retained as part of the Scheme. Where this is not possible, compensatory planting has been proposed. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9).</p> <p>The landscape masterplan aims to achieve no net loss of biodiversity value as part of the Scheme and retain habitat connectivity.</p>
Info/materials misleading	Very biased towards benefit of the road versus the surrounding environment.	N	The Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) outlines the wider benefits of the Scheme, including environmental.
Info/materials misleading	I read with interest point 2.7 of the PIER, what guarantees can be given that this will not be overridden by green councillors or non-commercial pressure groups?	N	The project is part of the government's national Road Investment Strategy, aligns with local

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			planning policy needs and has committed funding in place.
Info/materials misleading	As it is admitted that the PEIR 'presents currently available information from the ongoing EIA' (NTS # 1.1.8), so that the information it contains is 'preliminary' and 'the final assessment of environmental effects will be presented in the Environmental Statement that will be submitted with the DCO application' (# 1.5.3), public consultees at this stage lack the comprehensive evidence that they would need in order to be able to fully assess whether the adverse environmental impacts of the Scheme could be adequately mitigated.	N	The PEIR outlines Highways England's understanding of the environment and likely environmental effects / mitigation measures. A full environmental impact assessment based on completed survey results is presented in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), which will be available for public review and comment as part of the DCO application process.
Info/materials misleading	It is all to be in the ES within DCO, which is due November. This should have been available now for the public to consider. Do not understand 'baseline' of carbon being current situation, when government's target is based on 1990 levels. Document tells us virtually nothing of interest.	N	
Info/materials misleading	You did your environmental reports at a time to suit you and with little or no regard to what is actually happening. I have conducted bat surveys for the past 5 years and know all the rare bats we have around here. When did you conduct a survey? Cold wet Sept evening when most heading for a winter roost. I therefore have no faith in any survey conducted by you.	N	The bat surveys have been undertaken in line with the appropriate guidance and methodologies: Collins, J. (ed.) (2016). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines, 3rd edition, Bat Conservation Trust; Emergence and re-Entry surveys for high roost potential took place three times, for moderate two times, and for low once, in the period described; and Crossing Point survey specific Berthinussen and Altringham (2015) and Elmeros et al., 2016. The results of the bat surveys are presented in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1).
Info/materials misleading	I hope NCC's desire to promote and favour the currently-proposed route of the NWL has not influenced Highways or the design/Preliminary Environmental Information Report of the A47 North Tuddenham-Easton in any way, or indeed led to the lateness of this design and consultation.	N	Highways England is responsible for the Strategic Road network (SRN) and is promoting the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton scheme. We are working collaboratively with Norfolk County Council on how their proposed Norwich Western Link scheme can connect into the A47 but are clear that the A47 proposal is a

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			standalone scheme with committed funding in place.
Info/materials misleading	Question 11 in the 2020 on-line consultation is therefore confusing. How can the public agree or disagree with the environmental mitigation in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) when there are no mitigation measures outlined?	N	Detailed mitigation was not available at that time but is presented in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) .
Info/materials misleading	This document [Editors note: the PEIR] has not been circulated meaning that this important question is invalid. This part of the consultation cannot take place.	N	The PEIR was made available from the beginning of the statutory consultation period, on the Scheme website, a USB memory stick, and in hard copy format at the consultation events and public information points. A non-technical version of the document was also produced to help summarise the PEIR and its preliminary findings.
Journey time	I currently access this road at the Easton roundabout from the Ringland Road, until the proposed link to the A1270 opens. This access route will be made longer for journeys from the north to the east (the way I usually travel) - until the A1270 extension opens.	Y	Following Statutory Consultation, the Scheme has been amended to include provision of a new link road and underpass linking Hockering with Mattishall.
Journey time	The doctors' surgery is in Mattishall and those who do not drive will have a much longer walk and drivers will have a further 5 miles to drive to access Mattishall.	Y	
Journey time	the current proposal means that I will drive approximately a further 40 miles per week and visits to the surgery will add further miles,	Y	
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	I am concerned about the safety of any mixing people on foot, cycle or horse with local traffic.	N	The Scheme includes proposals to create walking, cycling and horse-riding routes segregated from the traffic.
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	Its also noisy and residents cannot get in their gardens as it's unbearable traffic noise. You can't even have a conversation without having to shout.	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains a noise assessment and proposed mitigation measures for significant adverse effects
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	Of course, if only parts of it are left open, e.g. that idiot Scheme outside St Andrews Church, it is going to attract unwelcome visitors and those that wish to dispose of rubbish illegally.	N	The Scheme has been designed to reduce the risk of anti-social behaviours, such as avoiding creation of turning heads in stopped up road

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			<p>where alternative private arrangements are available.</p> <p>Highways England has worked with Stakeholders to provide a solution at St Andrews Church, whereby parking and agricultural access can be provided whilst minimising the risk for such activities.</p>
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	<p>The proposals are nice but will see little use. This is for two reasons. Firstly, they are not routes for which there is significant demand for access by cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders. Secondly, they will be adjacent to a busy dual carriageway, and will not be attractive for recreational use. Well I fully support the inclusion of these paths in the plans, motorists will see how little use these facilities get, and this will reinforce the view that investment in sustainable transport infrastructure is a waste of resources.</p>	N	<p>The need is outlined in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) which also outlines the wider benefits of the Scheme.</p>
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	<p>The only reason for closing off parts of the existing A47 seems to be to provide for walking, cycling and horse riding which could be accommodated alongside the existing A47 from Hockering to Easton.</p>	N	
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	<p>Careful consideration of safety aspects and traffic flows are required. Likely that access for everything but cars could be maintained but better to have strictly defined access for motor vehicles and these be separated from access for all other road users.</p>	N	<p>The Scheme includes proposals to create walking, cycling and horse-riding routes segregated from the traffic.</p>
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	<p>One side of the road could be fenced off for use by walkers, cyclists and horse riders leaving the other for local traffic.</p>	N	
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	<p>Local traffic must be segregated from walkers, cyclists and horse riders, the road speed limit must be reduced, and road safety measures put in place at side roads and other crossing points.</p>	N	
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	<p>In relation to the Scheme, I am concerned about shared use with vehicular traffic. Segregation measures are needed.</p>	N	
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	<p>So we propose that, as it is within the plan envelope, a steel bridge should be provided across the cutting of the dual carriageway, connecting the ends of Ringland Lane for people on foot or prepared to wheel their bicycle. The alternative is a 1.4 km walk westward and then another 1.4</p>	Y	<p>A new walking and cycling overbridge is proposed at Easton, with the existing route via Ringland Lane being stopped up.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	km eastwards along the new shared cycle paths to the Blind Lane (or Norwich Road) underbridge (S07) where 4 slip roads have to be crossed.		
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	Keeping the 'old A47' road open for use by local traffic would mean it could be used by police to divert traffic from new A47 in case of accident. If Berry's Lane is not closed, and old A47 is not a road, all traffic will be tunnelled through Honingham. It's a problem for the village now if this happens; it will be worse with more traffic if happens with new A47.	Y	Following Statutory Consultation, more of the existing A47 was integrated into the local road network, such as north of Honingham.
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	The Scheme proposal requires some re-work to make better use of the existing A47 for local side road access and to reduce new link roads and the size/complexity of proposed junctions which is not necessary. Clearly this will require some additional fly-overs where the new dual carriageway and the existing A47 cross. However this will result in a much more balanced Scheme meeting the needs of national/regional as well as local road users.	Y	
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	The existing A47 and its extension as a local road will help E/W traffic flows and some of these connections but the Scheme continues to ignore all existing N/S flows for traffic, pedestrians etc and treats those flows as irrelevant to the Scheme.	Y	
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	The dualling should stay alongside the existing A47 and all what would be the east bound side should be on the existing road.	N	The justification for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017). The preferred route was announced in August 2017 and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) .
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	If sections of the existing road are to be thus retained for 'local use', it should be declassified and, in order to reduce the visual impact of parallel roadways, 'landscaped' and reduced to a width appropriate to the anticipated volume of local road traffic or the predominant use envisaged	Y	The existing A47 will be de-trunked where it is not part of the new dual carriageway. Through engagement with the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council, existing sections of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	for it at a particular point (eg. non-motorised use between the two proposed new junctions).		A47 will be reduced to Class B (6.0m wide) roads and a 50mph speed limit implemented. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9).
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	Re-using the old A47 idea - Please can some parking areas be considered for people wishing to leave their cars and then cycle to their final destination in Norwich; or to meet other drivers and car share for final leg of journey. (car share car parking?) - I have seen these in other rural places where people come from scattered places but then converge on employment areas.	N	This was considered but the need to avoid attracting antisocial behaviour has meant this could not be provided.
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	In addition, the speed limit must be reduced and further road safety measures introduced at junctions and crossing points.	N	The existing A47 will be de-trunked where it is not part of the new dual carriageway. Through engagement with the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council, existing sections of the A47 will be reduced to Class B (6.0m wide) roads and a 50mph speed limit implemented.
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	The current X1 Bus route involves stops at Hockering and Easton. From Dereham the bus would have to leave the A47 before the Fox Lane bridge and travel down the side road to Hockering. Then use Wood Lane junction to A47, then exit at Norwich Road junction to reach Easton. From Easton join A47 at Norwich Road junction and exit via Wood Lane junction to Hockering then side road to Fox Lane junction An alternative route would be to use to current A47 between the junctions (proposed NMU) or go via Honingham. Getting the buses on and off the A47 must improve traffic flow	N	Bus routes are determined by the bus companies. Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) confirms the Scheme would not adversely affect public transport. As a result of statutory consultation feedback, the existing A47 a Honingham is being retained and now provides a local road corridor between Honingham and Easton.
Keep sections of the existing A47 (SE)	Most important for local traffic is hopefully a bus route that as much of the old A47 and connecting roads are kept open as possible for local journeys between villages.	N	
Land take	The proposed road Scheme is severing agricultural land and making many parcels unfarmable. The proposed route seems ill though out.	N	The justification for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017) which was
Land take	The proposed off-line dualling results in taking much more land than the originally proposed on-line dualling, causing substantially more of loss of habitats for wildlife	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Land take	As previously noted, building a new dual-carriageway road largely 'off-line' from the existing A47 would unacceptably increase the amount of greenfield land-take whilst leaving parallel stretches of duplicated road space.	N	available on the Highways England project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation.
Land take	In the Highways England Preferred Route announcement in August 2017, the public were told that an amended version of Option 2 (on-line dualling) would be worked up, but the Scheme involves off-line dualling and this would result in greater land take and loss of habitats and protected wildlife species which cannot be mitigated.	N	The preferred route was announced in August 2017 indicating locations for the proposed junctions, and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) .
Land take	Moreover, though Option 2 was originally to be welcomed as the 'preferred route' as involving only the dualling of the existing A47 and as such as having the least impact on the environment, the Scheme as now proposed would involve building a new dual-carriageway road largely 'off-line' from the existing road (as admitted by the full PEIR # 2.5.1-2), thereby increasing unacceptably the amount of (mainly agricultural) greenfield land-take whilst leaving parallel stretches of duplicated road space.	N	The Junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation outlines the junction design in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) and based on the traffic modelling for the opening year (2025) and design year (2040).
Land take	The proposal is for the dualling of a section of the A47 between Tuddenham and Easton, to the west of Norwich. The route would partially follow the existing road corridor, whilst diverging and resulting in new land take to avoid settlements at Hockering and Honingham and to provide two new junctions.	N	
Land take	We are concerned at the scale of the land take and proximity to a significant number of areas of high ecological value.	N	
Land take	The Scheme would carve up the countryside with the off-line carriageway threading its way north and south of the existing A47 and massive grade separated junctions and roundabouts at Wood Lane and Norwich Road adding to the new urbanisation.	N	
Land take	The consequence is a series of employment and retail centres around the outskirts, initially situated on the outer ring road but now being pushed further out to the Southern Bypass and the Northern Distributor Road (NDR) in the neighbouring districts of Broadland and South Norfolk.	N	
Land take	I am also not at all clear why you are building new roads rather than widening the existing one given that the new roads will eat into a large chunk of very beautiful countryside down near the river.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Land take	two huge new junctions that consume huge areas of agricultural land in rural Norfolk.	N	<p>A landscape and visual impact assessment has been undertaken as part of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), submitted with the DCO application. The impacts on the landscape and visual receptors have been assessed and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to avoid and/or reduce significant effects where possible.</p> <p>The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9). The landscape masterplan aims to screen the Scheme where appropriate and design the road to fit into the existing landscape where possible.</p>
Land take	The 2 proposed roundabouts are huge, combined they are bigger than the size of our village.	N	
Landscape/visual	I was in favour of dualling the existing A47, but I am neutral about the current plan as it involves very little use of the existing road but instead snakes north and south of it. Consequently, the environmental impact is similar to other routes previously proposed.	N	
Landscape/visual	whilst the need for the new dual carriageway to be raised on embankments at both junctions (as admitted by the full PEIR # 2.5.7) can but only exacerbate the visually intrusive and other environmental impacts.	N	
Landscape/visual	road Schemes induce traffic, often far above background trends over the longer term, lead to permanent and significant environmental and landscape damage [and] show little evidence of economic benefit to local economies.	N	
Landscape/visual	The Consultation Brochure claims (p. 4) that improving this section of the A47 is necessary 'to ensure it is suitable for current and future demands, which will see a growth in both traffic and local residential developments along the A47 corridor to the west of Norwich' - but then heads the subsequent list of aims for the Scheme with the assertion that it will 'help enable regional development and growth in Norwich and its surrounding area'. If facilitating housing growth - and therefore the urbanisation of existing countryside west of Norwich - is indeed the primary aim of the Scheme, then it is clearly unacceptable from an environmental perspective and cannot be supported,	N	
Landscape/visual	The precise alignment of the proposed route should be revisited following completion of botanical surveys to evaluate if losses to the road can be avoided,	N	
Landscape/visual	The visual impact, especially near the river, where the road must be elevated, will be very detrimental.	N	
Landscape/visual	we still have concerns that the proposals for dualling this section will have a significant adverse consequence to the rural area.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Landscape/visual	We do not agree with the realignment of the off-line route for the revised Option 2 to the north of the existing A47 as it will impinge on landscape and biodiversity of the River Tud.	N	The environmental impacts were considered in the options appraisal process.
Landscape/visual	When I visited public consultation at village hall I asked about sound and pollution screening, visual effect of soundproof fencing. I got no absolute answers to my concerns.	N	The noise assessment has been assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), which is submitted as part of the DCO application. Mitigation measures including noise fences and noise bunds have been proposed to reduce significant effects where possible. A landscape masterplan is presented within the DCO application which identifies the areas for noise fences and bunds.
Landscape/visual	We disagree for the reasons set out in our response to 6b above to the closure of the Easton junction and the failure to model the implications of this on the Longwater junction and on the environment of Easton.	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) considers the effects on the Easton community, while Longwater Interchange forms the eastern extent of the assessment of journey travel times in Chapter 4 Transport Assessment of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).
Landscape/visual	It would urbanise the countryside.	N	The environmental impacts were considered in the options appraisal process.
Landscape/visual	Extensive spreading of "side roads" across the landscape is environmentally damaging.	N	
Landscape/visual	More Thought and Cooperation from HE with NCC in Planning and future maintaining of the surrounding local roads, Which HE have already said they're not are concern it's NCC remit that is an appalling attitude to take, If you are going to build a monstrosity through our county, the least you could do is help develop a plan to improve the WHOLE area.	N	Highways England has developed the Scheme in liaison with Norfolk County Council, the District Councils, Parish Councils and stakeholder user groups such as the Local Liaison Group and South of the A47 Taskforce group.
Landscape/visual	Additionally, thousands of trees will have to be felled for this Scheme to go ahead, again flying in the face of government commitments to increase tree cover in England.	N	Where possible, woodland areas have been retained as part of the Scheme. Where this is not possible, compensatory planting has been proposed. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9). The environmental masterplan aims to achieve

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			no net loss of biodiversity value as part of the Scheme and retain habitat connectivity.
Landscape/visual	The setting of the listed Saint Andrew's church with this junction is a complete sacrilege. How can one even consider a design which requires a retaining wall at the boundary of the church which will soon attract the local graffiti artists? The church is part of the rural landscape and should remain so.	N	The setting of St Andrew's church has been assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) , submitted as part of the DCO application. Since the statutory consultation events, the Norwich Road junction has been moved further east away from the church. Therefore, there is no longer a requirement for a retaining wall at this location.
Landscape/visual	It is ironic that the landscape measures proposed in the LDO for the Food Enterprise Zone to protect the views from St Andrew's church are now being negated by the new road layout specifically to connect the FEZ to the SRN.	N	Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer. The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.
Landscape/visual	It is moreover admitted that 'the value and sensitivity of known heritage assets and the potential for previously unknown assets within the area of the Scheme is not fully understood at this stage' (# 5.2.1), whilst to integrate the design into the surrounding landscape 'a detailed [tree] planting design will [later] be produced' (NTS # 1.9.4).	N	Cultural Heritage has been assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and is submitted as a part of the DCO application. Since the PEIR, archaeological trenching has been undertaken to provide information on previously unknown assets. The

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			value and sensitivity of all heritage assets are reported within the Environmental Statement.
Landscape/visual	As well as the provision of the retaining wall, the off-site landscape proposals to protect these views will no longer be possible due to the land being required by the junction [see attached LDO landscape proposals].	N	The setting of St Andrew's church has been assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) , submitted as part of the DCO application. Since the statutory consultation events, the Norwich Road junction has been moved further east away from the church. Therefore, there is no longer a requirement for a retaining wall at this location.
Layout	The original proposal from Highways England was for on-line dualling but the PEIR is different, instead proposing offline dualling which would seriously damage wildlife habitats and countryside	N	The justification for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017). The preferred route has the least environmental impact of the short-listed options. The preferred route was announced in August 2017 indicating locations for the proposed junctions, and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) . In line with Scheme objectives, in order to provide a more free-flowing network, the existing Easton roundabout is to be removed. The Junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation outlines the junction design in accordance with the UK
Layout	The current road elevation east of the existing roundabout allows this roundabout to remain untouched with the new A47 dualling going over it on the exact proposed route. Norwich road jcn will not exist.	N	
Layout	# Blue line is the existing A47 which is maintained as is and keeps local access including Berry Lane (no direct connection to new dualled A47) and Sandy Lane. This then also allows for existing A47 access to the new dualled A47 via a simple junction towards Hockering (similar to existing A47 North Tuddenham junction). This would need a new underpass / flyover where it crosses the new dualled A47	N	
Layout	I would like to see an environmentally sustainable alternative to dualling the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton, based around reducing road traffic and small road safety improvements which include traffic lights at the main side road crossings and closure of minor side road junctions.		
Layout	I agree because of heavy traffic on existing A47 but not to the extent of the two junctions which are larger than the village	N	
Layout	The Council strongly believe there is still plenty of flexibility within the Scoping Boundary for HE to revise their junction strategy and make all junctions smaller, moving their locations to more appropriate locations at the same time as meeting the objectives of the project.		

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Layout	The initial A47 improvement layout suggested that a single major junction in conjunction with a network of local feeder roads would be sufficient for this section of road but this has changed to the requirement for two major grade separated junctions with no apparent savings in the lengths of feeder roads.		Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) and based on the traffic modelling for the opening year (2025) and design year (2040).
Layout	On this section of the route, it must also be stressed that the slip road off the bypass from the Norwich direction onto the bridge comes off at far too acute an angle. There are frequently minor accidents and as it becomes busier, the problem will become worse. This was simply bad design.	N	An assessment of Fox Lane junction has been undertaken and improvements have been deemed not required in light of the wider traffic changes associated with the Scheme.
Layout	Improvements required to the existing junction with Fox Lane at North Tuddenham where the east and west bound slip roads are too short should be added to the Scheme at limited extra cost.	N	
Layout	As a further safety measure, some of the number of side roads along A47 NTE could be closed and the moderate number of vehicles they carry could be re-routed with little inconvenience.	Y	Presently there are 41 direct accesses onto the A47 between North Tuddenham and Easton. These directly contribute to the delays and poor safety record. The proposed scheme removes all direct accesses and provides safe access via the new junctions at Wood Lane and Norwich road. Following Statutory Consultation several side roads have now also been closed to through traffic.
Layout	We support small improvements to minor new roads (eg local road connection between North Tuddenham and Hockering) to provide safe local connections between villages and routes for slow moving farm vehicles.	N	Noted, safety is a key consideration in the design of the Scheme.
Layout	I think that even if the dualling doesn't go ahead improvements are needed in the form of roundabouts or ways to stop people turning right out of the junctions on to the A47.	N	
Layout	My disappointment was that the footbridge crossing from Lower Easton to Easton hadn't been addressed	Y	A walking and cycling overbridge at Easton is now included in the proposed scheme.
Layout	Why keep the current Mattishall Road A47 roundabout it will be surplus to requirements	Y	This has now been linked to the existing A47 connection to Wood Lane junction to avoid traffic passing through Honingham.
Layout	Lots of locals have pointed out that two proposed roundabouts are too close together. Please listen to us. They need moving further apart, an	N	The design is in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) and

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	accident waiting to happen as fast traffic meets traffic that is trying to turn off or join.		undergone Operational Safety assessments and independent Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.
Light	Also, what type of lighting is intended for this Scheme? As there are going to be new junctions, roundabouts etc would there be the tall invasive street lighting that is to be found on the roundabout at Honingham? This is a totally unnecessary cause of light pollution. Clearly displayed signs leading up to the junctions and roundabouts should be used instead of lights.	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) presents a summary of the proposed lighting and Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Impacts contains an assessment of impacts from any lighting during construction and operation.
Light	while there are those who will celebrate arriving at their destination a few moments earlier there are others who will have to live with the consequences like noise and light pollution	N	The proposed Wood Lane and Norwich Road junctions on the A47 will be lit.
Light	In addition, the need to reduce light pollution from the proposed works needs to be highlighted, so that dark skies are not unnecessarily impacted upon.	N	Consultation with the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council established there was no need for lighting on the local road network.
Lighting	I would like to put in statute law that all major road junctions must be well lit for road safety. The NNDR has had no end of trouble on the junctions due to this one glaring error.... No lighting. Street lighting is essential to safety and driver alertness. We all know light is safer than darkness. That's why we go to bed at night and work in the day.	N	
Lighting	Bats and other wildlife will find places to live just like they have on the NNDR, do not waste money on animal crossovers, just install fencing in the ground and the occasional deer will still get over, well that's Norfolk (and we love it) but be sure the junctions are well lit. I have been the victim of roundabouts on the NNDR and am told that it is due to wildlife that the roundabouts are not lit, it is preposterous... I would like to make a public submission or speech on this issue if the lighting is in danger of being taken away from the junctions.	N	
Lighting	As both new junctions are complex there must be good quality lighting on them and the junctions and the highway between them	N	
Lighting	I feel strongly that there must be an environmentally sustainable alternative to this off-line dualling. We must reduce road traffic, and make small improvements to road safety by installing traffic lights at the main side road crossings and closing minor side road junctions.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Location	"A47 needs to be made safer for local access but I can't agree with the new A47 swinging so close to the River Tud and the amount of countryside being taken to achieve a five-minute saving on journey times."	N	The justification for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017) which was available on the Highways England project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation.
Location	"2) Moving the A47 to the north of Honingham and south of Hockering will damage the River Tud valley, viz the Wensum valley. This will result in the loss of habitat, disturbance, the risk of water pollution and detrimental effects on the water table."	N	
Location	"Moving the A47 to the south of Hockering and north of Honingham would take the road closer to the ecologically sensitive River Tud valley which connects to the international important River Wensum, with likely loss of protected species due to loss of habitat, noise and disturbance and the potential for risk of contamination to the river, tributaries and water table."	N	
Location	The new section is too far South and into the Tud Valley. This is a flood plain and has its own climate producing fog and mist. This would not occur further North on existing.	N	
Mitigating measures	The mitigation measures are nowhere near effective enough and, as has been conclusively demonstrated in the case of the NDR, require a vast outlay of public money to achieve nothing much more than 'environmental posturing'.	N	The PEIR outlines Highways England's understanding of the affected environment and likely environmental effects / mitigation measures.
Mitigating measures	REAL and effective environmental measures need to be in place and further waste of dwindling public resources on cosmetic exercises will not go unnoticed.	N	A full environmental impact assessment based on completed survey results is presented in the final Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and will be available for public review and comment as part of the DCO application process. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9) .
Mitigating measures	Apart from some screening and drainage mitigation I could find little in the report that would lessen the environmental impact on the area.	N	
Mitigating measures	There is no such thing as environmental mitigation. This is greenwashing. Once fragile environments are disturbed, they cannot be replaced or recovered for a generation.	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) outline how the

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Mitigating measures	It is understood that the budget for improvements to this section of the A47 is £130.9m and the current cost estimate of the chosen option 2 is £92.76m to £238.42m with the most likely cost of £138.8m. There is already a potential for costs to exceed the budget by over 75% and we are concerned that this will result in shortcuts in the environmental protection measures.	N	design has been amended to reduce the environmental effects and maximise opportunities, and not just rely on mitigation.
Mitigating measures	It is disappointing that you have accepted mitigation rather than the higher level of avoidance before preparing the Environmental Statement.	N	
Noise	I am concerned that traffic will go through Ringland village from Taverham to access this junction. The road is not suitable for this level of traffic as Ringland has no footway or street lighting and has very narrow lanes with buildings that abut the road. It will be detrimental to health through respiratory problems. It will be dangerous to residents and animals including horses that are walked through the village every day to their paddock by children. It will destroy the village community as it will be too dangerous to walk through the village and talk to friends and neighbours. The noise level will be intrusive.	Y	Highways England has considered feedback from Ringland Parish council and the Local Liaison Group. The DCO includes the option to temporarily close Honingham Lane to through traffic in the interim period until Norwich Western Link road opens, to prevent an increase in traffic. Highways England continue to engage and support Norfolk County Council on the wider local road network.
Noise	No absolute answers to sound and pollution screening with fencing and massed planting of trees and shrubs. It simply is not good enough to expect me to agree to this, when you have not confirmed that fencing and planting will create a wide, fully planted screen between village and A47. Using evergreen and other types of trees to fully 100% infill the space between village and road is a solution. But it needs to be written into plans. Planners verbal assurances mean nothing.	N	Noise, air quality, health, landscape, visual, light pollution and ecology impacts have been assessed within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) , in the DCO application, and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to avoid or reduce significant effects. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9) .
Noise	Please take us into consideration when planning these junctions, we will undoubtedly also notice more light and noise pollution, which has risen markedly since the NDR opened, these things have a direct effect upon people's mental health and I already notice the effect on myself.	N	
Noise	more sunken tunnels of 100 to 200 metres in length to allow bridle paths, footpaths and animal crossings to take place. These would lessen the noise impact in the neighbouring area.	N	
Noise	Apart from some screening and drainage mitigation I could find little in the report that would lessen the environmental impact on the area.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Noise	In my opinion an increase in noise and air pollution would be inevitable as would habitat loss to wildlife.	N	
Noise	It will also have a terrible visual and noise impact on the area S of Hockering, near Gipsy Lane, where footpaths follow the banks of the River Tud in a tranquil setting. This will be destroyed. One main reason stated for choosing option 2 was that it would do least environmental damage, yet it has now been moved much to near the main sensitive receptor.	N	
Noise	The noise impact, especially near the river and elsewhere, where the road is not in a cutting, will be severe. No noise measurements or estimation of noise after build, have been presented.	N	<p>A noise impact assessment has been undertaken and informed the design through associated mitigation measures (e.g. provision of noise bunds or fencing), where applicable; these are reported in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1).</p> <p>The A47 mainline carriageway will also be constructed using a low noise road surfacing material.</p>
Noise	When the new road is built, it would be good if there was a bank on the Hockering side created to reduce noise heading towards the village from the traffic using the road.	N	
Noise	Appropriate sound barriers should be considered to protect the enjoyment of residents whose properties back on to the dual carriageway. My parents currently back on to the A47 at Dereham (dual section) and the noise is quite significant especially in rush hour. This should be a consideration to protect local residents. In Australia they have installed walls along the freeway to act as a sound barrier. They are painted to blend in with the area. I am not necessarily suggesting that a wall is appropriate here, but consideration needs to be given to the issue of sound protection.	N	
Norwich Road Junction	On first view this Proposed Norwich Road Junction seems rather over complicated, again with what appears too many slip roads and feeder roads. I would have thought this could have been simplified.	N	<p>The preferred route was announced in August 2017 and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p> <p>The proposed junctions are designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) taking into account the traffic modelling for the scheme opening year (2025) and design year (2040). This is presented</p>
Norwich Road Junction	In relation to the above proposal, I read the section in the Junction and Sideroad Strategy paper on Grade Separated Junctions concerning the complex double roundabouts proposed. In short, drivers unused to motorways or complex junctions are likely to find the number of options and the multi-lane slip roads difficult to navigate. The large number of older drivers in Norfolk was mentioned together with the problems such drivers might have in adapting 'motorway' speeds to existing small roads. I found this most concerning. The possibility of the Norwich Western Link	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	Road also joining the A47 here adds to the problem. This junction threatens to be a double monster.		within the junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation. The fully grade separated dumbbell junction layout is consistent with the existing A47 junctions at Longwater & Watton Road.
Norwich Road Junction	Everyone I know opted for option 3 August 2017. You chose a version of option 2. Every option showed a jcn at Easton for some obscure reason your final proposal shows the giant octopus jcn at Taverham road and Blind lane. Both just passable in a car and going nowhere.	N	
Norwich Road Junction	Abandoning the line of the existing A47 would appear to have necessitated the elaborate 'dumbbell' junction layout proposed at this point, with the consequently extensive slip roads required to connect to this and other existing roads increasing further the greenfield land-take,	N	
Norwich Road Junction	This junction is ridiculous for the location. It's huge with 8 lanes of carriageways at some points.	N	
Norwich Road Junction	I would have expected HE to design a Scheme which entail much reduced land utilisation	N	
Norwich Road Junction	The Easton Junction I agree is needed, but it does appear to be a very convoluted arrangement as it stands, with many roads old and new at this point. Could not the two roads parallel with the new A47 be modified? I suspect that the new road to the south of this junction is to accommodate the proposed business park nearby.	N	The proposed junctions are designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) taking into account the traffic modelling for the scheme opening year (2025) and design year (2040). This is presented within the junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation.
Norwich Road Junction	The Norwich Road junction as now proposed seems to be the same junction for alternative D that was rejected in the Norwich Western Link consultation of 2019. Why is Highways England still pursuing this alternative and not its own proposal for a junction north of Easton Church?	N	The fully grade separated dumbbell junction layout is consistent with the existing A47 junctions at Longwater & Watton Road.
Norwich Road Junction	Two huge new junctions within a mile of each other are out of scale with this part of Norfolk and conflict with statements made by Highways England concerning a junction north of Easton Church and with Broadland District Council which committed to the closure of Blind Lane.	N	It is not possible to locate the required form of junction at the intersection of Church Lane /

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Norwich Road Junction	This is another huge junction very close to the Wood Lane junction. We were told by Highways England that there would be a junction north of Easton Church replacing the Easton roundabout. Highways England seem to have changed their mind and are now suggesting a junction for two single track roads, Taverham Road and Blind Lane. Broadland District Council have already decided that Blind Lane would be closed, and Norfolk County Council decided after consultation that the Norwich Western Link junction would not be at Taverham Road and Blind Lane.	N	Dereham Road in the proposed scheme. The junction was positioned taking into account constraints, such as the Grade 1 listed St Peters Church, the Orsted pipeline route, approved Food Enterprise Zone development, Easton village and topography. Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer.
Norwich Road Junction	We also disagree with the decision to move the eastern Grade Separated junction to Blind Lane/Taverham Road which we perceive as solely to assist the Food Enterprise Park for which the current access is restricted in using the Easton roundabout which it is proposed to remove.	N	
Norwich Road Junction	There is no other logical explanation for the positioning of the Norwich Road junction at Blind Lane. Table 12 describes Blind Lane as "very narrow with no footway provision and is seldom used by motorists". The new junction seems specific to the FEZ in compensation for the removal of the Easton roundabout.	N	The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.
Norwich Road Junction	We don't see the need for a junction on the scale proposed. For example, the proposed Food Enterprise Zone is unlikely to become a significant development.	N	
Norwich Road Junction	The requirement for access to the upgraded A47 is primarily to serve the linked side roads and we believe positioning is not limited to any of the existing junctions. There is no logic for a junction linking these two roads other than for the LDO.	N	
Norwich Road Junction	I have not studied these close enough, but I am trusting there will be no direct traffic pulling onto the new dual carriageway, pulling off is okay but certainly not pulling on. If traffic is pulling onto a dual carriageway it needs a substantial slip road, I would prefer if traffic were diverted to the main junctions. I believe this would be most cost effective.	N	Presently there are 41 direct accesses onto the A47 between North Tuddenham and Easton. The proposed scheme closes all direct accesses to the dual carriageway and provides safe access via the Wood Lane and Norwich Road junctions only.
Norwich Road Junction	The elimination of the Easton roundabout eliminates Non-Motorised-Users (NMU) being able to cross the A47. At present with lower speed at the roundabout it is possible to cross.	Y	A walking and cycling overbridge at Easton is now included in the proposed scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Norwich Road Junction	Unless there is more forward, joined up thinking with Norfolk County Council, there are just going to be far more accidents.	N	<p>A primary objective of the Scheme is to improve safety on this section of the A47 as well as reduce congestion to aid economic growth.</p> <p>Presently there are 41 direct accesses onto the A47 between North Tuddenham & Easton which directly contribute to increased journey times, congestion, and a poor safety record. The proposed scheme addresses this by removing all direct accesses and providing safe access points at Wood Lane & Norwich Road junctions.</p> <p>The proposed junctions are designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) taking into account the traffic modelling for the scheme opening year (2025) and design year (2040). This is presented within the junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation.</p>
Norwich Road Junction	Similar to the £130,000 extra spend on the new NDR road leading to a further 28 accidents on the road in which people were hurt. (EDP 23/01/20)	N	
Norwich Road Junction	On this section of the route, it must also be stressed that the slip road off the Bypass from the Norwich direction onto the bridge comes off at far too acute an angle. There are frequently minor accidents and as it becomes busier, the problem will become worse. This was simply bad design. On the North side, turning right onto the old Dereham Rd. from the bridge, visibility is extremely bad. This is of course worse when the trees are not cut back but is always a problem due to the barrier causing a blind spot. I do not know if these specific problems will be the responsibility of Highways England or whether they will be looked at by the local council or Norwich County Council? They are recognised local problems already and will become far worse when the road becomes substantially busier.	N	
Norwich Road Junction	The best, most practical connections must be chosen. Get rid of these bottlenecks! These are not any good for growth of Norwich and commerce, commuters or safety.	N	
Norwich Road Junction	Thousands of vehicles use Ringland road at the existing roundabout your proposal shows they all have a mile diversion two junctions not a mile apart will cause an accident black spot on double 'S' bends. No junction I can think of has been so close with the slip roads leaving just a quarter mile to manoeuvre	N	
Norwich Road Junction	The promotion of the existing Blind Lane to the main connection point from the south is dangerous and does not take in to account the complexities of other traffic in the area in addition to that from the LDO.	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Norwich Road Junction	<p>Currently, there is only one business on the FEZ, which processes mustard and mint for forwarding on to Colman's processing plant at Burton on Trent. The Design and Access Statement for this planning application noted weekly HGV movements and "some tractor / trailer movement associated with the transportation of raw mint to the site during this seasonal period".</p> <p>We note that in 2018 it was reported that banning tractors from dual carriageway A roads was being considered. If this ban is enacted, is there an alternative for these tractor deliveries to the LDO?</p> <p>In addition to the FEZ, the same landowner operates Honingham Thorpe Farms with its main entrance at the other end of Blind Lane at the junction with Church Lane. One of the businesses conducted on this semi-business/industrial park is a chemical store for Frontier Agriculture Ltd. Although it is understood that the facility does not require COMAH registration, Frontier has an Operator's Licence for 3 rigid flatbed vehicles of 12T, 14T and 16T operating out of the site delivering to farms within the area plus 3 to 5 HGV deliveries per week for stocks.</p> <p>A change of use planning application has recently been approved for the relocation of this facility on the complex to another building. One of the conditions attached to the approval is that the current voluntary arrangement that all these vehicles must use Church which connects to the A47 at the Easton roundabout.</p> <p>This will become impossible with the Easton roundabout being removed and these chemical HGVs will be expected to use Church Lane and loop back on the new side road parallel to the A47, assuming Blind Lane will still be unsuitable.</p>	Y	<p>Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer.</p> <p>The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.</p>
Norwich Road Junction	<p>Currently, there is only one business on the FEZ, which processes mustard and mint for forwarding on to Colman's processing plant at Burton on Trent. The Design and Access Statement for this planning application noted weekly HGV movements and "some tractor / trailer movement associated with the transportation of raw mint to the site during this seasonal period".</p> <p>Clarification is required whether direct access for slow moving tractor/trailers is compatible with safety requirements of the SRN.</p> <p>We would appreciate your comments on these observations.</p>	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Norwich Road Junction	I have to question A agree but the roundabout had been left would been much easier than all these side roads. Why couldn't the road be left as it is no of course it couldn't all because someone wants a food hub and hundreds of houses built.	N	In line with Scheme objectives, in order to provide a more free-flowing network, the existing Easton roundabout is to be removed.
Norwich Road Junction	All the A47 from Wood lane to Easton should be kept open. This is achieved by moving Norwich Road Junction back to Easton. This will help massively during the now dualling construction and allow locals to use part of the old A47 after dualling.	N	It is not possible to locate the required form of junction, a fully grade separated junction, at the intersection of Church Lane / Dereham Road in the proposed scheme. The junction was positioned taking into account constraints, such as the Grade 1 listed St Peters Church, the Orsted pipeline route, Food Enterprise Zone development, Easton village and topography.
Norwich Road Junction	The Norwich Road junction needs to move east where Highways England always said it would be	N	
Norwich Road Junction	In 2017 Highways England announced a new junction north of Easton Church. This was going to replace the Easton roundabout. What has changed and why can't the Norwich Road junction move east to the 2017 location.	N	The Junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation outlines the junction design in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) and based on the traffic modelling for the opening year (2025) and design year (2040).
Norwich Road Junction	In more specific terms I would like to suggest that the Scheme for that junction should be moved further South away from the historic and environmentally important Berry Hall Estate with its exceptional woodland and important tree plantings. I believe that this would be possible, given the lay of the land.	N	The justification for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017).
Norwich Western Link	The effect of the NWL - as proposed - on the Wensum valley (SSSI) and ancient woodland is catastrophic. There are alternative routes for the NWL which would cause less damage and be cheaper; some of these would however use the proposed connection. I hope NCC's desire to promote and favour the currently-proposed route of the NWL has not influenced Highways or the design/Preliminary Environmental Information Report of the A47 North Tuddenham-Easton in any way, or indeed led to the lateness of this design and consultation.	N	Though Highways England continues to liaise with Norfolk County Council in relation to the Norwich Western Link (NWL), the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme is not reliant upon the delivery of the NWL so does not have any input to the route design or justification of that Scheme.
Norwich Western Link	I do not like the Wensum Valley being built up and this will connect to the NDR, but the current road is unsafe, and the bottleneck junctions need fixing	N	However, as the Local Highway Authority has a developed Scheme that proposes to connect with the A47, it's both sensible and pragmatic for

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Norwich Western Link	It's obvious that the NDR needs to be extended to join the A47, even though there are serious environmental issues about the route through the Wensum Valley. If that extension happens by any route, it would be an even worse bottleneck if the A47 could not accept the increased traffic.	N	<p>The A47 Scheme to anticipate that the NWL may come forward and, albeit separately funded by the Government, explore the ability to create a connection with the new junction to achieve efficiency opportunities with public spending.</p> <p>Post Statutory Consultation, Highways England has included a connection for walkers and cyclists from Wood Lane to the existing A47 across the NWL.</p>
Norwich Western Link	After the huge waste of NDR the last thing we need are more hyper expensive road Schemes when social and health services have had huge cuts.	N	
Norwich Western Link	The impact on the natural surroundings along with animals and other wildlife is far too high.	N	
Norwich Western Link	The NDR is bad enough with animals littering it, especially deer.	N	
Norwich Western Link	<p>The most important element of the junctions is the proposed connection with the NDR Wensum link (NWL), yet there is no question about this in this document</p> <p>The dumbbell junction with the new road and the proposed NWL is badly designed. Both the A47 and the NWL will be very busy dual carriageways carrying a large amount of long-distance traffic. A dumbbell roundabout with such small roundabouts for this interchange is far too under powered and will likely result in major traffic jams. It is totally unfit for purpose.</p>	N	
Norwich Western Link	It's possible that even if the NWL is built the connection to Wood Lane B1535 will encourage traffic to use that route instead of the NWL because of the route selected for the NWL will mean a detour for traffic heading into North Norfolk. Wood lane should not connect to the NWL at this junction.	N	
Norwich Western Link	Wood lane will probably be a popular route for cyclists when it no longer ends on the currently dangerous A47. Yet it will be impossible for cyclists to cross from the old A47 to the west across the NWL toward Norwich as no cycle route is proposed around the northern roundabout and crossing the dual carriageway of the NWL will be impossible	N	
Norwich Western Link	The northern roundabout of the dumbbell will be impossibly busy and very dangerous as designed and it will be next to impossible to exit from the Wood lane direction.	N	
Norwich Western Link	There's a junction with the proposed Norwich Western Link (extension of the 'Broadland Northway' A1270) which could be a good thing so long as	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Norwich Western Link	<p>Norfolk County Council's currently favoured option is canned in favour of something cheaper and less environmentally damaging.</p> <p>By their own scoping and alternative routes previously put out for consultation, 'Option B' (minus viaduct) most closely matches the original brief of the route, is projected to be tens of millions of pounds cheaper and, crucially, will not destroy the Wensum valley and surrounding landscape. NCC have not stated publicly why Option B (minus viaduct) was discounted. There was another version of 'B' which had a short viaduct although I do not feel this would be suitable to connect with the dualled A47 section either. Similarly, NCC are withholding a bat/environmental survey which is connected to this route and another which was commissioned for the rest of the A1270 route but pertains to this area. I feel this is highly dubious and that Highways should be aware of everything that is going on in relation to joining the A1270 to the A47.</p>	N	
Norwich Western Link	<p>Local policy changes have also taken place since 2017 and publication of the SAR. One change is that a proposed new community of 4,000 dwellings at Honingham has been put on the back burner. Another is that the number of jobs to be created at the Food Enterprise Zone is likely to be far smaller than predicted. Broadland DC stated in its 2017 response to A47 NTE dualling that the FEZ development would be of major significance for the local economy. WSP traffic modelling "Do-Minimum" Scenario for a Norwich Western Link originally assumed 3,000 to 5,000 jobs (NWL Technical Report, WSP, Oct 2017). Now County Council officers advise that the Core Scenario in the NWL traffic model assumes 246 employees for 2025 and 985 employees for 2040 and 2050 in relation to Phase 1. In view of the current economic situation, a question mark must hang over the future of this site.</p>	N	
Norwich Western Link	<p>A47 Dualling – North Tuddenham to Easton</p> <p>I am the chair of a campaign group, Stop Wensum Link (SWL), established to oppose Norfolk County's decision to construct a three-mile road (Norwich Western Link) (NWL) through the Wensum Valley. In short, our objection is based on the high cost of the project and the devastating and irreversible impact it will have on the unspoilt Wensum Valley. We are aware the A47 and NWL projects intertwine and the complex design of the A47 dualling will in part be dictated by the proposed</p>	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	junction of the NWL with the A47. The NWL will at best can be a classified as part of the Major Road Network (MRN), although we believe it should be no more than a local road. Either way as a secondary road it should not dictate the layout of the Strategic Road Network (SRN).		
Norwich Western Link	I do not agree with the Western link road - highly damaging to the existing wildlife and the environment in which they live by 'bisecting' and 'cutting-off' routes for all mammals including badger's deer and foxes!	N	
Norwich Western Link	The new section is too far South and into the Tud Valley. This is a flood plain and has its own climate producing fog and mist. This would not occur further North on existing.	N	
Norwich Western Link	Option A provides for a slightly wider underpass at Wood Lane to accommodate the B1535 which could come in useful if the planned capacity of the junction needs upgrading at a later date as it could then be easily converted into a junction like the A1/A66 without too much expense as once the Western Link is built there will be no need for the B1535 to connect to the A47. NCC only need a connection now in case for whatever reason the Western Link is not built.	N	
Norwich Western Link	I am concerned about the volume of surface water from these new roads and roundabouts/ junctions. Recent flooding has shown the river Tud/ flood plains and Wensum struggling with existing surface water run-off.	N	
Norwich Western Link	The failure to exploit the clear linkage with the proposed western link road is evidence of the lack of coherent thinking or planning and clearly a disservice to local residents.	N	
Norwich Western Link	More importantly, there is no clear evidence of effective coordination between Highways England responsible for the A47 and Norfolk County Council responsible for the (still unfunded) Norwich Western Link Road (NWLR). The consultations cannot and must not be separate especially regarding to the Wood Lane junction since traffic there will greatly increase because of the NWLR. That increase in traffic will affect the	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	villages south of the A 47. The issues must be addressed holistically not separately.		
Norwich Western Link	Also, there is no clear evidence of effective coordination between Highways England responsible for the A47 and Norfolk County Council responsible for the (still unfunded) Norwich Western Link Road (NWLR). The consultations cannot and must not be separate especially regarding to the Wood Lane junction since traffic there will greatly increase because of the NWLR. That increase in traffic will affect the villages south of the A47. The issues must be addressed holistically not separately.	N	
Norwich Western Link	To reduce the size of Wood Lane junction is even more prudent now as there is currently no planning and no funding for the Norwich Western Link which is presumably why this junction is so big.	N	
Norwich Western Link	Why can't you connect the NDR at the same time or do we have to suffer years of inadequate transport links between the two major routes before you do anything about it? It doesn't take a genius to work out that these two roads need to be properly linked.	N	
Norwich Western Link	Its not needed any more that the NDR was - its virtually empty - we should be working on increasing the use of trains and decreasing travel per se	N	
Norwich Western Link	Honingham Lane should be closed (preferably in two places with rising bollards) when the Easton roundabout is closed with an option to re- open after the NWL is opened	N	
Norwich Western Link	The Wensum Valley is a valued location for walking and cycling. The complex proposed arrangements fly in the face of preserving this important natural asset and recreational asset	N	
Norwich Western Link	When this Scheme is finished, I don't know who is paying for the N.D.R. to be connected to the new A47.	N	
Norwich Western Link	The consequence is a series of employment and retail centres around the outskirts, initially situated on the outer ring road but now being pushed further out to the Southern Bypass and the Northern Distributor Road (NDR) in the neighbouring districts of Broadland and South Norfolk.	N	
Norwich Western Link	The latest allocation of City Deal funding for public transport to the Greater Norwich Development Partnership in support of the Norwich Western Link	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	(NWL) announced by the Government is now likely to be no more than a third of that applied for.		
Norwich Western Link	You state at paragraph 2 on page 2 of your letter dated 6 April 2020 that this new position was considered prior to the PRA; if this was the case why did the PRA show an At-grade junction at Church lane/Sandy Lane? The side road strategy connects Sandy Lane and Wood Lane to the north of the A47 and Church Lane and Berry's Lane t to the south. Access to the A47 is therefore possible at either location of the junction and it seems that the NWL has influenced the relocation.	N	
Norwich Western Link	We note that you are also saying in this latest letter that you consider the differences in the design of the junction are limited between one with or without the NWL. Again, this is all confusing and questions the validity of the 2017 consultation.	N	
Norwich Western Link	The Honingham Junction in this form depends fully on the Norwich Western Link being agreed at this point. If it is not agreed the northern part of the junction will have to be reconsidered. If NCC in their deliberations place the Link elsewhere there will be major future disruption. Does this mean that the A47 proposals will be put on hold until this link is agreed?	N	
Norwich Western Link	An overall consideration should be given to this A47 Scheme and with the Norwich Western Link being handled by one governing body (At present yourselves, Norfolk C.C. and Norwich City C. if the latter are involved) especially in view of the size of the whole Scheme. Also, the 'Norwich Western Link' should be viewed as the 'Northern branch' of the A47 complementing the 'Southern branch' completed some 30/40 years ago.	N	
Norwich Western Link	By building the Wood Lane Junction, the Highways Agency goes against the PUBLIC and EMERGENCY SERVICES preference for the NCC Western Link ROUTE D.	N	
Norwich Western Link	The grade separated proposed Wood Lane junction has been partly designed to facilitate the Norwich Western Link which I also oppose. The proposed NWL would have a major detrimental impact on the River Wensum valley and its complex of fragile habitats and protected species such as otters and water voles. Norfolk County Council have not made a case for the road.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Norwich Western Link	However, there is concern for the connection of the proposed NDR western link at this location as the proposed short reservoir length for Wood Lane as proposed is inadequate.	N	
Norwich Western Link	The grade separated proposed Wood Lane junction has been partly designed to facilitate the Norwich Western Link which I also oppose. The proposed NWL would have a major detrimental impact on the River Wensum valley and its complex of fragile habitats and protected species such as otters and water voles. Norfolk County Council have not made a case for the road.	N	
Norwich Western Link	By building the Wood Lane Junction the Highways agency goes against the public and emergency services preference for the NCC Western Link route D all that is needed at Wood Lane is an underpass.	N	
Norwich Western Link	One thing, that is difficult to assess is future traffic growth, in view of the missing piece (Western link, linking A47 and NDR). It would be good to get some reassurances around that.	N	
Norwich Western Link	I just hope there is some 'joined up' thinking with the link with the NDR so we do not have one completed Scheme, which has to be dug up to accommodate the joining up.	N	
Norwich Western Link	I think that the Highways Agency would serve the public and emergency interest best by insisting that the NCC Western Link be brought to this junction. This would save cost of building the Wood Lane Junction to the dual carriageway (although the proposed local connections with underpass are needed. This saving could be put towards the extra cost of giving the public and emergency services route D of the Western Link.	N	
Norwich Western Link	It is acknowledged that a joined-up planning policy is desirable and a secondary consideration can be incorporated into a new consultation for the implications of local proposals. As yet finance has not been made available for the NWL and there are major concerns on environmental issues which may mean it will not go ahead. We see no justification for using the dictates of the NWL as an over-riding factor in the design of the A47 improvement works.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Norwich Western Link	As part of the construction of the new dualled A47, Highways England propose to build a new junction at Berry's Lane/Wood Lane. This junction will have two roundabouts, one to the north to join the suggested Norwich Western Link (NWL) to the new dualled A47, with an underpass under the dual carriageway, linking to the roundabout south at Berry's Lane. This will connect the dualled A47 directly to the C176 Berry's Lane, allowing lorries and cars looking for a 5-mile short cut, to rat run through Barnham Broom to Wymondham via country lanes, heading for the A11.	Y	Following Statutory Consultation, the direct connection between the A47 and Berry's Lane has been removed.
Norwich Western Link	The new consultation should be drafted as: 1)Route options with side road strategies assuming the NWL and FEZ do not feature. 2)Implications and changes to these options to accommodate the NWL and FEZ. An EIA will be required for the NWL but has yet to be submitted. We consider that any EIA implications specific to the NWL junction, including its repositioning, should form part of the EIA by Norfolk County Council for that Scheme and not the A47 proposals.	N	Highways England is not responsible for the Norwich Western Link or the FEZ. Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the Norwich Western Link and FEZ.
People/communities	Villagers on the route deserve to have the best solution possible. After the decades of deterioration, they have had to put with, be it noise, pollution, or traffic queues.	N	The Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) outlines the alternative route options considered and explains that the preferred option presents the least environmental impact.
People/communities	I also feel that the opportunity to restore St Andrew's Church to a more conventional relationship with its parish should have been taken.	N	The walking, cycling and horse-riding connection between Honingham and the Church has been reviewed and altered to provide a more direct connection, and includes an underpass below the proposed A47.
People/communities	It is debatable whether new roads will economically benefit Norwich City as the policies being pursued under Transport for Norwich (TfN) is to move private vehicles away from the centre of Norwich in favour of public transport and cycling.	N	Chapter 5 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) outlines the economic benefits of the Scheme. The proposed scheme also addresses the present poor safety record.
People/communities	Insufficient attention has been given to the significant impact of the proposals on residents of Rotten Row (with gardens being cut through, and the road being very close to houses, particularly if raised)	N	Since Statutory Consultation, the Scheme boundary has been altered to reduce its intrusion into gardens of properties along Rotten Row. The Environmental Statement

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			(TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the impacts on receptors near the Scheme.
People/communities	My main concern is the fair treatment of Ringland Village. This is a major concern for residents and the preservation of the area in general.	N	Highways England has considered feedback from Ringland parish council in relation to traffic movements on Honingham Lane and have included measures in the DCO to address the concerns.
Planting	reduced impact on environment. This consumes less of the Norfolk countryside, preserves more existing tree/shrub cover and provides an increased opportunity to plant new trees between the new dualled and existing A47 consistent with stated government policy.	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), with the DCO application, contains a biodiversity impact assessment and, where needed, proposes mitigation measures to achieve at least no net loss in biodiversity based on the Defra metric.
Planting	I think more should and could be done to accelerate and improve the eventual net environmental gain. This could include planting more mature trees/shrubs, maintaining as much as possible of the current tree/shrub cover north of the existing A47.	N	The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9). The landscape masterplan aims to achieve no net loss of biodiversity value as part of the Scheme and retain habitat connectivity.
Preliminary Environmental Information	Wildlife surveys are incomplete and until they have been carried out an assessment of environmental mitigation cannot be made. For example, survey information on bats is incomplete. The Scheme study area may potentially provide feeding grounds for barbastelle bats, a colony/is of which have been identified along with Preferred Route Option for NWL but not reported by Norfolk County Council.	N	The purpose of the PEIR is to outline Highways England's understanding of the affected environment and likely environmental effects / mitigation measures. A full environmental impact assessment based on completed survey results is presented in the final Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) and will be available for public review and comment as part of the DCO application process.
Preliminary Environmental Information	As it is admitted that the PEIR 'presents currently available information from the ongoing EIA' (NTS # 1.1.8), so that the information it contains is 'preliminary' and 'the final assessment of environmental effects will be presented in the Environmental Statement that will be submitted with the DCO application' (# 1.5.3), public consultees at this stage lack the comprehensive evidence that they would need in order to be able to fully assess whether the adverse environmental impacts of the Scheme could be adequately mitigated.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Preliminary Environmental Information	The environmental impact is not properly or fully understood.	N	
Preliminary Environmental Information	Certainly, the report is not either representative or inclusive. This is a very sensitive, uncommon type of environment, yet the proposed approach is rather uniform and standard, certainly not class leading.	N	
Preliminary Environmental Information	Landscape and Environment.	N	
Preliminary Environmental Information	Reading the documentation issued to date we can only conclude that no detailed environmental studies have been undertaken for the original fourteen options or the four shortlisted for the 2017 Public Consultation but you now intend to carry out the Environmental Impact Assessment for the Preferred Route only as set out in the Scoping Report submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.	N	The increasing level of assessment from the original fourteen options to the preferred option is in compliance with government standards for assessing options for highways Schemes, which seeks to short-list options on a balance of technical, economic and environmental considerations. This reflects the need to manage public spending by applying a proportionate level of assessment to each stage of options appraisal.
Preliminary Environmental Information	and looked at the proposals for this section Easton onwards. In all cases the extensive and damaging impact upon the environment has not been given adequate emphasis, an impact revealed in harsh reality by the Broadland Northway project A 1270.	N	
Rat running	The only disappointing thing about this is that it doesn't stop the problem of the rat run through Low Easton	Y	Highways England has considered feedback regarding lower Easton and has amended the side road proposals to remove linking church lane to the junction, and closing Church Lane to through traffic.
Rat running	Please do not encourage more traffic through our street, just improve access to & from the Dog Lane/ Ringland Hills route used for years to bypass our village.	N	
Rat running	An issue is vehicle access to the Food Hub west of Easton. It is important that vehicles, especially heavy vehicles, use the A47 and do not short-cut through the villages.	N	Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer. The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ)

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			<p>traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.</p> <p>Managing FEZ associated impacts is the responsibility of the FEZ developers and the local highway authority, any traffic using the local village should be brought to the attention of the Parish, District or County Council</p>
Reference to other consultation	<p>Unsure which page the section on the Vauxhall roundabout is, but adding more traffic lights to an already congested area will not improve the flow of traffic. The roundabout needs a slip lane from great Yarmouth to the bridge, and a slip road from the bridge towards Norwich with the whole bridge duelled.</p> <p>The Gapton roundabout needs a flyover from the bridge towards Gorleston, the whole chain of 3 roundabouts need major rethinks, as someone who drives daily to Norwich from Gorleston it is frustrating that it can take longer to reach the Acle straight (45-60min) than it does to get from the Vauxhall round about to Norwich city centre itself (30min)</p>	N	While this comment does not relate to this Scheme, the team has passed it to the relevant Design Team for consideration.
Reference to other consultation	<p>I agree with most of the proposal. However I disagree with changes to Vauxhall and Gapton roundabouts.</p> <p>Vauxhall: all that is needed is to add traffic lights, traffic is an issue here because there's a constant flow coming over the bridge and cars at other exit points can't pass. Stopping that flow will ease traffic on the Acle straight. Widening the lanes will make no difference, the whole Acle straight needs dualling.</p> <p>Gapton: its only just had improvements made to it, its not the roundabout that causes traffic, it's the road that leads to gapton and cars going to McDonald's. A one-way system is needed around the whole Gapton industrial estate.</p>	N	
River Tud	Technically, we have doubts about the impact upon ground water and the river during and after construction. Excavations, grading and piling all	N	The Environment Agency has been consulted extensively on the design and construction of the

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	pose risk. Financially, the entire project is at risk because of the nature of the ground geology and complex structures.		River Tud bridge crossing to agree acceptable design and build parameters that manages the flood fluvial and ecological impact risks.
River Tud	Tud Valley The complex design of the A47 means the construction and the changes once completed will almost certainly impact on the integrity of River Tud and, it follows, the River Wensum, comprising two rare chalk streams. It is known the Tud offers habitat for the rare white-clawed crayfish.	N	
River Tud	The PEIR admits that where the proposed offline route passes to the south of Hockering, and parallel to the River Tud, 'woodland along the north and south bank of the River Tud are described as habitats of potential ecological importance' (# 2.3.3), whilst where the proposed route follows an offline route to the north side of the current A47 and then north east of Honingham 'Close to this area are four woodland areas of potential ecological importance' (# 2.3.4).	N	Noise and ecology impacts have been assessed within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) , in the DCO application, and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to address any significant effects. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9) .
Safety	I have concerns that if the dual carriageway goes ahead there will be an increase in noise from increased traffic. Increase in pollution, increase in speeding on this stretch of road. Also, loss of trees and hedges which screen noise and pollution. I am not convinced enough planting has been agreed	N	
Safety	Always remember it needs dualling because it's dangerous, not because there are too many users. In practice it would be safer if there were more users, because drivers would be that bit more cautious.	N	Noted. The proposed scheme looks to address the poor safety record by removing all direct accesses to the A47 between North Tuddenham and Easton and providing safe entry points via the Wood Lane and Norwich Road junctions.
Safety	A dual carriage way will encourage speeding.	N	Improving safety along this section of the A47 is an objective of the Scheme. Its safety benefits are set out in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) .
Safety	I have lived in Dereham since the age of 11 and from the age of 17 I have travelled along the A47 almost daily between Dereham and King's Lynn (where I worked between 2008 and 2018) and Norwich (where I have now worked since 2019). Sadly in that time I have known a number of people from Dereham and the surrounding area who have lost their lives due to the inadequacy of the A47 (particularly on the section of the A47 between Wending and Easton), who have left behind family and friends with heavy hearts.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Safety	I have recently written to George Freeman, local MP, to express my concern at the level of road accidents which have occurred just in this last month or so on the A47 on the stretch of road between Necton and Easton, and the inadequacy of the layout of that section of road - particularly due to the volume of traffic, array of large vehicles (articulated lorries, agricultural vehicles etc.), and the number of minor roads leading onto the A47 which are black spots for accidents.	N	
Safety	On this section of the route, it must also be stressed that the slip road off the Bypass from the Norwich direction onto the bridge comes off at far too acute an angle. There are frequently minor accidents and as it becomes busier, the problem will become worse. This was simply bad design.	N	
Safety	The issue of new dual carriageway / NWL direct access to dangerous single track side roads (Berry's Lane , Taverham Rd) needs to be solved and at present the only proposal made to achieve this is keeping the existing A47 as is.	N	
Safety	We do not need more housing. Each house usually generates two cars, local services will be vastly overloaded, and the usual chaos will continue. Please, make the road safer, but also use the opportunity to make it an excellent example of how non invasive progress can be.	N	
Safety	We reiterate our belief that a non-dualled solution with junction and safety improvements should have been offered as an option.	N	
Safety	Consideration should also be given to the stretch between Wendling and Drayton Hall Lane which are also blackspots for accidents.	N	The 'A47 and A12 corridor feasibility study' reviewed the whole A47 corridor and identified the need to dual this section of the A47 Strategic Road Network - https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/a47-and-a12-corridor-feasibility-study-technical-report
Safety	The Mattishall roundabout ought to be removed in the process as it causes unnecessary congestion and risk for road users.	N	The Scheme will significantly reduce traffic at the Mattishall Road roundabout.
Safety	The close proximity of the Wood Land and Blind Lane junctions causes great concern for health and safety of road users. Traffic joining the A47 at Wood Lane travelling East towards Norwich will join a flow of traffic travelling at 70mph. Cars in the inside lane will be slowing down to exit the A47 at the Blind Lane junction, causing a potentially dangerous section of road with cars trying to get up to speed whilst at the same time driving alongside traffic trying to slow down to exit the A47.	N	The Scheme is designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB). The proposed design has also undergone Operational Safety assessments, and an independent Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Scoping report	Your Scoping Report (SR) issued to the Planning Inspectorate precedes this drawing and is dated September 2019. The resultant Scoping Opinion (SO) from the Planning Inspectorate criticised the SR at paragraph 2.3.1 stating that it "does not include a complete or consistent description of the Proposed Development".	N	A full description of the Scheme is presented in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) , submitted as part of the DCO application.
Scoping report	<p>At paragraph 2.3.2 the SO summarises the Planning Inspectorate's understanding that the development includes three junctions as shown in Fig 1-1 of the SR. For clarity these are one at each end of the new section of dualled carriageway with an intermediate junction at Church Lane and Sandy Lane.</p> <p>This is contradicted within the narrative description of the proposals at paragraphs 2.3.2 to 2.3.6 of the SR which notes an intermediate junction is proposed between Blind lane/Taverham Road and the existing Easton roundabout but does not mention the Church Lane/Sandy Lane junction. The latest PCF Stage 3 drawing now shows two junctions neither of which corresponds with either of the single locations mentioned in the SO (Church Lane/Sandy Lane) or SR (between Blind Lane/Taverham Road and the Easton roundabout). The two changed locations are Berry's Lane/Wood Lane and Blind Lane/Taverham Road. It can only be interpreted that this radical change to the junctions is a direct result of the focus of work being on the NWL and FEZ as your letter of 27 September 2019, neither of which projects relates to the Strategic Road Network(SRN). The SR and SO both also lack any reference to the circa 7km of new side roads which are now shown as necessary to provide access from the villages to the SRN.</p>	N	
Speed limit/signage	There is a traffic problem mainly only at the rush hours, caused mainly by roundabouts at Marshall Road and Easton, which could be replaced by traffic-light-controlled junctions with better flow, and at low cost.	N	The Case for the Scheme (TR0100038/APP/7.1) demonstrates the need for the Scheme on a balance of needs and considerations, including traffic growth, safety and environmental impacts, and why the Scheme is the preferred option with the least environmental impact.
Speed limit/signage	The main problem with this section of the A47 is safety, not (currently) traffic volume. There are alternative solutions to improving safety on this section of the road that would be cheaper both financially and in ecological cost, such as reducing the speed limit and other safety measures. In fact, there is a likelihood that increasing the road capacity would only increase traffic volume without solving the traffic safety issue.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Speed limit/signage	<p>(Editor's note: p4 brochure, underlined 'acts as a bottleneck') very seldom and due to speeding</p> <p>(Editor's note: p4 brochure, arrow to photograph of traffic queue) This is very seldom as indicated by the evening sky Between 5pm and 6.30pm because traffic speeds on the dualled southern bypass over the 70mph limit and bottlenecks into the single lane stretch!</p> <p>Slower speed limits on the dualled parts of 60mph would help environmentally and to cost of 'road kill'.</p>	N	
Speed limit/signage	<p>(Editor's note: p5 brochure, line to 'improve safety for all road users and for those living in the local area') This would be achieved by speed limits and cameras!</p>	N	
Speed limit/signage	<p>I drive a hybrid car. It is most efficient when travelling under 60mph. So in terms of carbon emissions it is better for me to follow traffic at approx. 50mph than going faster on a dual carriageway.</p>	N	
Speed limit/signage	<p>This section of the A47 would be safer for all concerned if there were traffic lights at important junctions and crossings (rather than dualling). The roundabout where the main road connects with the Mattishall Road is the main reason for the traffic hold ups at rush hours and (without dualling) could be improved with traffic lights, especially ones adjusted for tidal flow.</p>	N	
Speed limit/signage	<p>Norwich Green Party group of councillors would like to see a more environmentally sustainable option for addressing travel issues along this section of road.</p> <p>The A47 study showed that a significant proportion of journeys along the road are short distance. A number of these involve single person car commuting trips from smaller centre such as Dereham and Great Yarmouth to larger centres such as Norwich. Local road traffic reduction using a variety of measures such as travel planning and parking controls should be combined with small road safety infrastructure measures such as speed reduction and traffic lights at key crossing points to enable vehicles to cross over the A47.. Although the latter would slow down traffic, they would reduce road accidents, improve local environmental conditions, cut carbon emissions and potentially increase overall journey reliability.</p>	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Speed limit/signage	based around reducing road traffic and small road safety improvements which include traffic lights at the main side road crossings and closure of side road junctions.	N	
Speed limit/signage	Also, can we assume that the traffic lights which stagger traffic joining the Mattishall roundabout in rush hour (am) will be removed?	N	Arrangements at Honingham roundabout will be reviewed as part of the de-trunking of this section of the existing A47.
Taverham Road	Why have Highways England now proposed the Norwich Road junction for Taverham Road and Blind Lane which are both single track roads?	N	In line with Scheme objectives, in order to provide a more free-flowing network, the existing Easton roundabout is to be removed.
Taverham Road	Ringland is a rural village with a single-track winding road - unsuitable for heavy traffic flow and large vehicles. Also, there is a 7.5ton limit on the weak bridge crossing from Ringland to Taverham.	N	It is not possible to locate the required form of junction, a fully grade separated junction, at the intersection of Church Lane / Dereham Road in the proposed scheme. The junction was positioned taking account of constraints, such as the Grade 1 listed St Peters Church, the Orsted pipeline route, Food Enterprise Zone development, Easton village and topography.
Taverham Road	It is acknowledged in the Scoping Report (SR) submitted to the Planning Inspectorate that Blind Lane as "very narrow with no footway provision and is seldom used by motorists". We consider that Taverham Road is equally unsuited.	N	
Taverham Road	Given their proximity to the junction improvements at Church Lane and Taverham Road, the PEIR admits (# 5.6.5) that 'There will be an unavoidable impact' on the setting of the Grade I Listed St Peter's and Grade II* Listed St Andrew's Churches, but merely states that 'During design development, mitigation measures to reduce this potential impact will be investigated'	N	The Junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation outlines the junction design in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) and based on the traffic modelling for the opening year (2025) and design year (2040).
Taverham Road	The proposed roundabouts need to be moved closer to Easton as that have an unnecessary impact on residential property on Taverham road	N	
Taverham Road	I am concerned that traffic will go through Ringland village from Taverham to access this junction. The road is not suitable for this level of traffic as Ringland has no footway or street lighting and has very narrow lanes with buildings that abut the road. It will be detrimental to health through respiratory problems. It will be dangerous to residents and animals including horses that are walked through the village every day to their paddock by children. It will destroy the village community as it will be too dangerous to walk through the	Y	Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) . In response to feedback at statutory consultation, and Local Liaison Group, the proposed scheme now includes a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) for Honingham

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	village and talk to friends and neighbours. The noise level will be intrusive. It will make getting out of your drive dangerous and difficult.		Lane only, with Taverham Road remaining open to traffic. This would allow the option to temporarily close Honingham Lane to through traffic in the interim period between the opening of the A47 Scheme and the proposed Norwich Western Link to control the risk of traffic passing through Ringland.
Taverham Road	People will take the easiest option and head through Ringland Village, along roads that are too narrow, and through a village with tight bends, no footpaths, no streetlighting, a 7.5 tonne weight limit bridge and lots of agricultural machinery use. If 6-8000 traffic movements per day is likely then there will inevitably be a serious incident (especially as the Western Link may be many years from construction). Needs more and better analysis and more thought and design input to avoid such an obvious issue.	Y	Including the TTRO within the DCO will allow its implementation if it is deemed the right thing to do following further discussion with the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council. However, it does not preclude the option not to implement the closure if it is not supported by the local planning authority.
Taverham Road	This will lead them along a single-track road straight through via Ringland village, over a weak bridge over the Wensum by The Swan public House, along Beech Avenue, Taverham, joining the A1067. The risk of damage to property, risks to public, risk of RTAs, is immense.	Y	Highways England continues to engage and support Norfolk County Council in regard to the local road network and NWL scheme.
Taverham Road	To reduce the potential of traffic running from this junction via Taverham lane(it's not even classed as a B road)through the centre of Ringland village to Taverham , both of which are very dangerous narrow roads, please think again & consider using the existing A47 as the connection to Taverham road & not building the direct connection shown from the roundabout. This could stop a direct straight access & hopefully drivers would prefer not to go back on themselves to access Taverham Lane & they can continue to use the Dog Lane/ Ringland Hills route which has been used since 1992 when the Southern bypass was created. This plan would have minimal effect on Honingham Church goers.	Y	
Taverham Road	As a resident of Ringland village I am concerned that many vehicles will use the Taverham Road and Honingham Lane route from the Norwich Road Junction as a shortcut/rat run to get to and from Taverham, Drayton. This would lead to a substantial increase in traffic through the village.	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	A village where we have no pavements or street lighting and which in my opinion would pose an unacceptable risk to residents.		
Taverham Road	The connection to Taverham road (a narrow, mainly one-track lane) means all traffic to & from Taverham (currently in the 1000's per week) will use the route straight through the centre of Ringland. I live on this street Which is very dangerous even now! My neighbours next door to my property have already had their wall demolished at least 4 times as our properties are very close to one of the 3 sharp bends & drivers will not slow down regardless of chevron warnings	Y	
Taverham Road	The location of the new junction creates an obvious shortcut for traffic leaving the A47 to go to Taverham or Drayton via Taverham Road. This will take the traffic through the centre of Ringland Village which is a single-track road with no pavements or street lighting and some very narrow and sharp bends. It is not suited to such traffic.	Y	
Taverham Road	Once the Easton roundabout no longer exists and the new junction at Blind Lane and Taverham Road is in place there is a clear line of sight in regard to the easiest route for drivers to take rather than fully utilising the new layout at this point: Straight up Taverham Road and subsequently through Ringland village. We already see vehicle numbers of 1000 plus on a daily basis. Once the roundabout has gone this will escalate dramatically by probably 1000's more. Ringland is clearly very vulnerable.	Y	
Taverham Road	so we avoid these dangerously high numbers using Ringland village as a "rat run." The path of least resistance' is a phrase heard regularly, but it is entirely apt. Please consider Ringland at this vital stage. Thoughtful consideration is only fair and most definitely appropriate.	Y	
Taverham Road	In the absence of the proposed Norwich Western Link, it is highly likely that there will be damaging levels of traffic leaving the A47 via Taverham Road in order to join Fakenham Rd A1067 in Taverham, to access the NDR. This will lead them along a single-track road straight through via Ringland village, over a weak bridge over the Wensum by The Swan public House, along Beech Avenue, Taverham, joining the A1067.	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Taverham Road	The location of the new junction creates an obvious shortcut for traffic leaving the A47 to go to Taverham or Drayton via Taverham Road. This will take the traffic through the centre of Ringland Village which is a single-track road with no pavements or street lighting and some very narrow and sharp bends. It is not suited to such traffic.	Y	
Taverham Road	Ringland is local walking, cycling and horse-riding hotspot. AS mentioned above, traffic will be accessing the improved A47 from the NNDR and local roads around Taverham by driving through Ringland as the access at Easton will not be available to them. Whilst the A47 improvements are clearly necessary until the Western Link from the NNDR and The A47 is built, traffic will rat run through this little village, with narrow roads, no footway and no street lighting.	Y	
Taverham Road	Ringland needs to be considered, with three new junction in place at Blind Lane/Taverham Road and the Easton roundabout removed, Taverham Road will clearly be used as the 'path of least resistance' and Ringland will become even more of a rat run than now, vehicle numbers will rise from 1000 daily to 4000.	Y	
Taverham Road	My real concern is that this traffic will travel via the centre of Ringland, along Honingham Lane/Taverham Road to join the Blind Lane junction instead. The road through the centre of Ringland is wholly unsuited to any major increase in traffic volume. Action needs to be taken to close Honingham Lane, preferably from the junction near the Merry Hills caravan site to a point near to Ringland Church to stop this potential rat run.	Y	
Taverham Road	A simple re-design of the connection between Taverham Road and the new link road to Church lane via the old section of A47 rather than a direct link to the new roundabout will introduce a dogleg approach to Taverham lane which may discourage at least a proportion of the traffic and encourage it to use the current route via the Ringland Hills.	Y	
Taverham Road	A better and more effective solution would be that the Northern part of Taverham Lane, called Honingham Lane and which runs from the Merryhills Leisure Park to Ringland be closed completely. This has been discussed with Ringland Village at a meeting organised by the Parish Council and the village has voted by a large majority for this closure.	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Taverham Road	We definitely need a road closure along this cut through route at Honingham Lane. it is imperative that this is taken seriously and actioned to coincide exactly with the changes, so we avoid these dangerously high numbers using Ringland village as a "rat run."	Y	
Traffic increase elsewhere	Choosing of parts of A47, the local roads must not be allowed to become rat tuns for cars and lorries trying to get to the food hub by the local roads measures must be put in place on local roads to stop this and make them use the new roads.	Y	
Traffic increase elsewhere	HONINGHAM LANE CLOSURE TO MOTOR VEHICLES I am very concerned regarding increased rat run traffic through Ringland and would therefore request and support the suggestion that Honingham Lane needs to be closed to vehicular traffic.	Y	
Traffic increase elsewhere	At the consultation it was remarked that Sat Navs will still indicate the quickest route will not be by using the A47 to join the A11. Sat Navs will direct traffic through minor roads.	Y	
Traffic increase elsewhere	I have major concerns regarding the volume of traffic travelling through Ringland village, which could result from the road changes as they stand. It is crucial that this is prevented by all means possible including road closures and traffic calming measures and speed restrictions.	Y	
Traffic increase elsewhere	Concerns for smaller roads/lanes. Will need speed restriction and weight restrictions. From old main Rd. by my house to Hockering Concerns on T junction by Poppy Wood. Will need weight and speed restrictions.	N	
Timescales	My main concern is the long timescale given the safety concerns currently, and the environmental impact of continually queuing traffic near the Easton junction.	N	Highways England is committed to an end of 2024 Scheme opening date but needs time to ensure a safe and robust design process and obtain a development consent in accordance with the Planning Act 2008 process.
Timescales	Since the funding was approved in 2014, difficult to understand why the start of construction is still delayed until 2022, 8 years later!	N	
Timescales	Works on this project need to be commenced much earlier than Winter 2022! I have no doubt that more lives will be lost in that time and this will continue at a high rate until the works are undertaken to dual the A47.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Traffic/congestion	I Disagree with the proposal of a needed dual carriage way because, as stated it is a bottleneck and suffer congestion, WELL the only reason it has congestion, is because of the poorly designed junctions. At all other times, the road flows freely with no congestion (except if an RTC occurs) resulting from poor junction design.	N	The 'A47 and A12 corridor feasibility study' reviewed the whole A47 corridor and identified the need to dual this section of the A47 Strategic Road Network - https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/a47-and-a12-corridor-feasibility-study-technical-report
Traffic/congestion	The main problem with traffic is single occupant vehicles coming from Dereham and closer into Norwich. This has increased as (cheaper) housing has been allowed to be built on this corridor and public transport became more expensive and less flexible. Additionally, cars have become relatively cheaper so ownership has increased. The traffic lessens significantly when there are fuel shortages and school holidays so clearly a more wide-ranging transport plan (not just widening the road) is required. I have made every effort to car share and use public transport to commute but haven't seen evidence that many others in the country have actively sought to do so for all the years I have been commuting.	N	
Traffic/congestion	It is not primarily the section of single-carriageway road causing the problem, as stated in HE literature; even if dualled, with the same roundabouts, the congestion would be no different.	N	
Traffic/congestion	As much of the extra traffic that it is claimed makes improvements necessary to meet 'future demands' would in fact result from the housing developments 'unlocked' by the Scheme itself.	N	
Traffic/congestion	As with the NDR, built for today's traffic, yet all the land around it is being developed at an alarming rate so in only a few years the road will become congested.	N	
Traffic/congestion	Also, it seems a great deal of money to spend to save five to seven minutes of journey time (these are the figures quoted in the Highways England public consultation brochure). Nor am I convinced that the new road would reduce congestion, except perhaps in the very short term. It will simply "provide capacity for future traffic growth" as stated in Highways England brochure. Reducing congestion can only be achieved by reducing the number of vehicles and this requires very different policies.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Traffic/congestion	CPRE Norfolk wishes to draw attention to research which makes clear conclusions about the inadvisability of increasing the size of roads, as this leads to more traffic and a later demand for even more road building. This research, 'The end of the road?' (Transport for Quality of Life, for CPRE, March 2017) demonstrates from examining road-building over the past twenty years, "that road Schemes induce traffic, often far above background trends over the longer term,	N	
Traffic/congestion	We need to move away from car dependency. Building new roads will not help new roads make new traffic. see this report by the Campaign to Protect Rural England: https://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/the-end-of-the-road-challenging-the-road-building-consensus/	N	
Traffic/congestion	Therefore a roads first approach is likely to continue for the foreseeable future leading to ever more congestion and pollution. At some stage we must actually do something positive to effect this modal shift where the private car is no longer the dominating factor rather than glibly repeat the aspiration.	N	
Traffic/congestion	There does seem to be a disconnect between HE and NCC - with regard to the responsibilities emanating from the plans - and how NCC will pick up the onward traffic flow problems, when it leaves the A47 dualling	N	Highways England is responsible for the Strategic Road Network, including the A47 Trunk Road, while Norfolk County Council, is responsible for the other roads. However, Highways England and Norfolk County Council are working together to ensure the Scheme complements each other's needs and responsibilities.
Traffic/congestion	It is essential that Highways England engage with and work with Norfolk County Council on the effective mitigation of traffic flow effects outside the 300m area that you are concerned with if this road Scheme is to achieve the desired end result. A blinkered approach where only the connection to local roads are considered without a wider view of how this will affect traffic flow on these roads is not acceptable and would be severe failure of HE policy.	N	
Traffic/congestion	There a few design concerns arising from the review of the latest drawing: No works are shown to the existing Fox Lane junction at North Tuddenham. We consider that this will be the principal exit point from the dualled A47 for Hockering traffic from the west and entry on to the road for Hockering, Mattishall and East Tuddenham traffic going west. The existing junction appears inadequate for this major additional traffic.	N	Fox Lane lies outside the scope of works for the Scheme, but Highways England has undertaken operational traffic modelling and safety assessments to confirm that no further improvements to the existing Fox Lane junction are required due to the Scheme.
Traffic/congestion	HE must reappraise its traffic model and future predicted traffic growth and induced traffic in order to reflect the latest policy developments, to test	N	The Case for the Scheme (TR0100038/APP/7.1) demonstrates the need for the Scheme and how it will reduce congestion, taking into

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	possible new scenarios (e.g. more home working to become a permanent feature) and recalculate the cost benefit ratio.		consideration future traffic growth. It also details national, regional and local planning commitments to improve the Strategic Road Network, with safety and saving lives a particular focus on this section of the A47.
Traffic/congestion	We request that the A47 Dualling Scheme needs to assess in full the impact on Longwater Interchange and needs to account for the impacts of all the committed developments in the area, in particular the Easton housing development. We further request a meeting with Highways England, Norfolk County Council and the RNAA to understand how this has been assessed and what the impacts are before the Scheme proposals are further progressed.	N	
Traffic/congestion	If all the traffic from North Tuddenham/Hockering is going along this route it will become dangerous and congested and will require upgrading sufficient to reflect its new status as a major rural connection road, not a insubstantial rural route.	N	
Traffic/congestion	There is concern that the new junctions offering good access to the SRN may also increase the volume of traffic using the rural roads between the A11 and an improved A47. Again, traffic predictions are essential to determine the effect of the proposals.	N	
Traffic/congestion	The development of the Anglia Farmers coop is a traffic generation which will prove this to be an issue. Proposed storage / processing units on Wood Lane will prove this point.	N	
Traffic/congestion	At a national level, we advocate demand reduction measures such as a distance-based charging for reducing road traffic along the A47 and the road network overall. It is likely that some form of national road pricing system will be necessary to replace fuel duty revenue as vehicles switch from petrol/diesel to electric.	N	Noted, this is a national level consideration.
Traffic/congestion	I live 5 miles away from the Scheme, but I do have concern for the future when the Norwich Western link is operational , that this will increase the risk of a rat run between Berry Lane and Wymondham (A11) through the villages of Barnham Broom and Carleton Forehoe. The road through both villages is narrow and winding and in Carleton Forehoe there is a narrow humpback bridge. To avoid the temptation for traffic to use this route please consider at least a speed and weight restriction on these byroads.	Y	Following Statutory Consultation and further engagement with local affected stakeholders, the direct link between Wood Lane junction and Berrys Lane has been removed to reduce the risk of north-south rat running.

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Traffic/congestion	<p>We note that you are also saying in this latest letter that you consider the differences in the design of the junction are limited between one with or without the NWL.</p> <p>Again, this is all confusing and questions the validity of the 2017 consultation.</p> <p>Other groups are lobbying for a redesign of this junction as they fear that this will be a major link to the A47 both with and without the NWL introducing rat running in the villages south of Honingham from A11 traffic. We endorse their concerns.</p>	Y	
Underpass	<p>and I think that other considerations should include an underpass for animals to safely cross the road without endangering themselves or motorists and planting a significant amount of native trees to protect surrounding areas from air and noise pollution.</p>	N	<p>The Scheme includes special measures for protected species to cross the A47, including permanent mammal crossings to protect wildlife from vehicles. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9).</p>
Underpass	<p>It would be nice to have a underpass contacting lower Easton with Easton, as many residents would like easy access, and not everyone has a car.</p>	Y	<p>Following Statutory Consultation the Scheme has been amended to close the road level pedestrian crossing of the A47 in Easton and replace it with a new pedestrian overbridge in the location of the existing Easton roundabout after it is removed. This will provide an all user segregated crossing point linking Easton with lower Easton and wider routes.</p>
Underpass	<p>A bridge is needed near to the existing Easton roundabout - this would allow people living in the houses at Lower Easton to get to the main part of Easton village easily and save the construction of considerable amount two lane road. It would also mean that there would 6 lanes instead of 8 on the section from the Easton roundabout site to the Blind Lane junction. A further benefit is that it would limit the increase in traffic passing through the centre of Ringland</p>	Y	
Underpass	<p>A pedestrian link in the form of an under pass will maintain the community link to the village, encourage more none motorised methods of transport between lower Easton and Easton and bring the village back together.</p>	Y	
Underpass	<p>An underpass or over bridge is required at the site of the existing Easton roundabout - this would allow connectivity between the small group of houses at Lower Easton with the main part of Easton village and save the construction of considerable amount two lane road. It would also mean that there would 6 lanes instead of 8 on the section from the Easton roundabout site to the Blind Lane junction. A further benefit is that it would limit the increase in traffic passing through the centre of Ringland</p>	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Underpass	A pedestrian link in the form of an under pass will maintain the community link to the village, encourage more nonmotorised methods of transport between lower Easton and Easton and bring the village back together.	Y	
Underpass	Yellow junction for local access as above. This could move a bit further towards Hockering if needed to more separate the new junctions. Church Lane is re-routed to the existing A47 with Sandy Lane access maintained. The single bridge in the junction over the new dualled A47 could be a fly-over or a underpass as required. I have used the simple existing North Tuddenham A47 junction as a template for this local low volume junction and this may require further development to make it work. [This potentially could be removed given access at Fox Lane and Taverham Rd/Easton]. I think similar principles could be used to redesign the Taverham Rd / Blind Lane junction taking this to the west of the current Easton roundabout but east of Taverham Rd/ Blind Lane. Again a fly-over / underpass would be required to maintain the current A47 as the new dualled A47 passes close to St Andrews Church before this provides local access to the new dualled A47. I look forward to your comments. Please let me know if any of this would benefit from further explanation or discussion.	N	<p>The justification for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017).</p> <p>The preferred route was announced in August 2017 and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p> <p>The proposed junctions are designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) taking into account the traffic modelling for the scheme opening year (2025) and design year (2040). This is presented within the junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation.</p> <p>The fully grade separated dumbbell junction layout is consistent with the existing A47 junctions at Longwater & Watton Road.</p>
Unnecessary	More attention has been paid to keeping access to St. Andrew's, Honningham which is used for an hour or so on a Sunday than any of the routes N/S between villages which are used every day.	N	<p>The need is outlined in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p>
Unnecessary	Delays on this section are only sporadic, mainly at times of rush-hour commuter driving between Dereham and Norwich.	N	<p>The Scheme's objectives include improving journey times and road safety on a section of the Strategic Road Network with one of the worst road safety records in the country.</p>
Unnecessary	I personally do not think it is necessary. I do travel/have travelled when working, at peak times and know the pinch points and the endless queues. However, what you are proposing is not going to improve it that much during busy times, so why waste money and the environment?	N	<p>The Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) demonstrates the need for the Scheme and how</p>
Unnecessary	Without further extension of the dualling there is no immediate benefit, except that the traffic bottleneck is relocated to the next single-track section.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Unnecessary	At a time when we are increasingly aware of the impacts of human activity on the environment, it makes no sense to build costly new infrastructure that will enable and encourage increased volumes of road traffic.	N	it will improve road safety, journey times and provide economic and improved walking, cycling and horse riding connectivity benefits. It also sets out national, regional and local planning commitments to improve the Strategic Road Network, with safety and saving lives a particular focus on this section of the A47.
Unnecessary	There is no need for it. Th claim about hold-ups is exaggerated there is only some delay between about 8.15 and 9 am an on the return journey from Norwich between 4.45 and 5.30pm the delay is rarely more that 10-30 mins of slow-moving traffic having commuted in London, made trips to Cambridge and indeed into Norwich on the old A47 from the Calendars roundabout at Bowthorpe to Aldi junction/Hellesdon road (main junction before sweet briar roundabout) I can say the delay is negligible.	N	
Unnecessary	Indeed, if there was more adaptation in work patterns it could be ameliorated all together. For example, if high schools and colleges moved to a 10 am start or if workers moved to flexi-working then the bottle neck would end overnight. But even without any change the actual net gain to drivers is small.	N	
Unnecessary	The road flows freely between 9.15 am to 4.30 pm and from 6pm until 8 am	N	
Unnecessary	I don't believe for one minute that the environment, or our village of Honingham, will not be damaged by emissions from traffic using these 2 unnecessary roundabouts. We have submitted alternatives that are cheaper and less abusive.	N	
Unnecessary	all these proposed connections are based on a new dual carriageway which i am opposed to - there is not a compelling case for dualling here - further along the A47 there may be cases for it near for example little Fransham and those areas towards Kings Lynn where the A47 passes through small villages and speed restrictions to 30 mph are enforced - cases here to dual or bypass	N	
Unnecessary	Unfortunately, the mantra of unsustainable continual growth and dualling of the whole A47 by local politicians has generated the myth that without major roads to and around Norwich the economy of the city and county will decline because of poor connectivity to and within the Greater Norwich area.	N	
Unnecessary	Whilst we support the need for action on this section of road we do not necessarily agree that it has to be a dual carriageway.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Unnecessary	What is the point of Schemes designed to reduce rat running through the villages in the Wensum Valley only to generate the same in another area of the county?	N	Highways England has worked with and continues to support Norfolk County Council to consider the wider effects of the Scheme on local villages.
Unnecessary	We consider the lack of consideration of the side road and junction strategies is a major failing of the 2017 consultation process which should have also included as a base for comparison an option for anon-dualed solution with safety and junction improvements, assuming the 'Do Nothing' scenario is discounted. Without this base option the consultations are flawed as there is an unsubstantiated preconceived assumption that dualling is necessary.	N	Highways England presented the route options during the public consultation in 2017 and subsequently announced the Preferred Route in August of 2017 after taking account of the feedback received. The design has progressed to incorporate a junction and side road strategy that was consulted on in 2020. This informed the final design to be taken through to the DCO submission. Highways England has considered the responses from the Statutory Consultation when producing the final design.
Unnecessary	Seems illogical to build a whole new road Scheme whilst there is an existing single carriageway which could be made into dual carriageway if dualling is indeed even necessary.	N	Highways England has taken feedback from the public consultation 2017 to address concerns with a route online. These were outlined in the Preferred Route Announcement in August 2017.
Use existing A47	The cost of such a development of road structure could be greatly reduced by two bridge being erected and slip roads onto proposed A47 (as like Cromer Rd and the NDR at Norwich airport). The food hub enterprise at Blind Lane could be the same which would have less detrimental impact on the surrounding landscape.	N	The justification for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017).
Use existing A47	Surely it would be best to direct traffic back alongside the new A47 to where it again rejoins the Dog Lane where it then rejoins the road through Ringland Hills which joins Taverham to New Costessey which has been the route for over 20 years. This completely avoids Ringland village centre.	N	<p>The preferred route was announced in August 2017 and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p> <p>The proposed junctions are designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) taking into account the traffic modelling for the scheme opening year</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			<p>(2025) and design year (2040). This is presented within the junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation.</p> <p>The fully grade separated dumbbell junction layout is consistent with the existing A47 junctions at Longwater & Watton Road</p>
Use existing A47	Keeping the existing A47 for local side roads and repositioning this junction closer to Easton would radically simplify this and remove much of the need for new side roads.	Y	More of the existing A47 has been integrated into the local road network following Statutory Consultation feedback.
Walking, cycling, horse riding	Don't waste time and taxpayers money making plans for horse riding, cycling and walking these are leisure activities, not of commercial importance and people will find a way to do their leisure activity without you looking after them.	N	<p>It is an objective of the Scheme to provide a safer route between communities for cyclists, walkers, horse-riders and other vulnerable users of the Network, taking into consideration how their requirements can be addressed with improved connectivity.</p> <p>Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) details how the Scheme will improve safety along this section of the A47 and improved or new segregated routes for walkers, cyclist and horse riders.</p>
Walking, cycling, horse riding	All I have ever seen of major road works is that they make things worse for walking and cycling. I simply don't believe that improvements will happen.	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	taking out the Easton roundabout may increase traffic on the little road through Barnham Broom - Marlingford etc to the showground roundabout these destroying a very good cycle route	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	I cannot see any serious attempt to improve these routes. Do you seriously expect horses to negotiate such busy junctions?	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	I found it difficult to establish exactly how the changes would affect these groups. I could not differentiate where the existing A47 is being removed or change of use for cycle-path but I am sure under current guidelines and regulations the other users will be appropriately considered in the design.	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	Hockering FP7 is severed by the new road. The Plan appears to indicate a 2km diversion east to Church Lane, which lengthy and uninviting, as it runs out and back along the edge of the new road. We do not believe that this is an acceptable diversion or that it will attract many users.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Walking, cycling, horse riding	Highways England promises: "a new connection to maintain the north – south route from Honingham towards Weston Green, as the proposed Wood Lane junction cuts across an existing restricted byway". The byway - Honingham Restricted Byway 1 is shown on the Plan, but only schematically - it is not clear what provision is made for it to cross the new road, bearing in mind that, as a Restricted Byway, it is legally open to use by carriage drivers and we would want to see that ability retained.	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	I agree it would improve connections for cycling in terms of access to amenities at Longwater, but I am not convinced of benefits for recreational cycling, riding or walking given the close proximity the routes will have to the new A47. Who will want to cycle, ride or walk alongside a dual carriageway?	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	With the A47 very close I would hesitate to suggest horses to the route	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	The Wensum Valley is a valued location for walking and cycling. The complex proposed arrangements fly in the face of preserving this important natural asset and recreational asset	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	It might be asked how popular with walkers, cyclists and horse-riders the proposed routes would be, given their proximity to the new dual-carriageway and its likely attendant noise and air pollution impacts on those using non-motorised transport modes.	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	Seems pointless as only 1 or 2 people at most every weekend cycle on the A47 here. The needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	I am a rider and I wonder how many riders you have actually talked to about riding on these specially developed paths? The path left for horses coming down to Thickthorn Roundabout from the Ipswich side was never used, is far too frightening for horses. It is now totally overgrown.	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	In 5 years, I have never seen a cyclist, horse rider or walker on that stretch of the A47, and they certainly shouldn't be on the dual carriageway	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	Don't see the need for the footpath to the Church as there will be one round the Norwich Road junction.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Walking, cycling, horse riding	Nobody walks to the church currently or very few people.	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	Not sure that we need a connection for walking and horse riding. We already have lots of lovely areas to walk and ride - most of which are to be destroyed by this new A47. It is already possible to cycle into Norwich, but I suppose it would be safer. I wish I'd written this before ticking a box, now definitely disagree why change things, that are already ok.	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	I don't believe the proposals adequately provide safeguards or suitable access, especially for walking. There doesn't seem to be much walkway at all. Also access to cross the road which is very dangerous seems totally missing especially around Easton. There needs to be safe access across the A47 to Ringland from Easton.	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	However, these will need to be maintained so that they are safe to use and attract people to use them	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	There are plenty of examples of how to design and implement effective cycle ways, if only one bothered to look at what has been done in Germanic and Scandinavian countries for over 40y.	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	I am strongly of the belief that routes for cyclists, walkers and riders should be dedicated and not shared with cars and other "local traffic".	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	Walking, cycling and horse riding are quiet pursuits. I hope there will be plenty of fencing, hedging, landscaping of whatever sort to dampen the noise of the traffic.	N	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	As a proportion of the cost of the overall development, I'm sure the provision of these paths is very small. It would be heartening to see this level of investment in infrastructure for sustainable transport in nearby areas where it could have a real impact. For example, the residents of Wymondham, Hethersett and the surrounding villages are dissuaded from commuting into Norwich by the lack of safe cycle routes to the city, and in particular the lack of safe crossing points over the a47.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Walking, cycling, horse riding	<p>The footpath crossing over the A47 at the original location of Dog Lane Easton is very dangerous but is going to be made much worse (currently A47 traffic is either slowing for or accelerating away from the roundabout). As a Scout Leader I have had to take a group of scouts across this crossing and it felt very unsafe with the current arrangements - once the roundabout is removed traffic will be passing this point at full speed (legal max at this point 70mph)</p> <p>There needs to be either an underpass or bridge to allow the safe passage of pedestrians and cyclists</p>	Y	<p>Following Statutory Consultation the Scheme has been amended to close the road level pedestrian crossing of the A47 in Easton and replace it with a pedestrian overbridge in the location of the existing Easton roundabout after it is removed. This will provide a safe segregated crossing suitable for all users linking Easton with lower Easton and wider routes.</p>
Walking, cycling, horse riding	<p>The footpath crossing over the A47 at the original location of Dog Lane Easton is very dangerous, but is going to be made much worse (currently A47 traffic is either slowing for or accelerating away from the roundabout). Once the roundabout is removed traffic will be passing this point at full speed (legal max at this point 70mph) - there needs to be either an underpass or bridge to allow the safe passage of pedestrians and cyclists</p>	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	<p>There is currently no plan for walkers and cyclists to access the main village of Easton from Lower Easton. The existing foot crossing at the south end of Dog Lane is extremely dangerous and will be increasingly so when the Easton roundabout is removed and traffic does not have to slow down for it as is the case at the moment. Currently the only safe way to get to Easton village from Lower Easton is to drive. As the population of Lower Easton is largely an ageing one, there will come a time when some of the residents will not be driving and will want to walk into Easton to catch a bus etc. With no safe crossing facility this will not be possible. Also, with the increased use of the Lower Easton rat run, it will be even more unsafe to walk along the lane (there is no pavement or trod at present to provide a safe walking/cycling environment).</p>	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	<p>Current proposals would isolate Lower Easton from Easton village as far as walkers are concerned leaving the only way to access the village by car, which is a nonsense if one wants to walk up to the village to catch a bus.</p>	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	<p>Me and my neighbours face a walk of over two miles to get to the village on foot if the current proposals are enacted without any provision for walkers. As part of an aging population in Lower Easton, this is going to cause great difficulty for us living here.</p>	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Walking, cycling, horse riding	If the Wood Lane junction goes ahead as planned, it will not be safe to walk, cycle or ride on many of the local C Class roads south of the A47 due to the increased volume of heavy traffic cutting through to the A11.	Y	Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) sets out how the Scheme will improve safety along this section of the A47 and provide improved or new segregated routes for walkers, cyclist and horse riders.
Walking, cycling, horse riding	It isn't clear that there will be any benefits to these classes of user. Certainly, a very busy section of dual carriageway will significantly impact on the amenity and environment, and as such detract from any potential benefit to walkers, riders, or cyclists.	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	Increasing road capacity will hinder the ability and inclination of cyclists to use this route both through degradation of the noise/ emissions setting and also through giving incentive to use a private car.	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	However, the existing small road between Mattishall and Hockering (Mattishall Lane); which is a practical direct link between Mattishall and Hockering appears to be blocked off by the new dual carriageway to the SW of Hockering. Could a width restricted underpass be installed here for small cars, cycles, horses, pedestrians?	Y	Following a range of Statutory Consultation responses requesting access via Mattishall Lane, the final Scheme includes a new vehicle underpass at Mattishall Lane.
Walking, cycling, horse riding	I believe your plan includes blocking off Mattishall Lane or Hockering (just beyond the Council Houses).	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	As a regular walker (for physical exercise/well-being) Mattishall Lane is an important exit south of Hockering for Mattishall and surrounding villages, lanes, tracks, etc. To prevent its use by walkers will be detrimental to all of us who walk.	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	However, the existing small road between Mattishall and Hockering (Mattishall Lane); which is a practical direct link between Mattishall and Hockering appears to be blocked off by the new dual carriageway to the SW of Hockering. Could a width restricted underpass be installed here for small cars, cycles, horses, pedestrians?	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	It is imperative that there is, at the very least, an underpass for walkers, cyclists and anyone who is a non-driver wishing to visit Mattishall.	Y	
Wood Lane Junction	Your proposal closes Mattishall Lane and Sandy Lane (south of A47) all traffic North (South will use Mill road, an unsuitable single-track road).	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	Hockering footpath no 7 is shown blocked, with a huge diversion to get to East Tuddenham.	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			Scheme with walking and cycling access to facilitate an alternative to the severed FP7.
Walking, cycling, horse riding	As the many small roads crossing the existing A47 are being disconnected completely there is no easy way for walkers, cyclists and horse riders to travel N/S except via the traffic routes.	N	<p>Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) presents a review of impacts on walkers, cyclist and horse riders and the Scheme's provision to maintain and improve connectivity for these users across the network in this area.</p> <p>A more direct walking and cycling connection with an underpass between Honingham and St Andrew's Church and a walking and cycling overbridge has been added at Easton.</p>
Walking, cycling, horse riding	However, those routes in the design are not necessarily the right solution in the right location. The walking route to Honingham church is a joke. What is a five-minute walk from the current Honingham roundabout has turned into a 25 minute walk, taking a completely unnecessary detour in the wrong direction.	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	We will raise the problems that we see starting from the west. 1. We are concerned that the main part of the village of Hockering is cut off from the southern fringe of the parish and the villages of Honingham and Mattishall on the other side of the river Tud. The only way that walking only members of the Hockering community can reach the footpath (Hockering Footpath 8) south of the new road will be by walking from the truncated FP7 for 2 km beside the new road being battered by the noise of it, to use the Church Lane underpass. Although walking beside the old A47 might be quieter. Then after their walk either returning the same way or going up into Honingham before getting to Church Lane underpass. The crossing bridge to the west (Fox Lane), is easily a 4km round trip from the church end if the village and is really only viable for cyclists and car drivers.	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	The access to Honingham Church is completely unacceptable for those walking there. The route for the footpath demonstrates a complete lack of understanding of the local environment, local users and local needs.	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	There are about 27 houses within 0.75 km of the north side of the dual carriageway. People living here currently have two routes on foot to get into the main village to reach the bus stops and other village facilities. The first is a route via the present roundabout. The second is about 350 metres to the east, where the remnants of Ringland Lane crosses the dual carriageway sufficiently close to the roundabout that traffic is likely to be moving more slowly than the 70mph limit; there are steps at each side of the road, and a staggered gap in the central barrier. With the removal of the roundabout, the first crossing is eliminated and the last will have traffic	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	all going at 70mph. There should be a bridge over the road for people on foot or cycling at this latter point - the alternative is a 1.4 km walk westward and then another 1.4 km eastwards along the new shared cycle paths to the Blind Lane crossing.		
Walking, cycling, horse riding	A new underpass close to the Honingham roundabout would seem to solve this problem and limit the number of new side roads that Highways England seem to be envisaging.	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	<p>Instead where the new A47 cuts off small N/S roads underpasses should be provided, sufficient for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders. This will help maintain the existing links between villages and encourage new use, particularly for cyclists between local communities who will find it easier to cycle than to travel around the limited new junctions. It will separate walkers, cyclists, and horse riders from vehicular traffic. The Scheme routes all traffic N/S, vehicles, walkers, and cyclists by the same route. My proposal reduces this interaction, improving safety, reducing NO2/CO2 for walkers etc.</p> <p>It will help maintain established elements such as the Whitford bridge which otherwise will become surplus to requirements and cut off. At present such routes N/S are used every day by walkers etc. Having underpasses will enhance this provision by separation from both the A47 and other vehicular traffic.</p>	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	The plan at the east end of Hockering is less clear on you map. I mean the point where a farm track is used at present as a footpath running north-south near the present sewage works; this just to the west of a proposed drainage basin. Please will you make sure there's an underpass or at the very least a safe place for pedestrians to cross the A47, so that we can continue to have access from this north-south footpath to the footpaths which run east to west along both sides of the River Tud.	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	An alternative to the proposed bridge might be an underpass near the location of the existing roundabout, although this would have to have some lights to cater for winter and evening travellers.	Y	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Walking, cycling, horse riding	Church Lane/Sandy Lane underpass to the west of Honingham appears to be for cyclists and pedestrians only. Are any bespoke footpaths and cycleways therefore proposed for these groups to access both Hockering and Honingham or will they be expected to share the road with vehicles?	Y	
Walking, cycling, horse riding	If the Wood Lane junction goes ahead as planned, it will not be safe to walk, cycle or ride on many of the local C Class roads south of the A47 anymore due to the increased volume of HGV's and cars that will cut through to the A11.	Y	
Wildlife	4) Off-line dualling will lead to the harming of wildlife habitats and their associated species. It will lead to damage to the River Tud which feeds into the River Wensum. The latter is a chalk-fed river with the internationally important designation of SAC. This is primarily due to the presence of endangered Annex II species White-claw Crayfish (and Desmoulins's Whorl Snail, Brook Lamprey, and Bullhead). The Scheme will lead to loss of biodiversity and exacerbate the extinction emergency.	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), with the DCO application, contains a biodiversity impact assessment that will consider risks from light pollution and to protected species, including white clawed crayfish. The assessment proposes mitigation measures for likely significant impacts. A landscape masterplan is presented within the DCO application to identify proposed replacement landscape planting and ecological habitat creation. The landscape masterplan aims to achieve no net loss of biodiversity value as part of the Scheme and retain habitat connectivity.
Wildlife	Doesn't go far enough to protect wildlife from light car pollution and traffic accidents!	N	
Wildlife	In addition, the Scheme would significantly damage wildlife habitats, which runs counter to the Government's proposals to make net biodiversity gain mandatory for new developments.	N	
Wildlife	The current route doesn't support the County Council's own brief for finding the route with the least environmental damage, although the junction proposed on the A47 plans would support an alternative Scheme to 'finish' the A1270 that has much less of an environmental impact. It is my belief - along with that of the CPRE and many other local and national organisations - that what Norfolk County Council is proposing to finish the A1270 is grossly negligent towards environmental concerns and would have a permanently devastating impact on the river Wensum (which has SSSI status and is a unique chalk river valley) as well as on local ancient woodlands and other wildlife sites. I therefore implore you to please help Norfolk County Council (NCC) choose an alternative route and not to endorse it in any way.	N	Though Highways England continues to liaise with Norfolk County Council in relation to the Norwich Western Link (NWL), the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme is not reliant upon the delivery of the NWL so does not have any input to the route design or justification of that Scheme. However, as the Local Highway Authority has a well advanced Scheme that will connect with the A47, it's both sensible and pragmatic for the A47 Scheme to anticipate that the NWL may come forward and explore the ability to create a connection with the new

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Wildlife	We have already experienced inadequate protection of the environment with the recent construction of the NDR to the north of Norwich, although we acknowledge this was not a Highways England Scheme. There has been a loss of two colonies of barbastelle bats, flooded bat tunnels, over 60% of trees dying in the first year. This must not be repeated.	N	junction to achieve efficiency opportunities with public spending.
Wildlife	The proposed NWL would have a major detrimental impact on the River Wensum valley and its complex of fragile habitats and protected species such as otters and water voles. Norfolk County Council have not made a case for the road.	N	
Wildlife	Detailed comments on PEIR biodiversity chapter 7.2.5-where disturbance or restrictions to survey effort means that reptile surveys cannot be carried out, then due to the presence of reptiles in other areas of the road corridor, we recommend their presence is presumed in the impact assessment.	N	Reptile surveys have been undertaken which identified good populations of grass snake and slow worm in one area of the Scheme. As juveniles of both species were recorded this area is considered a breeding ground for grass snake and slow worm. No reptiles were recorded at any other location within the study area. The population of reptiles has been assessed as a biodiversity resource of county importance although common lizard and grass snake are listed on the East of England Priority Species List.
Wildlife	Table 7.1-we strongly recommend that bat surveys should cover a wider area than the 100m study area proposed, given the potential for severance and increased collision impacts on commuting routes across the road corridor. In particular, the proposed works are within the 6 km Core Sustainance Zone for the nearby barbastelle bat colony identified in preliminary work for the Norwich Western Link proposal, and table 4 of this PEIR identifies records of barbastelle within the survey area.	N	Bat surveys have been undertaken in line with appropriate guidance and methodologies: Collins, J. (ed.) (2016). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines, 3rd edition, Bat Conservation Trust; Emergence and re-Entry surveys for high roost potential took place three times, for moderate two times, and for low once, in the period described; and Crossing Point survey specific Berthinussen and Altringham (2015) and Elmeros et al., 2016. The results of which are presented in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Wildlife	Table 7.3-we note that the 2019 reptile surveys did not return records for adder and common lizard recorded in the preceding 2016 surveys. In particular for adder, given the alarming declines in their population nationally, we recommend that additional reptile surveys for all four species are carried out to better understand their distribution, expanding on the basic seven survey visits already carried out which are necessary to determine presence/absence.	N	Reptile surveys have been undertaken which identified good populations of grass snake and slow worm in one area of the Scheme. As juveniles of both species were recorded this area is considered a breeding ground for grass snake and slow worm. No reptiles were recorded at any other location within the study area. The population of reptiles has been assessed as a biodiversity resource of county importance although common lizard and grass snake are listed on the East of England Priority Species List. The results of which are presented in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) .
Wildlife	7.4.8-in addition to the surveys listed, we recommend that further bat surveys are carried out to determine where there are existing bat crossing points. This is to ensure the assessment of crossing distance impacts (such as changes to commuting routes and increases in collision risks to bats) set out in 7.6.1 will be based on robust data.	N	Since the submission of the PEIR, further bat surveys have been undertaken. The results of which are presented in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) .
Wildlife	Bats and other wildlife will find places to live just like they have on the NNDR, do not waste money on animal crossovers, just install fencing in the ground and the occasional deer will still get over, well that's Norfolk (and we love it) but be sure the junctions are well lit.	N	The two junctions of Wood Lane and Norwich Road will be suitably lit. Fencing is provided along the length of the Scheme with no designated animal crossovers proposed.
Wildlife	Highways should be tunnelled in repeated areas to allow wildlife passage over in safety. Since the new NDR and on the M11 and the A47 there has been a considerable increase in the mortality rate of our wildlife.	N	Fencing is provided along the length of the Scheme with a designated mammal underpass and mammal ledges in appropriate culverts to maintain the connectivity between both sides of the road for mammals. The landscape planting proposals and ecological habitat creation are detailed within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010038/APP/6.9) .
Wildlife	Concern re protection of Barn Owls.	N	Barn owls have been assessed within the Biodiversity assessment of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) . Mitigation measures for the protection of barn owls have

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			been reported within the Environmental Statement.
Wood Lane Junction	<p>The proposed Wood Lane junction seems (i) unnecessarily complex and (ii) far too close to East Tuddenham generally and Rotten Row in particular.</p> <p>Insufficient attention has been given to the significant impact of the proposals on residents of Rotten Row (with gardens being cut through, and the road being very close to houses, particularly if raised)</p> <p>The noise from traffic already impacts on residents of East Tuddenham, a major junction will exacerbate this</p> <p>The junction should be located to the north of the existing A47 where there are fewer residents and the impact on East Tuddenham (it is in danger of being surrounded by the dualling of the A47, the link with the Northern Distributer Road and the Colton Hub development) lessened</p> <p>Why can't the design be simpler?</p>	N	<p>The justification and design for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017) and Junction & Sideroad Strategy Report (February, 2020), which were available on the Highways England project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>The preferred route was announced in August 2017 and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p>
Wood Lane Junction	<p>However, there are major issues arising from the design of specific junctions.</p> <p>The Wood Lane junction is unnecessarily large, complex and expensive because of the perceived need to maintain a connection with Berry's Lane. While there may be a normal obligation to maintain access to side roads, the current design of this junction could be simplified and cost less.</p>	N	<p>The proposed junctions are designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) taking into account the traffic modelling for the scheme opening year (2025) and design year (2040). This is presented within the junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation.</p>
Wood Lane Junction	<p>The entire junction looks very complicated and uses a huge area of land</p>	N	<p>The fully grade separated dumbbell junction layout is consistent with the existing A47 junctions at Longwater & Watton Road.</p>
Wood Lane Junction	<p>The Wood Lane junction is unnecessarily large, complex and expensive because of the perceived need to maintain a connection with Berry's Lane. While there may be a normal obligation to maintain access to side roads, the current design of this junction could be simplified and cost less.</p>	N	<p>In response to Statutory consultation feedback, and feedback obtained from the Local Liaison Group, the southern roundabout at Wood Lane</p>
Wood Lane Junction	<p>The size of the roundabouts proposed, 80m, are vastly oversized for the requirements of the traffic using it now or in the future. There appears to be no justification for why these roundabouts need to be so big in size when the roundabouts at Blind Lane are only 60m in size.</p>	N	
Wood Lane Junction	<p>The side road connections are complex. The traffic system seems over-complicated for the volume of traffic. Traffic joining from the NDR will still find it quicker to travel across the A47 to join the A11 (north to south).</p>	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Wood Lane Junction	This design is a massive spaghetti junction it will urbanise a beautiful piece of Norfolk it is unnecessary and expensive. Traffic lights at this junction would be a better cheaper safer healthy option.	N	has been modified to remove the link to Church Lane and Berrys Lane.
Wood Lane Junction	Scheme involves massive land take and will be significantly disruptive to the natural habitats of the Wensum Valley	N	Berrys Lane will be closed to through traffic in the proposed scheme.
Wood Lane Junction	Covering more of Norfolk with concrete and tarmac for a minimal saving on journey time is ridiculous.	N	
Wood Lane Junction	Please replicate Scheme used for dual carriage way built 30 years ago at North Tuddenham. This would eliminate need for roundabouts All side roads could be accessed from existing A47. Provide slip roads to and from old A47.	N	
Wood Lane Junction	Basically good, but the intersection with the Norwich Western Link is inadequate. The section of the new A47 to the east of this junction will be carrying a lot of traffic going between A11 and the north of Norwich which will have to use this under powered dumbbell junction. I find it unacceptable that no special attention has been drawn to this proposed junction and no questions asked about it in this document.	N	
Wood Lane Junction	You have not asked a question about the proposed Norwich Western Link Road which will be a dual carriageway. The junction as proposed will not be able to cope with the traffic flows from the Western Link, especially the traffic going to the west from the Western Link, which as proposed will have to go round TWO roundabouts. If constructed as proposed it will have to be re-built when the new Western Link is added, a waste of Public money and a huge extra inconvenience to the road users.	N	Though the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme is not reliant upon the delivery of the NWL, Highways England has maintained regular liaison with Norfolk County Council to enable the creation of a connection with our new junction to achieve efficiency opportunities with public spending. If the Norwich Western Link scheme, does not attain funding or planning consent, then this connection will not be provided.
Wood Lane Junction	The junction proposed at Wood Lane will be inadequate for the traffic flows from the Norwich Western Link when it joins where provision is proposed. The Norwich Western Link is a dual carriageway and the traffic will overwhelm the junction as proposed, especially traffic coming south that wants to head west which will have to go round two small roundabouts. The junction will have to be re-designed within two years if it is constructed as proposed leading to a waste of public money and huge inconvenience to road users.	N	The Scheme traffic model takes into account the Norwich Western Link scheme, with junctions sized in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads and Bridges for the traffic forecast opening year (2025) and design year (20240).

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Wood Lane Junction	The structure of the proposed Wood Lane junction assumes a connection with the Norwich Western Link road but when I attended the public consultation event in Honingham I was surprised to learn that this point of connection is not yet decided. There should be an overall plan for infrastructure but there seems a distinct lack of coordination between Highways England and the Local Authority.	N	
Wood Lane Junction	Two huge new junctions within a mile of each other are out of scale with this part of Norfolk and conflict with statements made by Highways England concerning a junction north of Easton Church and with Broadland District Council which committed to the closure of Blind Lane.	N	<p>The justification and design for the Scheme alignment and junction arrangement, based on a technical, economic and environmental analysis, is outlined in the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme Assessment Report (December 2017), which was available on the Highways England project consultation website during the Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>The preferred route was announced in August 2017 and can be found on the Highways England Website. The preferred route decision making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p> <p>The proposed junctions are designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) taking into account the traffic modelling for the scheme opening year (2025) and design year (2040). This is presented within the junction & sideroad strategy report presented at Statutory consultation.</p> <p>The fully grade separated dumbbell junction layout is consistent with the existing A47 junctions at Longwater & Watton Road.</p>
Wood Lane Junction	We are not given any reason for this western junction being moved from Church Lane/Sandy Lane to Wood lane/Berry's Lane apart from the future connection to the NWL.	N	
Wood Lane Junction	This location regularly floods in heavy rain causing problems on the A47. By increasing the size of the road at this location you will only be creating more problems. There can be no justification that traffic levels, either now or in the future, will be enough to have such a large junction connecting to single track country roads.	N	
Wood Lane Junction	However, there is concern for the connection of the proposed NDR western link at this location as the proposed short reservoir length for Wood Lane as proposed is inadequate.	N	
Wood Lane Junction	I am also concerned that this design would take the road too close to the river floodplain, which could extend as we see more flooding due to rising sea levels.	N	
Wood Lane Junction	Whilst bearing in mind our comments about the serious issues around increasing the capacity of roads, CPRE Norfolk favoured Option 2 as outlined in the original proposals for this Scheme. However, there are now serious concerns about how those proposals have evolved to those in this consultation. In particular, the focus and siting of the proposed new junctions has significantly changed, in part by placing the two proposed junctions close together (less than 2.5km apart) and requiring a greater land-take.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			Highways England have engaged extensively with the Environment Agency, Lead Local Flood Authority, and Internal Drainage Board on the design of the road drainage network and detention basins, ensuring climate change allowances are accounted for within the scheme proposals.
Wood Lane Junction	Although there is an ongoing debate concerning whether the three off-shore wind projects will go ahead with individual on-shore cables or a single cable with an off-shore ring, the current Dudgeon and Sheringham 3 shoal proposes a route passing under the Norwich Road Junction which questions the suitability of this location as a junction. Also, the existing high-pressure gas main is in the vicinity of the Wood Lane Junction and could similarly make this location unsuitable.	N	Highways England is engaging with local major developers to manage the interaction of the Schemes, as reported in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) . Highways England has engaged with National Grid on the existing gas main and a diversion is included as part of the proposed scheme.
Wood Lane Junction	You have not asked a question about the proposed Norwich Western Link Road which will be a dual carriageway. The junction as proposed will not be able to cope with the traffic flows from the Western Link, especially the traffic going to the west from the Western Link, which as proposed will have to go round TWO roundabouts. If constructed as proposed it will have to be re-built when the new Western Link is added, a waste of Public money and a huge extra inconvenience to the road users.	N	Highways England is engaging with Norfolk County Council to manage the interaction of the Schemes, as reported in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) . Though the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Scheme is not reliant upon the delivery of the NWL, Highways England has maintained regular liaison with Norfolk County Council to enable the creation of a connection with our new junction to achieve efficiency opportunities with public spending.
Wood Lane Junction	Basically good, but the intersection with the Norwich Western Link is inadequate. The section of the new A47 to the east of this junction will be carrying a lot of traffic going between A11 and the north of Norwich which will have to use this under powered dumbbell junction. I find it unacceptable that no special attention has been drawn to this proposed junction and no questions asked about it in this document.	N	If the Norwich Western Link scheme, does not attain funding or planning consent, then this connection will not be provided.
Wood Lane Junction	The grade separated proposed Wood Lane junction has been partly designed to facilitate the Norwich Western Link which I also oppose. The proposed NWL would have a major detrimental impact on the River Wensum valley and its complex of fragile habitats and protected species such as otters and water voles.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Wood Lane Junction	There is no mention of the impact of the proposed western link which will be far more important than these local links, and which needs to be both more prominent and detailed to allow proper inclusive consultation.	N	The Scheme traffic model takes into account the Norwich Western Link scheme, with junctions sized in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads and Bridges for the traffic forecast opening year (2025) and design year (20240).
Wood Lane Junction	If I've read what is going to happen is just [REDACTED]. The junction at wood lane, is that to join with the NDR?? If so that should be the you all need your P45 and get the [REDACTED] out, you should know I do realise that roads run better with no bumps in them your just putting them all along the A47. I have said it to you before why didn't you put these roundabout along the A14,A46, the Postwick junction the east of Norwich and Blofield is overcrowded, next all the land near the junction is being built on so you can't make improvements, we should when making new roads to learn from previous mistakes, I've said enough waste of time anyways	N	
Wood Lane Junction	However, my concern is the proposed connection to the Norwich Western Link as I stated in my previous comments above. The route that Norfolk County Council (NCC) are currently proposing is highly controversial due to its environmental impact - which will be devastating - and the huge financial cost that it will involve. Furthermore, NCC have discounted cheaper and less environmentally devastating options without proper consideration or letting the public know why these were dropped and have concealed bat-impact reports from the public too. The proposed route doesn't have funding or planning permission and I know the CPRE and other organisations are against it. I believe the NWL should go ahead, but not at the great financial and environmental cost as is currently proposed. I also sent NCC my own route for the NWL - which would connect at Wood Lane and is similar to the 'Option B' that wasn't favoured - but I never had a response about it. NCC have reportedly been buying land along the proposed route (source: EDP, December 2019/January and Feb 2020), even without funding for the route or planning permission. Once again, I would implore you to question what NCC are playing at and why they are insisting Option C is the best route even though it does not meet their own requirements for the NWL as set out in their consultation brief (2018/9). If there is any way you can exercise influence this so that common sense prevails then I and many others would be grateful - not least for the sake of future generations who will otherwise lose this valley and the benefits it brings.	N	

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Wood Lane Junction	<p>Anecdotally, at one of the route option public consultation events held for the NWL, I was told (by representatives of NCC) that an option had already been pre-selected and was favoured by the council due to a councillor living in Weston Longville and as a 'last hurrah' for a chap called Ian Taylor, who I believe could be appointed chief engineer for the project. I was told at the event, that was held in Fakenham, that Mr Taylor may retire with this or the new river crossing being built in Great Yarmouth as he 'wants to go out with a bang.' I don't have anything to corroborate what I heard, and I don't have any connection with Mr Taylor or the highways department of the council, but if any of this is true it's absolutely awful and a gross misuse of public trust, finance and the Council's own environmental responsibilities.</p> <p>Otherwise, I fully agree with the design of this junction but I feel embarrassed to say how terrified I am that the NWL could be built as NCC are proposing and that it would connect to the A47 here. I realise it might be beyond the scope of this consultation and the Highways Department to influence this further.</p>	N	
Wood Lane Junction	<p>The focus now appears to be to service and provide access to the proposed Norwich Western Link road (NWL) at the Wood Lane Junction and to the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) at the Norwich Road Junction.</p> <p>The removal of the current Easton roundabout will cause major access issues for the FEZ, in particular as direct access to the A47 is critical for 60% of the permitted development on that site. The creation of the Norwich Road junction therefore appears largely to be the means by which this access will be provided. There is a serious concern about the funding of this proposed access to service the private enterprise that is the FEZ. It seems unreasonable to CPRE Norfolk that the costs of providing the elements of this proposed junction which will service the FEZ should be publicly funded.</p>	N	<p>Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3) on the access and egress of the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) from the A47 with the County, District Council and the developer.</p> <p>The proposed scheme closes Blind Lane to through traffic. Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) traffic will access the A47 via the new Norwich Road junction link to Dereham Road, Easton as per the controls on FEZ related traffic under its respective Local Development Order with Broadland District Council.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Wood Lane Junction	One of the main aims of the NWL is to reduce rat running across the Wensum Valley but the proposals would suggest that better access to the A47 is likely to increase rat running, particularly if the NWL was not built (and there is no guarantee that it will be). The public needs to understand the complete picture of the various Schemes being planned and we would be grateful to know whether your brief includes projections of traffic use changes on all roads in the vicinity when works are complete. In particular it would be useful to have predictions of traffic numbers on all the side roads (a) for the A47 improvements alone and (b) with both the A47 improvements and a completed NWL. The public needs assurances that the two connections and feeder roads will discourage additional rat running both with and without the NWL.	N	Statutory Consultation concerns about north-south traffic flows were explored during various Local Liaison Group, sessions chaired by Martin Wilby, and the South of the A47 Taskforce, chaired by George Freeman MP. Both forums included representation from directly affected Parish Councils and those within the locale of the Scheme. Chapter 4 Transport Assessment of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) demonstrates how it considered the Norwich Western Link in its modelling assessment scenarios.
Wood Lane Junction	I don't believe for one minute that the environment, or our village of Honingham, will not be damaged by emissions from traffic using these 2 unnecessary roundabouts.	N	Noise and air quality has been assessed within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), within the DCO application, and mitigation measures proposed as part of the Scheme to reduce significant effects.
Wood Lane Junction	I am concerned that traffic will go through Ringland village from Taverham to access this junction. The road is not suitable for this level of traffic as Ringland has no footway or street lighting and has very narrow lanes with buildings that abut the road. It will be detrimental to health through respiratory problems. It will be dangerous to residents and animals including horses that are walked through the village everyday to their paddock by children. It will destroy the village community as it will be too dangerous to walk through the village and talk to friends and neighbours. The noise level will be intrusive. It will make getting out of your drive dangerous and difficult.	N	Highways England has outlined its position statement in the Scheme Design Report (TR010038/APP/7.3). In response to feedback at statutory consultation, and Local Liaison Group, the proposed scheme now includes a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) for Honingham Lane only, with Taverham Road remaining open to traffic. This would allow the option to temporarily close Honingham Lane to through traffic in the interim period between the opening of the A47 Scheme and the proposed Norwich Western Link to

Topic area	Consultation response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			<p>control the risk of traffic passing through Ringland.</p> <p>Including the TTRO within the DCO will allow its implementation if it is deemed the right thing to do following further discussion with the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>However, it does not preclude the option not to implement the closure if it is not supported by the local planning authority.</p> <p>Highways England continues to engage and support Norfolk County Council in regard to the local road network and NWL scheme.</p>
Wood Lane Junction	Improvements to safety are also questionable because of the likely increase in traffic speed and the proximity of the Wood Lane and Norwich Road junctions. This will surely lead to considerable lane switching. And isn't safety more to do with driver behaviour than road design?	N	Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1) demonstrates how the Scheme will improve safety along this section of the A47.