

A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Dualling

Scheme Number: TR010038

Volume 5

5.2 Annex O: Table Evidencing Regard had to Targeted Consultation and Project Update 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 O

TABLE EVIDENCING REGARD HAD TO TARGETED CONSULTATION AND PROJECT UPDATE 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-30015-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 CONSULTATION RESPONSES.....	2
2.1	Consultation under Section 42(1)(a) & (b) of the Planning Act 2008.....	2
2.2	Consultation under Section 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008	27
2.3	Consultation under Section 47 and Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008	33

1 OVERVIEW

- 1.1.1 The tables provided below evidence the regard had to responses received to the Applicant's winter 2020 targeted consultation and project update 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 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

2.1 Consultation under Section 42(1)(a) & (b) of the Planning Act 2008

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
General	The Council recognise's the benefits that this scheme will provide and therefore wishes to see the scheme delivered as soon as possible because of the significant and urgent need for these improvements. The Council therefore supports the principle of dualling this stretch of road and the incorporation of a junction connecting the A47 with the proposed Norwich Western Link road in the location shown.	Breckland Council	N	The support is welcomed.
Mitigation and environment	As has also been expressed before, this is subject to the detail of the proposal being acceptable and adequate protection being afforded to the amenity of residents as well as the local characteristics of the area. This would clearly include matters such as the associated visual impact of the proposal (including any impacts upon features such as listed buildings and trees), as well as flood risk, areas of public open space and local road network connectivity.	Breckland Council	N	The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the impact of the Scheme, including on residents, visual amenity, listed buildings, trees, flood risk, areas of public open space and local road network connectivity. Mitigation measures are presented to avoid or minimize, significant adverse effects during construction and operation of the Scheme.
Heritage and environment	We note that the consultation brochure correctly identifies a Grade II listed building (Berry Hall) and an area of veteran woodland at Berry's Lane as being situated in close proximity to the location of the proposed junction. We also note the Grade II Listed building (Icehouse - listing 1077350) on Berry's Lane. The impacts of the proposal upon these will clearly need to be considered carefully and the Council would welcome further details of how the presence of these features have been taken into account within the design process. In addition, the Council would welcome confirmation of any potential flood risks associated with the scheme in this area. For example, what the	Breckland Council	N	These issues are considered in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage and Chapter 13 Road Drainage the Water Environment in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1). Chapter 13 is also supported by a Flood Risk Assessment study reported in Appendix 13.1 of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.3).

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>impact of the proposal will be upon the area of surface water flood risk that exists to the south of Hockering, adjacent to the new route, and the impacts of surface water will be mitigated so that flood risk does not increase.</p>			
<p>Information and materials</p>	<p>One omission we notice is that the consultation brochure does not identify Poppy's Wood which is located just to the west of Lyng Road. This is designated as an area of open space within the Breckland Local Plan and therefore Policy ENV01 applies. The impact of the proposals upon this area clearly needs to be considered and its ability to be used in this manner should not be impaired in any way.</p>	<p>Breckland Council</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Poppy Wood has been identified as public open space under the Breckland Local Plan and the impacts are assessed in Chapter 12 Population and Human Health in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1).</p>
<p>Access and connectivity</p>	<p>The Council, and in particular the local ward members covering the scheme, also consider it important to preserve the connectivity between existing villages to the north and south of the proposal without creating a north-south rat run (that is likely to occur once the new A47 and Western relief roads are in place). There is particular concern at the latest proposal to stop up Berry's Lane in this regard. It is therefore suggested that Wood Lane and Berry's Lane be connected by way of an underpass under the A47 but separately from the proposed new A47/NWL junction. However, in the event that this is not feasible then Berry's Lane should be connected to the new junction, subject to a weight restriction, and any appropriate width restrictions, to prevent HGV traffic from using it. Furthermore, in order to safeguard the existing Bus route to Hockering village it is also important that the link from Wood Lane to the new junction is preserved. If appropriate, please can we ensure that these comments are adequately reflected somehow within the SoCG?</p>	<p>Breckland Council</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The B1535 Wood Lane is the locally appointed HGV route by Norfolk County Council and so has been connected to the A47 improvements.</p> <p>The A47 is a stand-alone scheme however, Highways England are working collaboratively with Norfolk County Council in regard to impacts or changes to the local road network.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council are developing their proposals for the Norwich Western Link (NWL); and are working with the Parish Councils to identify plans for the local road network should mitigation measures be required.</p> <p>The proposed design for the A47 takes into account public / stakeholder feedback from the Statutory Consultation, Parish Council Meetings, Local Liaison Group Meetings, MP Meetings and engagement</p>

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				with Norfolk County Council. This engagement led to the closure of Berrys Lane to through traffic, to discourage the north south traffic which is a significant local concern.
Connectivity, walking and cycling, traffic	<p>Can you tell me when you decided to cancel the pedestrian, cycling underpass at Church lane/Sandy Lane and move to a new underpass including vehicles at Mattishall Lane / Hockering, as I can't find any notification or advice from you on my files. All our previous emails have been about closing Church Lane and not linking to Berrys lane but all along the underpass was included.</p> <p>The traffic flows shown below are worrying – East Tuddenham will not benefit unless you can get people from Yaxham and Mattishall onto the new dual carriageway. Also, Barnham Broom road traffic will double !!</p>	East Tuddenham Parish Council	N	<p>The change was made in line with the decision to include Mattishall Lane as the preferred North - South crossing following the responses received during the statutory consultation, parish council feedback and feedback from the Local Liaison Group meetings.</p> <p>As confirmed at the multi parish Local Liaison Group, Norfolk County Council are undertaking a review of the wider local road network with regard to North-South movements as part of their development of the Norwich Western Link scheme.</p>
Heritage	As we noted in our advice on the Preliminary Environmental Report (dated 6 April) earlier this year one of our chief areas of interest is the impact on the setting of the listed parish churches at North Tuddenham, Honingham and Easton as 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.	Historic England	N	These impacts of the Scheme on the setting of church of St Michael, St Andrew and St Peter are considered in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1).
Walking and cycling, heritage	The decision to place the pedestrian and cycle route from Honingham Village to St Andrew's church in an underpass rather than a on a footbridge is a positive one in terms of visual impact, as is the relocation of the Norwich road junction some 150m further east of the church. We will continue to advise the consultants on the impact on all three churches and will be able to give specific advice on the degree to which these changes	Historic England	N	The feedback and continued support is welcomed.

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	have reduced the effect as well as on the footbridge proposed to the north of Easton church.			
Design	We are planning to install HV cables which will most likely be drilled under the A47 scheme and so the exact location of your infrastructure is important for us to consider in the planning phase. I have seen the map you sent in your attachment and this is helpful but for our cable routing purposes we would like to include your scheme in our project GIS.	Equinor N , The feedback and continued support is welcomed.		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).
Connectivity	Overall North Tuddenham PCC is pleased with plans for this part of the A47 dualling project. The re-establishing the link from NT along the old Main Road near Poppy Wood and part of the existing A47 to Hockering (with a T-junction to Lyng) is welcomed. So is the Mattishall Lane underpass at Hockering leading to services in Mattishall, thus avoiding more traffic on Fox Lane.	North Tuddenham Parish Council	N	The positive feedback to the changes since statutory consultation is welcomed.
Connectivity and design	A strategy for dissuading HGVs to continue to find any route across the Wensum Valley rather than use the new NWL will be important.	North Tuddenham Parish Council	N	The local highway authority, Norfolk County Council are responsible for the local road network. The B1535 Wood Lane is the current local authority HGV route, and therefore forms part of the proposed scheme. As confirmed at the multi parish Local Liaison Group, Norfolk County Council are undertaking a review of the wider local

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				road network with regard to North-South vehicle & HGV movements as part of their development of the Norwich Western Link scheme.
Traffic	The congestion around North Tuddenham and Mattishall to beat potential hold-ups on the A47 during construction of the dual carriageway also keeps us awake at night.	North Tuddenham Parish Council	N	<p>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 is presented in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (TR010038/APP/7.5).</p> <p>The proposed scheme is largely offline, which allows the construction works to be undertaken such that public interface will be minimised as far as possible.</p> <p>In spite of our best endeavours there will be occasions where temporary traffic management is required on the existing network as the improvements are made.</p> <p>However, any such occasions will be identified and appropriate communication disseminated to local communities in advance and we will be working with Norfolk County Council, and Parish Councils to ensure the works progress with minimal adverse effect and where necessary allow for timeous, commensurate and effective intervention to appropriately manage any issues as they arise.</p>

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Heritage	The HE map doesn't indicate the location of our Grade 1 Listed St Marys Church (shown to the right of Mattishall Lane as an inverted L shape). Regarding the curved road which goes southwards past Kimblewick Equestrian Centre, off Low Road, towards the bridge over the River Tud and joins Blind Lane - the section of 'road' between Low Road and the bridge over the River Tud is extremely poor. It has a hump down the middle of it and falls away alarmingly towards the River Tud and as such, really not fit for vehicles.	North Tuddenham Parish Council	N	The proposed scheme has no impact on the setting of St Marys Church. Impacts of the Scheme on the setting of the church of St Michael, St Andrew and St Peter are considered in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1). Highways England are responsible for the Strategic Road Network. The local planning authority, Norfolk County Council are responsible for the local road network.
Design	Please see attached asset plan. NGG have a high-pressure gas pipeline in the vicinity of the development. Please get in touch if you want to discuss the proximity of the pipeline further.	National Grid	N	The Applicant has been engaging with National Grid since the statutory consultation to manage the relocation of the high pressure gas pipeline.
Mitigation	A local resident has been in touch to express their concerns that although the church at Easton will get some noise proof fencing in your plans for A47 dualling the three cul-de-sacs on the other side of the roundabout/ junction going towards Longwater have not been offered of this type of noise protection. I remember when some rumble strips were put down on the stretch of road leading to the roundabout we had to call in the MP to help get them removed because of the vibrations in those homes.	Cllr Margaret Dewsbury, Norfolk County Council	N	Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) has recommended provision of low noise surfacing on the A47 at this location to mitigate significant adverse noise impacts on properties adjacent to the A47 east of Easton roundabout.
Design and access	I am writing to ask for the Temporary TTRO on Taverham Road to be removed from the A47 N. Tuddenham to Easton Dualling:General Scheme Layout for Consultation. I'd like to make it clear that there are circumstances which might well justify the closure of Taverham Road. However, I don't think that the closure proposal should be included within the A47 DCO but instead be part of the NCC side road strategy looking at all the	Weston Longville Parish Council	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

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>roads which will be impacted by the A47 and NWL. There is no reason why an exception should be made for Taverham Road. A coherent side road strategy will need to take account of three sets of circumstances: a strategy assuming the completion of both the A47 and the NWL, a strategy to manage any significant difference in delivery timescales, and a strategy if the A47 goes ahead but funding is not secured for the NWL. The latter circumstance might also call into question the closure of Church Lane at Lower Easton.</p>			<p>(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>
Design	<p>We have throughout our discussions with Highways England been led to believe that the side road strategy was the responsibility of NCC not HE. The need for a published strategy is becoming increasingly urgent. I have attached a copy of the WLPC Side Road Strategy Proposals which we submitted to HE and to NCC in May 2020, which spell out the circumstances in which WLPC would support the closure of Taverham Road.</p>	Weston Longville Parish Council	N	<p>Highways England are aware of the proposals from Weston Longville Parish Council, which were discounted. Highways England have advised the Parish Council that the proposed A47 and NWL Schemes are separate schemes, with different objectives, funding streams and subject to different planning submission routes.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council are responsible for the local road network and not</p>

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>Highways England who are formerly responsible for the Strategic Road Network.</p> <p>Highways England have continued to engage and support Norfolk County Council in regard to the local road network and NWL scheme.</p>
Design and mitigation	<p>I'd be grateful to know how the decision to include Taverham Road was arrived at without any discussion with WLPC given the significant implications for the B1535 and C167 if there are disparities in completion timescales for the A47 and NWL, or the NWL does not go ahead, or the NWL mitigation measures we are seeking, (which include road closures), are not implemented.</p>	Weston Longville Parish Council	N	<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</p>

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				and support Norfolk County Council in regard to the local road network and NWL scheme.
Design and traffic	<p>The map appears to show the closure of Taverham Rd/ Honingham Lane (going from the new A47 roundabout through to Ringland). Our understanding was that traffic modelling was to be done in order to assess impact on Breck Rd and The Broadway in Weston Longville, and Weston Rd in Easton, before this decision was taken. Since the decision would appear to have been done, please will you share the outcome of the modelling as to what will be the impact on traffic movements on these three roads by the closures of both the Taverham Rd and Church Rd/ Ringland Rd combinations. If the impact is to increase the volumes of traffic on the Weston Longville routes then, as has previously been stated, the Weston Longville Parish Council would expect that the Breck Road route would also be closed, to protect local residents. Both Breck Rd and The Broadway routes will be closed by the NWL so doing so as part of the A47 scheme will just bring forward that outcome.</p>	Weston Longville Parish Council	N	<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>

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Safety	Following on from Highways England's Project Update of Winter 2020, I have been contacted by a number of constituents who are concerned about HE's approach. The topic my constituents are particularly concerned about is the safety of Taverham Road as they feel the safety for all users is being seriously prejudiced. A number of residents are concerned Taverham Road is being turned into a rat run to access the A47 and feel HE plans do nothing to prevent this happening.	Jerome Mayhew MP	N	Highways England is working closely with the local highway authority (Norfolk County Council) regarding the roads that form part of the local road network. As confirmed at the multi parish Local Liaison Group, Norfolk County Council is undertaking a review of the wider local road network with regard to North-South vehicle & HGV movements as part of the development of the Norwich Western Link scheme
Consultation	The Council are shocked and disappointed at the very limited time that Highways England have provided to allow for comments to be submitted given that the period crosses the Christmas holiday.	Honingham Parish Council	N	Adequate response periods were provided for the update which allowed sufficient time for stakeholders to provide a response. The non-statutory consultation period was 30 days which is in excess of the minimum 28 days consultation for informal responses and 37 days for any newly identified stakeholders, thereby allowing for the Christmas bank holiday period.
Consultation	The Council are also frustrated that Highways England have chosen not to release the results of the consultation of April 2020 before, or as part of the Winter Update and new map. The Council has no means of knowing the extent or content of responses made during the consultation or assessing the adequacy of any amendments made by Highways England to the design in response to this.	Honingham Parish Council	N	The consultation report (TR010038/APP/5.1) will be provided as part of the Development Consent Order submission. Highways England has continued to engage with the parish council and other stakeholders post the Statutory Consultation to discuss issues pertinent to the village and other stakeholders through direct meetings and the Local Liaison

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				Group meetings
Access	The Council are pleased to see that feedback from the Council around the access to the church from the village has been addressed and that a more suitable and direct route has been chosen. However, the Council maintain that if a footpath to the church can be provided via a new underpass, then there should be no reason why this could not be expanded to include a roadway to also allow vehicular access along this route, thus providing a route for local traffic to navigated north-south across the new A47. Ideally this would be one way to prevent the route being used for rat-running but would have the benefits of reducing the area to being susceptible to fly tipping and illegal encampment, as well as removing the need for a gate to access the church.	Honingham Parish Council		<p>Local traffic movements north south of the A47 are catered for via the proposed Norwich Road junction. This junction is grade separated allowing safe movement of local traffic below the A47 dual carriageway.</p> <p>The project team have also engaged with local landowners, stakeholders and the local authority to ensure that measures are in place to reduce the risks highlighted and was communicated to the parish council representative at the local liaison Group.</p> <p>The proposed road cross section will be single carriageway to the entrance of the lodge property, with a secure entry gate placed immediately after the entrance to prohibit further access. Access to this gate will be provided to the church and landowner accordingly.</p> <p>The project team will continue to engage on the provision and type of gate to ensure it serves the needs of the church and landowner it would serve.</p>
Access	There remain many unanswered questions regarding the type of security gate which is proposed, such as who will have access to open the gate? Will pedestrians still be able to pass? How will disabled people, who may need to drive directly up to the church, be able to get there without the assistance of someone who may have a 'key' to the gate? Without the finer detail it is not possible for the Council to assess the potential effectiveness	Honingham Parish Council	N	Highways England welcomes suggestions on the type of provision provided; but will further evaluate the security requirements during the detailed design which will enable it to provide further detail on the type of gate.

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	of the gate.			<p>The proposed security gate will maintain pedestrian and cyclist access adjacent to the proposed route with vehicular access being provided to those who require access, for example the landowner, church warden and local authority.</p> <p>With regards to access, it would be the responsibility of access holders to open / close the gate as required.</p>
Traffic	<p>The Council continue to be extremely concerned about the impact of additional traffic through the centre of the village. A previous request to re-route Berrys Lane to connect to Dereham Road and blocking off Dereham Road's access to the current A47 was dismissed due to a gas pipe passing through the area.</p>	Honingham Parish Council	N	<p>Following the feedback provided from statutory consultation, the Local Liaison Group, meetings with George Freeman MP and Honingham Parish Council, the latest design proposals have the existing A47 as the priority connection to the Wood Lane junction, not Dereham Road and Berrys Lane closed to through traffic.</p> <p>The proposed design provides two points of local access to the A47 Dual carriageway via the proposed connection at Dereham Road to Wood Lane junction, or eastwards to the proposed Norwich Road junction providing greater network resilience and local access.</p> <p>The proposed layout will reduce the impact on the village, which is further enhanced with the provision of gate way features at the western and eastern extents of the village to further discourage direct movements whilst providing the option for a local bus route.</p> <p>The existing A47 is proposed to de-</p>

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>trunked with a 50mph speed limit implemented providing a faster more direct route for vehicles exiting / joining the A47.</p> <p>The project team have been working with National Grid to reduce the impact of proposed diversionary works to local properties such as Berrys Hall and Merrywood House.</p> <p>The proposed layout closes off Berrys Lane as a through route, reducing the impact of North-South traffic and providing a safe link for walkers, cyclists, horse riders to connect into the proposed improved walking, cycling, horse riding network.</p>
Traffic	<p>However, there are still grave concerns about the amount of traffic which will cut through the village to get South of the A47. Once off the new A47 at the Wood Lane junction traffic is intended to travel east along the current A47 to the Honingham roundabout and then travel back west along the Mattishall Road to be able to travel south. It is inevitable that local traffic will take their own route, turning off onto Dereham Road into the village centre and then cutting back south along Colton Road, to cut off the corner and avoid the Honingham roundabout.</p>	Honingham Parish Council	N	<p>Following the feedback provided from statutory consultation, the Local Liaison Group, meetings with George Freeman MP and Honingham Parish Council, the latest design proposals have the existing A47 as the priority connection to the Wood Lane junction, not Dereham Road and Berrys Lane closed to through traffic.</p> <p>The proposed layout will reduce the impact on the village, which is further enhanced with the provision of gate way features at the western and eastern extents of the village to further discourage direct movements whilst providing the option for a local bus route.</p> <p>The existing A47 is proposed to de-</p>

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				trunked with a 50mph speed limit implemented providing a faster more direct route for vehicles exiting / joining the A47.
Traffic	In addition to that, traffic travelling from Mattishall intending on accessing the Norwich Western Link or the A47 west bound will also cut through Colton Road in an attempt to shorten their journey.	Honingham Parish Council	N	<p>The traffic modelling for the scheme demonstrates that traffic heading North for the A47 or exiting the A47 heading south would not utilise this route through the village.</p> <p>The road layout has been designed to principally deter this movement, with further engineering measures put in place to discourage. Two gateway features have been included at either end of the village reducing the carriageway to a one lane priority entry system along with a 30mph speed limit implemented.</p>
Traffic	Highways England have discussed the option of traffic calming measures at the junction of Dereham Road with the current A47, and where Norwich Road meets Mattishall Road, with the Parish Council but with little confirmed detail there is concern that these measures will neither materialise nor prevent rat running from occurring.	Honingham Parish Council	N	<p>Two gateway features have been included in the proposed design at either end of the village reducing the carriageway to a one lane priority entry system along with a 30mph speed limit implemented.</p> <p>Highways England will continue to engage with the Parish Council to ensure these measures and the appearance are suitably integrated into the village.</p>
Traffic	The junction of Colton Road and Mattishall Road has also been completely missed off from the plan, and as the only other route into the village this should be included as an area to have traffic calming measures. In the absence of specific details on the traffic calming measures suggested the Council would prefer that the junction of Dereham Road and the current A47 is closed	Honingham Parish Council	N	The proposed design provides two points of local access to the A47 Dual carriageway via the proposed connection at Dereham Road to Wood Lane junction, or eastwards to the proposed Norwich Road junction providing greater network

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	so that there is no direct access into or out of the village of Honingham at the Wood Lane junction.			<p>resilience and local access.</p> <p>This approach is in keeping with the principles proposed at Hockering, Honingham and Easton providing resilience to the local road network for connections to the Strategic Road Network.</p> <p>The proposed layout will reduce the impact on the village, which is further enhanced with the provision of gate way features at the western and eastern extents of the village to further discourage direct movements whilst providing the option for a local bus route.</p> <p>The existing A47 is proposed to de-trunked with a 50mph speed limit implemented providing a faster more direct route for vehicles exiting / joining the A47.</p>
Traffic	Alternatively, the Council would like to see an official proposal of the traffic calming measures that Highways England are prepared to install, to include Dereham Road, Norwich Road and Colton Road, before the submission of the DCO to be able to fully consider the impacts of the proposed road design.	Honingham Parish Council	N	<p>Two gateway features have been included in the proposed design at either end of Dereham Road reducing the carriageway to a one lane priority entry system along with a 30mph speed limit implemented.</p> <p>Highways England will continue to engage with the Parish Council to ensure these measures and the appearance are suitably integrated into the village.</p>
Traffic	There are significant proposals for a new development of between 4000-8000 houses in the Honingham Thorpe area in the near future. The requests from the Parish Council in relation	Honingham Parish Council	N	Highways England have engaged with Norfolk County Council on the scheme traffic modelling to ensure that natural and

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>to the A47 are not only seeking to address the immediate issues posed by the current designs for road but also take into account the future impact of this development, and neighbouring developments, for example in Easton of 900 houses and the expansion of the Food Enterprize Zone, which will all contribute to major increases in extra traffic in the area.</p>			<p>planned growth is accounted for 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> <p>The model contains natural growth factors in line with national standards, accounts for developments under construction and those with planning permission in place.</p> <p>The Honingham Thorpe development does not form part of the Norfolk Local Development Plan and has therefore not been included in the scheme traffic model.</p>
<p>Traffic and consultation</p>	<p>The Council have always held concerns that Highways England do not listen to the Council's concerns for the longer-term impacts of the road on the village and that they are only seeking to solve the immediate problems of making the road safer, which the Council fully support, and relieve congestion. Whilst the proposed road may ease current congestion it will simply increase and redirect local traffic to the roads through Honingham village without appropriate traffic calming measures in the 3 locations mentioned.</p>	<p>Honingham Parish Council</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Highways England have engaged with the Parish Council throughout the development of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>This has led to design changes for the existing A47 North of Honingham in addition to changes to the proposed road layout at the wood lane junction being redesigned, and also the inclusion of a walking & cycling route to St Andrew's Church.</p> <p>The proposed design provides two gateway features at the eastern and</p>

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>western extents of the village, which will locally reduce the carriageway to one lane priority access; and supported with a 30mph speed limit.</p> <p>Highways England will continue to engage with the Parish Council to ensure these measures and the appearance are suitably integrated into the village.</p>
Traffic	<p>An alternative traffic calming measure which could be considered at the Dereham Road junction could be timed access during peak times to prevent the village being used as a rat run. This would allow residents and deliveries access but prevent others from using it as a short cut. The Council are committed to continue to work with Highways England to address and come up with a solution to this problem and urge Highways England to resolve this matter as soon as possible, rather than after construction.</p>	Honingham Parish Council	N	<p>The proposed scheme contains mitigation measures which have been discussed and reviewed with the adopting local highway authority, Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>Highways England will continue to engage with the Parish Council to ensure these measures and the appearance are suitably integrated into the village.</p>
Construction	<p>The Council seek absolute confirmation that there will be no construction traffic travelling through the centre of Honingham at any time. The Council are deeply concerned about the number and proximity of the compounds to the village and the impact of both noise, traffic and environmental destruction which will occur due to these. The Council seek reassurance that Highways England and their appointed contractors will continue to work with the Parish Council during the construction period so that any negative impacts of the construction on the parish can be addressed immediately and reduce the severe and disruptive impact of the construction on those living in the parish.</p>	Honingham Parish Council	N	<p>The predominantly linear nature of the proposed highway upgrade works results in works being carried out in such a manner that any need to route construction traffic through the village of Honingham will be obviated.</p> <p>Construction traffic will be confined to using the existing road network outside the curtilage of the village. Moreover, the impact of construction traffic in respect of plant used, plant and vehicle movement and anticipated logistics during the construction programme has been assessed and where necessary appropriate mitigation measures identified</p>

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>within the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) (Chapter 5 Air Quality, Chapter 11 Noise & Vibration) to ameliorate the impact to an acceptable level pursuant with accepted construction best practice.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the current measures to mitigate construction impacts, Galliford Try (Highways England's contractor), in conjunction with Highways England, undertakes to continue to liaise with Honingham Parish Council throughout the construction period to ensure the works progress with minimal adverse effect and where necessary allow for timely, commensurate and effective intervention to appropriately manage any issues as they arise.</p>
Construction	<p>Whilst the Council support the requirement that the contractors sign up to the Considerate Constructors scheme, as detailed in the Winter Update brochure, this does not give any significant reference to the impact on those living in proximity to the construction area. It is a disappointment that the 'Respect the Community' element of the schemes Code of Considerate Practice was not included in the brochure and that this omission is not an indication of the intentions of Highways England or its appointed contractors to dismiss the concerns of the residents of Honingham.</p>	Honingham Parish Council	N	<p>Galliford Try (Highways England Contractor), are wholly committed to sustainable construction and front and centre of this we take our role and responsibilities in respect of societal impacts seriously.</p> <p>Our Sustainability and Social Value Policy which applies to all our construction activities sets out, amongst other aspects, our commitment to assessing and mitigating negative impacts and promoting positive effects.</p> <p>Our Code of Conduct sets out our holistic approach to being a good neighbour and the requirement to treat all our</p>

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>stakeholders with respect, courtesy and consideration.</p> <p>Galliford Try are wholly committed to and take part in the Considerate Constructors Scheme (CCS) and with its principles embodied in our policies and procedures, this means that we accept and implement all aspects of the CCS; including the provisions under "Respecting the Community".</p> <p>In this regard and through these commitments we intend and expect to establish and maintain excellent working relationship with the Parish Councils and residents affected by the construction works.</p>
Construction and environment	<p>The Council also seek assurances that the destruction of mature trees and shrubs should be kept to a minimum, particularly in the areas of the temporary compounds. Whilst the Council are aware that replacement trees will be planted it will take decades before they grow and return the environment to its current state, having a negative impact on wildlife in the area during that time. Highways England should seek to keep the size of the compounds to an absolute minimum, and where possible move them as far away from residential areas as possible.</p>	Honingham Parish Council	N	<p>The construction compounds and material storage areas will seek to protect existing trees and shrubs (including hedgerows) where possible.</p> <p>The impact of the proposed compounds has been assessed in terms of the, potential impact on residents, trees, shrubs, wildlife, and watercourses.</p> <p>These have been assessed in the following chapters of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) Chapter 5 Air quality, Chapter 7 Landscape and visual effects, Chapter 8 Biodiversity, Chapter 11 Noise and vibration, Chapter 13 Road drainage and the water</p>

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>environment.</p> <p>Where possible, the noise generating and dust generating activities have been moved away from residential properties.</p>
Traffic	<p>The issue of increased traffic on Taverham Road both during and after the completion of the A47 and the completion of the proposed Norwich Western Link remains an area of deep concern for the Parish Council. Both scenarios predict a massive traffic increase along Taverham Road, but with no acknowledgement by HE of the unsuitability of this country lane or the impact of this congestion on its residents. Highways England's revised plans provide no further information on how this will be addressed. Highways England have continued to reiterate that this problem is not one they are responsible for solving, passing responsibility to Norfolk County Council, yet it is a problem of your creation. This major flaw in traffic routing, coupled with the need to build multiple new link roads to access the new Norwich Road junction, indicates that there remains a big question over both the need for, and the location of, such a major and complex junction at Taverham Road/Blind Lane.</p>	Honingham Parish Council	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 Junction & Sideroad Strategy explains how the scheme has been developed, in alignment with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (UK DMRB).</p> <p>Along the A47 corridor between North Tuddenham to Easton, there are 5 routes north, of which only one is classified as a "B" Road and is assigned as the local authority HGV route, 3 "C" Roads and one unclassified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lyng Road (C198) • Heath Road (C173) • Wood Lane (B1535) (Local Authority HGV Route) • Taverham Road (C174) • Church Lane (unclassified) <p>Presently, local traffic heading north towards Ringland from the strategic road network (A47), does so via the Easton</p>

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>roundabout and Church Lane, as this is the fastest route based on the present road layout and egress point from the A47 Easton roundabout.</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 under the Scheme. The junction was positioned taking into account constraints, such as the Grade I listed St Peters Church, the Orsted pipeline route, approved Food Enterprise Zone development, and topography.</p> <p>Taverham Road, as a result of the junction being located west of the existing Easton roundabout, becomes the most direct route which is reflected in the traffic model.</p> <p>The removal of Church Lane was based on stakeholder feedback, existing safety issues and traffic modelling data. The modelling demonstrated that this route would not be used, due to the longer route, and increased journey time which was reflected in the Scheme traffic model.</p> <p>There are presently 41 direct accesses onto the A47 between North Tuddenham and Easton which directly contribute to the congestion and poor safety record.</p> <p>The Scheme addresses this by removing all direct access to the Strategic Road</p>

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>Network in line with the UK DMRB; and providing safe access points via the proposed junctions at Wood Lane and Norwich Road.</p> <p>Local roads where possible were connected to the existing / new sideroad network and proposed junctions, with some north – south routes severed where this was not feasible.</p> <p><u>Traffic Modelling:</u></p> <p>The base model (2015) recorded annual average daily traffic (AADT) of 600 on Taverham Road, which is modelled to increase naturally to 900 by the proposed scheme opening year of 2025 with no improvements.</p> <p>The proposed A47 scheme and NWL scheme would see this AADT reduce to 200 in 2025.</p> <p>The proposed A47 scheme, No NWL, and Honingham Lane closed is modelled at 1300 AADT.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council is undertaking a review of the wider local road network, with regard to the interim period between the two schemes opening. Highways England continues to engage and support Norfolk County Council in regard to the local road network and NWL scheme.</p>
Traffic	Highways England have repeatedly told the Council they (HE), must ensure the safety of road users but are creating a situation	Honingham	N	The local highway authority, Norfolk County Council are presently developing

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>which will simply make safety on Taverham Road for all types of road user, whether driving or pedestrian, much worse. Those drivers who are seeking to gain access north and south of the A47 will simply use Taverham Road as their only choice, thus it will become a new rat running route. In the light of this very major concern, the Council are proposing that Taverham Road is closed to through traffic and access is only allowed for residents and deliveries.</p>	Parish Council		<p>the Norwich Western Link scheme to address the existing north – south issues around the A47 route corridor.</p> <p>As part of this scheme, Norfolk County Council are engaging with all Parish Councils, to understand views, and take account of feedback on issues on the wider local road network to ensure that north – south traffic uses the NWL.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council are also undertaking a review of the wider local road network, with regard to the interim period between the proposed schemes opening. Highways England continue to engage and support Norfolk County Council on this matter.</p>
Lighting, noise and mitigation	<p>The residents on Taverham Road will be particularly impacted by both noise and light from the new road and they appear to have been disregarded.</p>	Honingham Parish Council	N	<p>Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual and Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assess the light and noise impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are proposed where significant adverse impacts are predicted.</p>
Lighting and mitigation	<p>The scheme map published on the Highways England website, but only provided in limited detail as part of the Winter Update brochure, does not give any detail on the location of lighting provision for the new A47. When will this be available and how will the impact of this be able to be considered by the Council, with the opportunity to influence the proposal, if it is not provided prior to the submission of the DCO? Can Highways England please confirm that only the junctions will be lit for safety and</p>	Honingham Parish Council	N	<p>Section 2.4 in Chapter 2 The Proposed Scheme of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) describes the proposal lighting arrangements for the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement</p>

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	not the road itself? The dark skies of Norfolk will be lost if there is unnecessary lighting of the road.			(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.
Noise and mitigation	Noise barriers also seem to be missing from the areas around St Andrews church, Taverham Road and the village of Honingham. Again, the residents of Taverham Road seem to have been completely disregarded and will be plagued by both noise and light pollution due to their proximity to the new Norwich Road roundabout. How will this be mitigated both during construction and afterwards?	Honingham Parish Council	N	Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the noise impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme. Mitigation measures, including provision of noise barriers and low noise surfacing, are proposed where significant adverse noise impacts are predicted.
WCH	The Parish Council welcome the addition of new, safer walking routes around the parish, improving accessibility for pedestrians. However, the new route which comes from the underpass at Hall Farm will lead pedestrians to have to cross the current A47 which could be highly dangerous without an appropriate and safe crossing. How will this be addressed?	Honingham Parish Council	N	The existing A47 will be de-trunked as part of the proposed scheme from an A road to a B road; and retained for local access. The cross section of the road will be reduced to 6m wide and a speed limit of 50mph implemented. An uncontrolled crossing point will be provided at this location, with advance road signage and road markings provided to ensure the safe crossing of users.
WCH	Despite requests there has been no provision for a footpath to be installed from Richmond Drive, along Norwich Road to the Honingham roundabout, leaving pedestrians still needing to walk along the verge. It would be very easy to include a footpath along this stretch of road, which would then meet the objective of Highways England to consider safety at all points of its scheme.	Honingham Parish Council	N	Highways England have engaged with stakeholders throughout the development to deliver improvements to the walking, cycling & horse riding network. The Scheme has been consulted on by the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council and the Norfolk Public Rights of Way (PRoW) officers. The

Topic area	Response	Prescribed consultee(s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>Scheme provides new cycle tracks, 4 new safe means to cross the A47 carriageway, and improves existing routes.</p> <p>The existing A47 through Honingham is to be detrunked, with the existing road cross section reduced to 6m and a new walking cycling route provided linking to Honingham Roundabout and the proposed walking & cycling underpass.</p> <p>Enhancements outside of the Scheme boundary should be pursued with the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council.</p>
WCH	<p>There is also a local concern that the proposals extinguish the long established and convenient cycle link from the north of the A47 at Taverham Road to the southern villages, such as Barford and beyond, via Blind Lane. The closure of Blind Lane should be adjusted to permit cycle access only to continue along Blind Lane to maintain this well used route.</p>	Honingham Parish Council	N	<p>A walking / cycling route from north of the A47 to the south is provided via the new segregated crossing points proposed at Honingham and Easton.</p> <p>Dedicated off carriageway walking / cycling routes from Taverham Road are provided west to the proposed new Honingham underpass, and eastbound to the proposed new Easton overbridge. From there users would then connect into the existing local road / walking & cycling network.</p>

2.2 Consultation under Section 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Access, property and design	<p>Currently at Berry Hall there is a mix of arable and livestock farming carried out by a farmer on a contract basis. The current plans propose to take approx. 30 acres of land out of production (80% of all arable land), thus decimating the viability of the Estate to be used in its current manner. This is likely to mean the end of farming at Berry Hall for the foreseeable future as there will not be enough useful land left on which the farmer can make a meaningful living. The remaining land will also be of such small scale in farming terms that it will not be viable.</p> <p>If the eastern field is used there will be no way of moving cattle to the low meadows to the east of Berry's Lane. Given that unviable situation resulting from the land take would last for several years, [Editor's note: name removed] current farmer will have little choice but to leave and may never return. This will potentially alter the farming practices at Berry Hall permanently.</p> <p>The land to the north of the new road is part of a much larger estate and so while the current impact in terms of acres taken would no doubt be similar, the proportionate impact on the estate and farming business will be much less than at Berry Hall. It would therefore make sense to move as much of the construction and storage sites to the open agricultural land to the north west as possible.</p>	N	<p>A number of factors have been carefully considered and assessed in selecting the location and size of compounds. The compounds must be located within the Scheme boundary and be sufficiently proximal to the works to allow for efficient and effective support to construction activities, recognising the linear nature of the works and the expected multiple phasing in works execution.</p> <p>In addition, the compounds must be of sufficient size and shape to allow for safe operation in accordance with applicable health and safety requirements and best construction practice, provide safe vehicular access and egress and not impede the main construction activity. These requirements are always balanced against the imperative of minimising as far as possible adverse impact to the local area and ameliorating any impact as far as is practicable.</p> <p>Given the specific works at this location of the Scheme and in particular the large grade separated junction around Wood Lane and related number of accommodation works (side roads, drainage, etc.), there is a requirement to have a suitable compound to serve these works. The proposed compound satisfies the selection criteria.</p> <p>Land situated to the north does not provide the required area for a construction compound, material storage, safe access / egress to the A47 nor align with the construction phasing of the Scheme.</p> <p>Land to the east of Berrys Hall is required temporarily for the diversion of the National Grid gas main, which has to also take into account the interface with Merrywood House.</p>
Mitigation	<p>There are 10 households [REDACTED] that would be severely impacted by pollution, noise</p>	N	<p>The impact of the proposed compounds are assessed in terms of the potential impact on residents, trees, shrubs,</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>and light as a result of the location of the construction, materials handling and storage compounds. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Once again, moving as much as possible to the bare farmland north of the new road would reduce this impact. Not a single household would be affected to the north of the new road as there are none.</p>		<p>wildlife and watercourses.</p> <p>These have been assessed in the following chapters of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1):</p> <p>Chapter 5 Air quality,</p> <p>Chapter 7 Landscape and visual effects</p> <p>Chapter 8 Biodiversity</p> <p>Chapter 11 Noise and vibration</p> <p>Chapter 13 Road drainage and the water environment</p> <p>The construction compounds and material storage areas will seek to protect existing trees and shrubs (including hedgerows) where possible. Where possible, the noise generating and dust generating activities have been moved away from residential properties.</p>
Design	<p>The Estate owns a holiday cottage, the business of which will be impacted upon by this scheme. As with the residential properties there will be significantly less impact both from a business point of view as well as a personal one if the compound can be moved to the north.</p>	N	<p>Highways England will discuss any compensation with landowners, that is required as a consequence of the scheme for permanent or temporary land take and have sought to reduce the impact of construction areas on receptors and properties where possible. Galliford Try are wholly committed to and take part in the Considerate Constructors Scheme (CCS) and with its principles embodied in our policies and procedures, this means that we accept and implement all aspects of the CCS; including the provisions under "Respecting the Community".</p> <p>In this regard and through these commitments we intend and expect to establish and maintain excellent working relationship with the Parish Councils and residents affected by the construction works.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the current measures to mitigate construction impacts, Galliford Try in conjunction with Highways England undertake to continue to liaise with</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			Landowners, Parish, district and county Council's throughout the construction period to ensure the works progress with minimal adverse effect and where necessary allow for timeous, commensurate and effective intervention to appropriately manage any issues as they arise
Design, heritage and health and wellbeing	Merrywood House children's home is not technically part of the Estate, but it is adjacent and controlled by a Meynell Family Trust. There is a compound proposed to be on Estate land within close proximity of Merrywood House. [REDACTED]	Y	Highways England is engaging with Merrywood House and following discussions has reduced the works adjacent to the home as much as practically possible. The project team will continue to engage with the Trustees through the design process.
Heritage	We have previously pointed out that the Estate is designated as a National Heritage Asset and is of "outstanding scenic, historic or scientific interest". While the road itself will have a profound and negative impact on this designation, the impact of the compounds is likely to be more severe as for the duration of the works the character of the Estate will be severely impacted as will the public benefit. The construction works could threaten the Heritage Status of the Estate. Once again the impact would be lessened if the compounds could be moved to the north.	N	The impact of the Scheme on Heritage Assets is assessed in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1), with mitigation measures proposed where significant adverse impacts are predicted.
Design	A larger drainage pipe will need to be installed beneath Berry's Lane to allow for the additional water being brought to this location as a result of the proposed drainage changes.	N	Appendix 13.2 Drainage Strategy of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.3) presents an assessment of the Scheme's impacts on and proposed changes to the local drainage system, including provision a new drain alongside Berrys Lane to a new outfall to the River Tud as part of a system to manage surface water runoff.
Walking and cycling	There has been mention that the footpath that runs east-west to the north of Merrywood House may have its surface upgraded to something more akin to a hard track. We would oppose this as it would encourage cyclists which are not permitted on a footpath. It is a rural footpath and thus should remain grass.	N	It is proposed to upgrade the footpath to a bridleway with a cycle track to replace the connection lost by removing the Berrys Lane highway connection with Dereham Road. This upgrade would provide an enhancement and connect into the wider local walking, cycling, horse riding network.

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Access	Highways England look at the possibility of creating a gated access from the new roundabout on the southern side of the flyover at Berry's Lane to the track that runs north-south from [Editor's note: name removed] agricultural buildings. As it stands [Editor's note: name removed] only access route for HGVs will be cut off permanently, which is not acceptable. The solution we are proposing would be the easiest way around this.		Access is maintained via Berrys Lane onto the agricultural access track running west before turning north to the agricultural building. Berrys Lane is proposed to be closed to through traffic in response to Stakeholder feedback from Statutory Consultation, Local Parishes, and the multi parish Local Liaison Group.
Design and access	Why not block Sandy Lane off above Thompsons scrap yard? Leaving it accessible from the new link road to and from Honingham will without doubt create a rat run to Wood lane, Lenwade and Fakenham and indeed will still allow traffic to come from Wood Lane down Sandy Lane. It achieves nothing by allowing traffic to use the road; farm and local traffic (me included) can go via Wood Lane to meet the new A47.	N	The proposed scheme maintains a similar arrangement of the Wood Lane and Sandy Lane junctions with the existing A47. Highways England have engaged with the lead local highway authority, Norfolk County Council throughout scheme development. We will raise your concerns with Norfolk County Council, the local highway authority, for their consideration.
Environment	I do not want my hard dug trees to be squashed by builders materials and plant whilst the site is in course of construction. I have made an effort on my 3.5 acres to create a woodland, it would be sad to see it flattened for a hard standing	Y	The proposed temporary compound and construction works area has been reduced to minimise impact on this land parcel, but some loss will still be incurred as the Scheme crosses this site. Where unavoidable, temporarily affected land would be replanted.
Design	It appears that where the Lyng Road joins the existing A47, the road will change route slightly. We ask why this is necessary if the junction is adequate as it is and given the current road will be a lot less busy. All that moving the route of the Lyng Road seems to do is take additional land from our clients. We request for either clarification as to why the Lyng Road has to change route or that it remain in its current position.	Y	The existing Lyng Road provides a north south connection to the A47 and west towards North Tuddenham. As part of the proposed scheme, a new sideroad will connect the Existing Lyng road to the existing A47 and Hockering via the creation of a new sideroad and T-Junction. In order to comply with road design standards, to ensure a safe connection, and junction visibility we have remodelled the layout. Following the feedback provided at the Statutory Consultation the revised design provided in the Winter update moved the

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			road connecting Lyng Road to the A47 further west to reduce the impact on the landowners.
Access	St Michael's Church Lay-By: According to the current plan it would appear that the western end of the church lay-by is being cut off from the existing A47. Why is this? This route is used by our clients to access their land. If it is cut off as proposed then it will become a magnet for fly-tipping. We request that either the lay-by is not closed at either end or that a gate is installed and that [Editor's note: name removed] are given control over this access route. What is key is the access to the north from St Michael's Church to the agricultural buildings is maintained.	N	The existing lay-By will be maintained as part of the proposed scheme.
Access	Access is required under the Mattishall Lane underpass to reach land our clients farm at North Tuddenham following the closure of part of Low Road. As yet no details have been given as to whether this underpass will be of a sufficient size to accommodate farm machinery. We would be grateful for further details.	N	<p>The proposed Mattishall Lane Link Road has been designed in accordance with the requirements of the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council for a class "C" road.</p> <p>The road cross section will be 5.5m, with a 2.5m verge on the eastbound side. On the west side will be a 0.5m separation strip, a 2.0m cycle track and 0.5m verge.</p> <p>The structure cross section will provide a clear span of 10.5m and headroom height of 5.3m.</p> <p>Access to fields south of the A47 is also provided via the proposed local road network of the A47 and via the existing Fox Lane Junction over the A47 dual carriageway.</p>
Environment and protected species	There is a [REDACTED] on our clients' land. We have not as yet had any consultation about this or details of what it will involve.	N	Letters were sent to landowners prior to the Winter update consultation regarding access to this land for this purpose and Highways England will continue to liaise with the landowner regarding this during subsequent meetings.
Environment	The flood area marked on the plans near the Lyng Road looks bigger than previously depicted. Can you please confirm whether this is due to a revision from the Environment Agency or in fact an intention to create a flood area.	N	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

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			The area reflects the extent of land required to mitigate flooding downstream, taking into account climate change forecasting, design requirements and EA / LLFA requirements.

2.3 Consultation under Section 47 and Section 48 of the Planning Act 2008

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Health and wellbeing	<p>We believe that increased noise and construction work, would have serious implications on the residents in Merrywood House. Such road building disruption is not conducive to the therapeutic nature of our work, which is so important to the residents.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	Y	<p>In consultation with the charitable organisation, Childhood First, and Ofsted where required, further safety measures for working in proximity to the sites will be developed, so far as reasonably practicable, during the detailed design stage between the principal contractor, Highways England and any third party contractors to support maintaining the charitable organisation's operational standards.</p> <p>Highways England is exploring measures to reduce the noise impact during the works and the area identified adjacent to Merrywood House will only be used for essential works that are required to take place. Following engagement, the area will no longer be used for other construction activities.</p>
Construction and health and wellbeing	<p>I should like to make a comment on the preparatory arrangements for this work, in particular the plan to store stock/equipment etc, on a field adjacent to the garden of Merrywood House, on Berrys Lane. Needless to say, the disruption caused by your works and the noisy comings and goings, [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Please will you reconsider this idea, and find another field; there are several others available!</p>	Y	<p>Use of the field adjacent to Merrywood House is unavoidable as it is the location of a high pressure gas pipeline that needs diverting under the proposed A47 dual carriageway. Other utility services also need diverting through this field.</p> <p>However, the area identified adjacent to Merrywood House will only be used for essential works that are required to take place in that field.</p> <p>At statutory consultation, the location of potential compounds was still to be determined, thus the undertaking of further engagement in December 2020.</p>
Construction	<p>It appears to us at Merrywood House that the statutory consultation documents did not include any construction compounds or works areas such as the one now proposed at Berry's Lane. Had they done so we would have raised the objections at that stage about the unsuitability of this location.</p>	Y	<p>Following engagement with Merrywood House, the area will no longer be used for a construction compound and activities will be managed to minimise disturbance to Merrywood House.</p>
Construction and health and	<p>As a trustee [REDACTED] in Berrys Lane, I have been made aware of the proposal to make the area adjacent to</p>	Y	<p>In consultation with Childhood First, and Ofsted where required, further safety measures for working in proximity to the sites are to be developed, so far as reasonably</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
wellbeing	<p>Merrywood House the construction site for the roadworks on that part of the A47. When the decision was made you were probably completely unaware of the [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] they can have happy and fulfilled lives with strong relationships. The noise and upheaval taking place on the adjacent construction site is going to put [REDACTED]</p>		<p>practicable, during the detailed design stage between the Principal Contractor, Highways England and any third-party contractors to support maintaining the operational standards.</p> <p>Highways England are exploring measures to reduce the noise impact during the works and have reduced works to only essential works in the vicinity of Merrywood House.</p> <p>The area identified adjacent to Merrywood House will only be used for essential works that are required to take place. Following engagement, the area will no longer be used for other construction activities.</p>
Construction and health and wellbeing	<p>With the site so close to Merrywood House, we will be considerably impacted by an increase in noise from the works and the movements of construction vehicles for a sustained period. We believe there are health and safety issues associated with a major construction site and these would have serious implications for Merrywood, [REDACTED]</p>	Y	
Health and wellbeing and safety	<p>Any disruption to the calm of the Merrywood House environment [REDACTED]</p>	Y	<p>The area identified adjacent to Merrywood House will only be used for essential works that are required to take place. Following engagement with Merrywood House, the area will no longer be used for a construction compound and activities will be managed to minimise any disturbance to Merrywood House.</p>
Health and wellbeing and mitigation	<p>There will be an impact on the [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] sight of any impact assessment that has been undertaken to consider the above in choosing the location. If none has been done, then the planning considerations behind this decision have not been adequate and must be reviewed.</p>	Y	<p>Use of the field adjacent to Merrywood House is unavoidable as it is the location of a high pressure gas pipeline that needs diverting under the proposed A47 dual carriageway. Other utility services also need diverting through this field. However, the area identified adjacent to Merrywood House will only be used for works that are required to take place in that field. Following engagement with Merrywood House, the area will no longer be used for a construction compound and activities will be managed to minimise disturbance to Merrywood</p>
Design	<p>As a further observation on the plan, we see what might be an</p>	N	

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>alternative construction site North West of the new roundabout. This would have far less disruption on local residents as this area has no residents. We strongly advise this option is considered as alternative.</p>		<p>House.</p>
Design	<p>I am concerned about how traffic from the HUB will access the proposed road. Will there be any restrictions on traffic turning right? Vehicles wanting to travel east may prefer to join the A47 at the junction servicing the Show Ground. This would be very disruptive for the village. It may decrease safety on the Dereham Road yet improving safety is one of the declared aims of the scheme. It is very possible that SATNAVs may direct traffic to go east through the village. Moreover, many of the drivers will not be locals and not appreciate the disruptive nature of the decision. Also, has an alternative route out of the HUB been considered?</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> <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>
Design and mitigation	<p>Will this proposal disrupt access to and services at Saint Peter's Church? The flow of traffic past the church must interrupt local access to the church. Some older parishioners drive to the church and they will be discouraged and parking outside the church which is roadside may be ill advised with huge trucks passing through. I note a noise barrier is located behind the church. This is an obvious recognition of noise pollution. The traffic that passes behind the church is the same traffic which will pass in front of it. How is this noise mitigated?</p>	N	
Design, access and traffic	<p>The "T" junction with Dereham Road is not detailed. Even if large trucks are prohibited from turning right, which would provide some mitigation, trucks will require a larger than average amount of space to negotiate what is a tight junction. Will you provide detailed information on the control and use of this junction? Inevitably traffic from the HUB will congest the west end of the village and generate noise and air pollution. This is not a happy prospect for the people living at the west end of the village.</p>	N	<p>The connection to the existing T-Junction from Dereham Road has been designed in accordance with the required local highway authority standards.</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	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			<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>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>
Design, access and safety	<p>I am writing to voice my concerns about the proposed closure of blind lane was under the impression this was going to be used as a feeder road for the Food Hub on Church Road Easton. The closing of Blind Lane now means traffic will have to come off at the Norwich road junction and double back on itself to the Dereham Road Junction. this will mean once DRIVERS realise this they will use the Dereham road through our village as a cut though this is going to make the Dereham road dangerous for school children and villagers trying to cross.</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 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>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>
Design, access and traffic	<p>With the increase in traffic and the amount of heavy goods vehicles which will use it as a shortcut and was also lead to believe when the Food Hub was agreed blind lane was going to be used as the access road to avoid all the heavy goods vehicles passing our church. With your proposed plans not only will all the traffic now pass the church we will also get a increase in traffic though our village which in both cases is totally unacceptable.</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> <p>Managing FEZ associated impacts is the responsibility of the</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			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.
Mitigation and property	On your illustration there is on area on the existing road marked as red hatching illustrating "noise action planning". This does not appear to extend to our property. Over the years the existing bund has diminished to such an extent that it is lower than our boundary fence which means we can actually see the traffic from our garden. At the various consultations we were assured that the bund would be increased and topped with noise reducing fencing. As this is not illustrated can you please confirm that this will be undertaken and extend around the existing western boundary of our property.	N	<p>Noise action planning areas are defined by The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) as part of their duty to identify areas requiring Noise Action Plans under the Environmental Noise Directive and were shown on the scheme plans accordingly.</p> <p>Details on the noise action planning areas can be found on their website https://data.gov.uk/dataset/6c7a54b5-bb79-4c90-923a-d3a33d0a3d9a/environmental-noise-directive-end-noise-mapping-agglomerations-england-round-2, please note that our noise assessment and mitigation areas are not confined to the Noise Important Action Areas identified by DEFRA in August 2020.</p> <p>The proposed scheme does not include the provision of noise fencing on the westbound A47 carriageway at Easton due to constraints, but does include the use of low noise road surfacing.</p> <p>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the noise impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are proposed as part of the scheme where significant adverse impacts are predicted, such as the provision of low noise surfacing on the A47 and noise barriers where appropriate.</p> <p>These commitments are in the Environmental Management Plan (TR010038/APP/7.4) and secured through a legal Requirement of the DCO to deliver the commitments in this document.</p>
Design and	The introduction of the footbridge access to lower Easton could have implications for our property depending on its location and	N	Information and guidance on compensation and claims, is

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
property	height. As it stands at the moment, we are unable to assess whether or not we are in a position where we should be considering compensation.		<p>provided on the Highways England website.</p> <p>Letters have been sent to those who we believe may be entitled to compensation as a result of the proposals.</p> <p>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the noise impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are proposed where significant adverse impacts are predicted, such as provision of low noise surfacing on the A47 and noise barriers.</p> <p>These commitments are in the Environmental Management Plan (TR010038/APP/7.4) and secured through a legal Requirement of the DCO to deliver the commitments in this document.</p>
Mitigation	The only point I would make is to continue with the screen banking past the residents at Hockering to aid with reducing the noise level into the village. It seems a very short section that's on the current plan.	N	<p>Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the noise impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures, including provision of noise barriers and low noise surfacing, are proposed where significant adverse noise impacts are predicted.</p>
Access	The latest manifestation of access to and from Hillcrest is a complete disaster. If this approach were to be used, such a link would need to be a properly constructed road of a firm foundation as the subsoil at the top of Hillcrest is stoneless pure sand at least 3 metres deep as Balfour Beatty found out to their cost when they laid the Honingham to Mattishall water main which they tunnelled under my orchard.	N	<p>Initial Ground Investigation (GI) work has been undertaken to inform the development of the preliminary scheme design.</p> <p>A further programme of supplementary ground investigation is currently being prepared and shall be carried out as required during the subsequent design stages. In addition, a detailed topographical survey will be undertaken to inform the development of the detailed design in early 2021.</p>
Access and design	Further to the possible approach road across the field from Church Lane, about 70m west of the Hillcrest boundary there is a deep gully about 50m from side to side and approximately 10m deep which runs the full length of the field. The sides of the gully are about 25% slope so would probably be impassable to		<p>The access track shall be designed taking account of the topographical and geological features along its length, which will include any necessary ground improvement works.</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>traffic in frost. The minimum estimated traffic use on the projected approach road would be as follows: seven days a week one or more careers; postman up to six days per week; occasional delivery vans; occasional paramedic and ambulance access; refuse and recycling lorries, which emphasises the need for a robust approach road. Also, as Church Lane is banked is banked the very narrow, a suitable wide base platform would be needed to allow the refuse lorries to turn safely.</p>		<p>Furthermore, the access track will be designed to accommodate the necessary vehicles, vehicle loadings and traffic figures indicated.</p>
Construction	<p>I am not very happy at the thought of a construction compound close to the eastern boundary of Hillcrest with ongoing dust.</p>	N	<p>The Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme. Mitigation measures, including provision of a noise and dust management plans, are proposed where significant adverse noise impacts are predicted.</p>
Access and design	<p>Taverham Road is a single track road used by overweight and oversized vehicles as well as cars and non motorist groups. The verges are continually being eroded and the lives of its users constantly put at risk. Taverham Road is being turned into a rat run to access the A47 and Highways England plans to do nothing to prevent this happening. Highways England and Norfolk County Council have only recently reported updated model results 6.8 attached showing Taverham Road's traffic movements as 200 per day in the 2019 base year, increasing to 1,800 in the 2025 opening year without the scheme and to 1,100 in the 2025 opening year with the scheme. The percentage increase from the base year to 2025 is 900% without the scheme and 550% with the scheme. These increases are much higher than for any of the other 12 roads shown in the model tabulation. The increased safety risk for a single track road is self evident. If it is suggested that the number of users is low, then there is clearly no need for a connection to the A47 at all and Taverham Road could be closed for all traffic except for local access. Safety is a major issue for everyone. Highways England would have us believe that it is an issue for them. Norfolk County Council have always recognised the</p>	N	<p>Along the A47 corridor between North Tuddenham to Easton, there are 5 routes north, of which only one is classified as a "B" Road and is assigned as the local authority HGV route, 3 "C" Roads and one unclassified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lyng Road (C198) • Heath Road (C173) • Wood Lane (B1535) (Local Authority HGV Route) • Taverham Road (C174) • Church Lane (unclassified) <p>Presently, local traffic heading north towards Ringland from the strategic road network (A47), does so via the Easton roundabout and Church Lane, as this is the fastest route based on the present road layout and egress point from the A47 Easton roundabout.</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 Scheme. The junction was positioned taking into account constraints, such as the Grade I listed St Peters Church, the Orsted pipeline route, approved Food</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>importance of safety. Taverham Road's safety cannot continue to be ignored.</p>		<p>Enterprise Zone development, and topography.</p> <p>Taverham Road, as a result of the junction being located west of the existing Easton roundabout, becomes the most direct route which is reflected in the traffic model.</p> <p>The removal of Church Lane was based on stakeholder feedback, existing safety concerns and traffic modelling data. The modelling demonstrated that this route would not be used, due to the longer route, and increased journey time which was reflected in the scheme traffic model.</p> <p>There are presently 41 direct accesses onto the A47 between North Tuddenham and Easton which directly contribute to the congestion and poor safety record.</p> <p>The Scheme addresses this by removing all direct access to the Strategic Road Network in line with the UK DMRB and providing safe access points via the proposed junctions at Wood Lane and Norwich Road.</p> <p>Local roads where possible were connected to the existing / new sideroad network and proposed junctions, with some north – south routes severed where this was not feasible.</p> <p><u>Traffic Modelling:</u></p> <p>The base model recorded an AADT of 600 on Taverham Road, which is predicted to increase naturally to 900 by the proposed scheme opening year of 2025 with no improvements.</p> <p>The A47 scheme and NWL scheme would see this AADT reduce to 200 in 2025.</p> <p>The A47 scheme, No NWL, and Honingham Lane closed is modelled at 1300 AADT.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council is undertaking a review of the wider local road network, with regard to the interim period between</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			the two schemes opening. Highways England continues to engage and support Norfolk County Council in regard to the local road network and NWL scheme.
Design, traffic, and walking and cycling	Changes caused by the coronavirus pandemic cannot have been taken into account in the earlier stages of planning this project. I believe, therefore, that there should be a review of this (and many other projects) in case priorities have changed as a result of the costs of the pandemic and changes in, for example, shopping behaviour, office-based work/working from home, and increasing walking and cycling. Ideas not given serious consideration pre-pandemic may have become worth evaluating. For example, could it be that resources would be better used simply improving the known dangerous junctions and creating a new Park and Ride/cycle park somewhere along the planned route?	N	<p>The Scheme has followed the latest Department for Transport (DfT) Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG) for developing the traffic forecasts and undertaking the scheme appraisal, this is summarised in the Case for Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1). In assessing the value for money of this scheme, sensitivity tests have been undertaken to include both high and low growth traffic scenarios in accordance with TAG. The low growth scenario undertaken should allow for uncertainties in the future national trends, such as GDP growth, fuel prices, etc which may result in a reduction of traffic demand.</p> <p>Therefore, under the low growth scenario, which potentially could act as a proxy for uncertainties such as the impact of COVID-19, this scheme still represents medium value for money.</p> <p>Further sensitivity testing will be undertaken, upon the release of the latest Department for Transport, TAG (expected at the end of March 2021) in line with normal process.</p>

<p>Environment and protected species</p>	<p>You will be aware that a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] has been identified on or close to the currently 'preferred route' for the proposed Norwich Western Link. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and the Wildlife and Countryside Act. It appears to me that this is relevant to the A47 proposed development. It needs to be ascertained whether an increasing flow of traffic, travelling at a higher average speed than is currently the case, constitutes a threat to these [REDACTED] ie if the planned developments are within the area in which they fly and feed. The planned connection with the Norwich Western link (shown as the 'Proposed Wood Lane junction' on the plan in the consultation document) would no longer be needed if the link road is not built - in which case the Wood Lane junction would need to be re-designed. If the route of the link road is changed then the design of at least one other junction would need to be modified. In my view there is much to be said for only finalising the A47 project after a final decision has been taken on the route of any Norwich Western link - otherwise (scarce) resources may be wasted. Research undertaken by those who have publicised the [REDACTED] issue suggests that the measures intended to protect [REDACTED] near the Northern Distributor Road (now renamed Broadland Northway) were ineffective and those former colonies are now deserted. I am not, therefore, hugely reassured by the 'Protecting the Environment' section of your consultation document (and the bat graphic on page 9 is depressing).</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Chapter 8 Biodiversity in the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the impacts on bats during construction and operation of the Scheme. Mitigation measures are proposed where significant adverse noise impacts are predicted, including special measures to maintain [REDACTED] flight paths taking into account lessons learnt from the Northern Distributor Road.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>The proposed A47 scheme is a stand-alone scheme, to reduce the congestion and safety issues experienced on the single carriageway section of the A47 between North Tuddenham & Easton.</p> <p>The two schemes are being delivered separately by both Highways England and Norfolk County Council, via two different planning and funding routes however have made a commitment to a collaborative approach.</p> <p>The proposed scheme includes a stub connection for the proposed Norwich Western Link (NWL) scheme promoted by Norfolk County Council. The A47 Development Consent Order (DCO) has been drafted such that if the NWL scheme does not gain planning approval, the stub connection will not be delivered.</p> <p>If the NWL scheme does not go ahead, a grade separated junction would still be required at this location due to traffic flows, and therefore this would not change the proposed junction location or layout. The Junction & Sideroad Strategy report prepared in advance of Statutory Consultation, is available on the Highways England Website. This report outlines the technical data behind the junction selection, based on traffic flows and compliance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges.</p> <p>The report also outlines the poor safety record on the A47 between North Tuddenham and Easton.</p>
--	---	----------	---

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design and traffic	A further issue which relates to the proposed link is that if there is a significant time interval between the A47 work being completed and the Norwich Western link being built, or if the link does not divert traffic as hoped, there is an obvious risk that drivers wishing to access the north and west of Norwich, and/or to use Broadland Northway, will cut through from the A47 using narrow roads such as Honingham Lane; this would funnel traffic through The Street at Ringland which, as there are neither street lights nor pavements, would be unsafe as well as polluting.	N	<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 and property	My small parcel of land at [Editor's note: detail removed] is insufficiently large and has insufficient access to allow the turning of large HGV's and I can not rely on access to my neighbours property at Oak Farm for the turning of vehicles i.e. it is private property not in my ownership.	Y	Following engagement, the access for the proposed drainage attenuation basin east of Oak Farm will also be designed to accommodate HGV turning movements, under controlled access to be agreed with the landowner.
Access and property	At the gated end of this road, adjacent my property, there is provided by NCC a small turning area (tarmacked as a part of the road); this is adequate for cars and vans but not for HGV's. This was not an issue previously because large HGV's could still access from the A47 with out the need to turn ... i.e. there was a 'through road' access route available that eliminated the need for turning. The only way of providing adequate HGV access to	Y	

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>my property is by an HG vehicle being able to turn at the cross roads junction with Low Road and then reverse the full length of the road leading to Oak Farm. This is obviously not ideal, but may be a possibility depending on the suitability of that crossroads for HGV turning and positioning plus any safety issues that relate to such an operation. I am uncertain as to whether that junction is considered safely suitable for such an HGV manoeuvre.</p>		
<p>Access and traffic</p>	<p>Colton residents believe that access to our village becomes unnecessarily complicated, with yet more single traffic roads which will need to be shared with commercial vehicles. I believe this is a highly unsatisfactory solution.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The proposed A47 strategic road scheme has no impact on the existing A47 access / egress routes for residents of Colton to the south.</p> <p><u>North West:</u></p> <p>Residents would head towards the existing Honingham Roundabout via Mattishall Road as per the current route. They could then head west to the proposed A47 Wood Lane junction, or head East towards the proposed Norwich Road Junction to join the A47 dual carriageway.</p> <p><u>North East:</u></p> <p>Residents would head towards Easton, where they could then travel west along the new connector road the proposed A47 Norwich Road junction or continue east through Easton to the Longwater Junction.</p>
<p>Design and traffic</p>	<p>As the Easton roundabout will be removed, my concern is the free-flowing traffic on to the existing A47 will bring even more noise from the road at Bawburgh road, at least the Easton roundabout slowed the traffic down somewhat.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The proposed design includes the upgrading of the existing dual carriageway road surface at Easton, to low noise asphalt, to mitigate increased noise emissions from the change in traffic speeds at this location.</p> <p>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the noise impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are proposed where significant adverse impacts are predicted, such as provision of low noise</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			<p>surfacing on the A47 and noise barriers.</p> <p>These commitments are in the Environmental Management Plan (TR010038/APP/7.4) and secured through a legal Requirement of the DCO to deliver the commitments in this document.</p>
Design and walking and cycling	<p>Will the new bridge over the A47 linking Easton with lower Easton for walkers and cyclists, be able to access a new shorter route to the Longwater Retail Park Costessey Norwich?</p> <p>Although the new layout looks quite favourable, myself and many local residents are concerned what effect the traffic noise will have on the local area.</p>	N	<p>The proposed scheme includes a new segregated walking and cycling route to cross the A47 dual carriageway via an overbridge.</p> <p>The proposed route is a replacement for the existing at grade crossing point east of the Easton roundabout. The existing route comprises of steps down the embankments and the crossing of a dual carriageway. This does not conform to current design guidelines; and does not allow safe access for all users.</p> <p>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the noise impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are proposed where significant adverse impacts are predicted, such as provision of low noise surfacing on the A47 and noise barriers.</p> <p>These commitments are in the Environmental Management Plan (TR010038/APP/7.4) and secured through a legal Requirement of the DCO to deliver the commitments in this document</p>
Design and traffic	<p>The closure of Berry's Lane to through traffic will have a very detrimental impact on the volume of traffic through the villages of Hockering and Honingham. Particularly when the Proposed Norwich Western Link is open, there will be a high volume of traffic using the Wood Lane junction in a north/south direction. There will be no suitable alternative other than driving through one or other of those villages.</p>	N	<p>The proposed design takes into account public / stakeholder feedback from the Statutory Consultation, Parish Council Meetings, Local Liaison Group Meetings, MP Meetings and engagement with Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>This engagement led to the closure of Berrys Lane, to discourage the north south traffic which is a significant local concern.</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			<p>Further design development included retaining the existing A47 to the north of Honingham as the primary local road, connecting to Honingham roundabout.</p> <p>Dereham road was connected to this route, as the secondary arm, and a gateway feature included to give priority to vehicles exiting the village.</p> <p>A second gateway feature is also included on the eastern approach into Honingham giving priority to vehicles exiting the village.</p> <p>The existing A47 carriageway will be de-trunked with a reduced 6.0m cross section and a speed limit of 50mph.</p>
Design and safety	<p>As a resident of Dereham Road, Honingham; I feel that a lot of the lanes around Honingham and the surrounding villages have been unnecessarily cut off. Not as a link to the new A47 route but to the villages on the Honingham side of the new A47. My belief is that Berry's Lane should still be open and still linked to Honingham at the Dereham Road end. This would enable safer travel for some of the local Honingham traffic to other villages on the Honingham side of the new A47. In addition to this, Hockering residents have only been given the unsafe option of Mattishall Lane which try again is a narrow country Lane. Please do not make our local lanes and roads redundant to us! We have been using Berry's Lane especially for many years and to the residents of Honingham it is an essential link</p>	N	<p>The proposed design takes into account public / stakeholder feedback from the Statutory Consultation, Parish Council Meetings, Local Liaison Group Meetings, MP Meetings and engagement with Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>This engagement led to the closure of Berrys Lane to through traffic, to discourage the north south traffic which is a significant local concern. This will allow Berrys Lane to be utilised by walkers and cyclists to connect to Dereham Road and wider network via a proposed upgraded of the existing footpath to a bridleway with a cycle track.</p> <p>The proposed design provides two points of local access to the A47 Dual carriageway via the proposed connection at Dereham Road to Wood Lane junction, or eastwards to the proposed Norwich Road junction providing greater network resilience and local access.</p> <p>This approach is in keeping with the principles proposed at Hockering, Honingham and Easton providing resilience to the local road network for connections to the Strategic Road Network.</p> <p>The proposed layout will reduce the impact on the village,</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			<p>which is further enhanced with the provision of gate way features at the western and eastern extents of the village to further discourage direct movements whilst providing the option for a local bus route.</p> <p>For local movements north and south of the A47, there are 5 proposed locations where residents could safely cross the A47 dual carriageway via grade separated junctions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing Fox Lane Junction - Proposed Mattishall Lane Link Road - Proposed Wood Lane Junction - Proposed Norwich Road Junction - Existing Longwater Junction
Design and traffic	<p>Taverham Road rat-run: This is the really big issue here for us and the other residents at the southern end of Taverham Road and it needs a robust solution. There are a number of strands but, primarily, the predicted dramatic traffic escalation down Taverham Road is created by the (unresolved) consequence of the removal of the initial proposal of a north link road between Lower Easton and the proposed Taverham Road north side roundabout. It appears that your designers have ignored the fact that Taverham Road is (for its entire length) only a single track country lane, barely half the width of much of the Ringland Road / Church Lane to Lower Easton.</p>	N	<p>Along the A47 corridor between North Tuddenham to Easton, there are 5 routes north, of which only one is classified as a "B" Road and is assigned as the local authority HGV route, 3 "C" Roads and one unclassified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lyng Road (C198) • Heath Road (C173) • Wood Lane (B1535) (Local Authority HGV Route) • Taverham Road (C174) • Church Lane (unclassified) <p>Presently, local traffic heading north towards Ringland from the strategic road network (A47), does so via the Easton roundabout and Church Lane, as this is the fastest route based on the present road layout and egress point from the A47 Easton roundabout.</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, approved</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			<p>Food Enterprise Zone development, and topography.</p> <p>Taverham Road, as a result of the junction being located west of the existing Easton roundabout, becomes the most direct route which is reflected in the traffic model.</p> <p>The removal of Church Lane was based on stakeholder feedback, existing safety concerns and traffic modelling data. The modelling demonstrated that this route would not be used, due to the longer route, and increased journey time which was reflected in the scheme traffic model.</p> <p>Highways England continue to engage and support Norfolk County Council in regard to the local road network and NWL scheme.</p>
Design and mitigation	<p>The Norwich Road Junction has moved eastwards 150 metres or so. The roundabouts (north in particular) and the, presumably, elevated new dual carriageway, are now positioned on the exact visual axis of the four properties to the east on the rising hill up Taverham Road. So, unless there is very significant shielding / planting etc, this will now inflict a direct view south from the properties to not only the main road but also over the even nearer new (illuminated) roundabout junctions.</p>	N	<p>Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) has assessed the impacts on views and landscape planting is proposed to screen long term views of the Scheme.</p>
Design and mitigation	<p>There is nothing shown on the drawing indicating a 'Noise Action Planning Area' to offer any scheme of noise protection to St Andrew's Church at Honingham or, indeed, to the Taverham Road residents (who will be in direct line of the noise from the elevated road and the new roundabouts). The roundabouts are particular generators of noise as cars / motorcycles accelerate and brake - you know this. We note that the church at Easton and adjacent residents in Easton have some noise relief works indicated, and it is hard to see why the residents on Taverham Road should not be given such consideration too. It would seem very sensible (indeed, semi 'green') to use the road excavation materials as both sound and visual landscaped bunding along the north side of the new road as it bypasses the Taverham</p>	N	<p>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assess the noise impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are proposed where significant adverse impacts are predicted, such as provision of low noise surfacing on the A47 and noise barriers.</p> <p>These commitments are in the Environmental Management Plan (TR010038/APP/7.4) and secured through a legal Requirement of the DCO to deliver the commitments in this document.</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	Road residents. Will you please also confirm that the new dualled A47 road itself will be laid with a low noise surfacing as it passes this area.		
Design	All schemes I ever prepared for planning approval were required to be accompanied by a lighting layout drawing, details of the fittings and light spread diagrams - and illustrated in a manner which was comprehensible to the layperson. Where are these and what is proposed - we need to have this information and it needs to consider immediate neighbours?	N	<p>Section 2.4 in Chapter 2 The Proposed Scheme of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) describes the proposal lighting arrangements for the Scheme.</p> <p>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.</p>
Cycling and safety	Blind Lane Closure: This has long been an established and convenient cycle link across from the north of the A47 at Taverham Road to the southern villages, with a direct route down to Barford village, which we use regularly. Any link to the new Norwich Road junction and what could have been a potentially safer A47 crossing for cyclists appears to have been extinguished. Please clarify and, if necessary, adjust to permit cycle access to continue.	N	<p>A walking / cycling route from north of the A47 to the south is provided via either of the new segregated crossing points proposed at Honingham and Easton.</p> <p>Dedicated off carriageway walking / cycling routes from Taverham Road are provided west to the proposed new Honingham underpass, and eastbound to the proposed new Easton overbridge.</p> <p>South of the A47, users would then connect into the existing local road / walking & cycling network.</p>
Design and traffic	It has become increasingly clear that for these two road schemes (Western Link and the A47) to get off to the best start, they need to open at the same time. They have become - certainly with this current HE solution - so interdependent that a mismatch between completion dates creates very significant interim problems. We foresee the grim possibilities of two (supposedly complementary) schemes completing at different times and thereby delivering nothing but disjointed and poorly coordinated solutions.	N	<p>Highways England continues to work with the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council responsible for the development of the proposed Norwich Western Link scheme.</p> <p>The two schemes are being delivered separately by both Highways England and Norfolk County Council, via two different planning and funding routes. The A47 scheme has committed funding in place from Department for Transport (DfT).</p> <p>The delivery teams meet at regular intervals to ensure a collaborative approach and also jointly deliver the A47/NWL Local Liaison Group meetings, (a multi parish forum).</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design and traffic	The present staggered and busy junction(s) at Beech Avenue / A1067 Fakenham Road / Fir Covert Road will prove an ever increasing impediment to road users accessing the new NDR (A1270) at the Fir Covert connection. If this isn't tackled soon (a free-flowing roundabout perhaps), that junction will be avoided and much traffic will continue to seek other ways onto the southern A47 using the present system of lanes.	N	<p>Highways England are responsible for the Strategic Road Network.</p> <p>The roads mentioned, fall under the ownership of the local highway authority, Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>We have passed your feedback onto the Norfolk County Council team responsible for the development of the Norwich Western Link scheme.</p>
Traffic	With the addition of the Norwich Western Link connection a greatly increased volume of traffic will join the Wood Lane junction. Unless significant traffic calming measures are introduced to include the Barnham Broom Road it will continue to be the most direct and quickest route from the A47 to the A11.	N	<p>Highways England have engaged throughout scheme development with Parish Councils along the scheme corridor and North- South of the proposed scheme. We have also engaged with the South of the A47 taskforce, led by George Freeman MP and including Parish Councils south of the proposed Wood Lane junction.</p> <p>As a result of this engagement, and stakeholder feedback from the statutory consultation, the proposed scheme will close Berrys Lane to through traffic.</p> <p>The connection of the B1535 Wood Lane sideroad has also been altered to give priority to the new local connector road to discourage the north – south movement through local roads.</p> <p>The A47 improvement programme, also includes the upgrade of Thickthorn Interchange to address the existing congestion, improve journey times and increase capacity. Coupled with the dualling of the single carriageway section from North Tuddenham to Easton, this will reduce the rat running experienced presently.</p> <p>Highways England continue to engage and support Norfolk County Council in regard to the local road network and NWL scheme.</p>
Design	The Scheme update severs roads (Low Road, Church Lane, Berry's Lane and Blind Lane, Easton) currently joining the A47. The Mattishall Road leading through East Tuddenham already	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

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>experiences heavy use and problems with speeding. This will be compounded by forcing all the traffic through just 3 areas, the Mattishall Lane link road (an underpass with no direct link to the A47), the Wood Lane double roundabout and the Norwich Road junction.</p>		<p>making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p> <p>It is not feasible to maintain every existing access point / junction and the proposed scheme therefore reduces the north / south crossing points of the A47.</p> <p>Segregated North – South routes across the A47 are provided at Fox Lane Junction, Mattishall Lane Link Road, Wood Lane Junction, Norwich Road Junction and Longwater Junction.</p> <p>The proposed scheme removes all direct accesses to the A47 Dual carriageway and provides safe access points to the Strategic Road Network via the proposed Grade Separated junctions at Wood Lane and Norwich Road.</p>
Environment	<p>Extreme weather seems to be a regular occurrence. The A47 was recently closed again due to flooding close to St Andrew's Church – the Scheme update shows an underpass at this point. It would be interesting to see a superimposed image of the Scheme's floodplain over the reality of recent events.</p>	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>Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) contains an assessment of flood risk taking into account climate change risks.</p>
Design and walking, cycling and horse riders	<p>I believed the favoured A47 dualling route was Option 2, to dual the existing A47 yet in reality a new road will be built. The old A47 will remain for use for local traffic, walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The problem being there will be more concrete and less countryside to enjoy.</p>	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>
Design	<p>As you are well aware Ringland lies some distance from the A47 itself and therefore our primary concern is the impact on the flow of traffic through the local road and lane network serving the village. We are very pleased to see that you will be seeking the temporary closure of Honingham Lane to through traffic to</p>	N	<p>Highways England welcome the offer of support and will work with you during the discussions that will be held with the local planning authority (Norfolk County Council).</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>protect Ringland from becoming a direct rat-run for traffic travelling between Taverham and the A47. We appreciate that the fine details have yet to be worked out between HE and NCC, but we want to offer our support and assistance wherever necessary when the means of closing the road and the resulting traffic management do come up for discussion as we feel our local knowledge would be invaluable in finding the best compromise for both the villagers and those using the local roads.</p>		
<p>Design and traffic</p>	<p>I am concerned that the proposal includes closing off the very northern end of Berry's Lane, denying access to the Wood Lane junction and onward access to Wood Lane, and also the proposed Norwich Western Link connection. This means that traffic wishing to access routes north from Barnham Broom Road, East Tuddenham, and traffic from further south of Barnham Broom, would have to detour through Honingham village, which has only been relieved of a "rat running" problem after the extremely ill advised Honingham roundabout installation. Could consideration be given to allowing the final few meters to be kept open, joining either the roundabout or the feeder road from Honingham village, giving the residents of Honingham a quieter safer life, and road users from the above mentioned points, a better route north?</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The proposed design takes into account public / stakeholder feedback from the Statutory Consultation, Parish Council Meetings, Local Liaison Group Meetings, MP Meetings and engagement with Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>This engagement led to the closure of Berrys Lane to through traffic, to discourage north- south traffic which is a significant wider local concern.</p> <p>The route for traffic heading north, is via Mattishall Lane to the existing Honingham roundabout, where there is a proposed connection route west to the A47 at Wood Lane junction, or east at the Norwich Road junction.</p> <p>A 30mph speed restriction will be provided along with two Gateway features at either end of Dereham road to give priority to vehicles leaving the village and discourage through traffic from using Honingham village.</p> <p>The existing A47 will be detrunked to a local road, with a 50mph speed restriction, linking Honingham Roundabout with the proposed Wood Lane junction</p>
<p>Design and traffic</p>	<p>I question the decision to stop off Berry's Lane south of the Wood Lane junction. Closing off this link may displace traffic west, and thus place load on two unsuitable routes across the A47 (Mattishall Lane and Fox Lane) consisting largely of narrow lanes with occasional passing places. The alternative, under</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Supplementary Local Road surveys were undertaken in October 2019 along the proposed route covering the existing junction locations. These results were used to validate the traffic model.</p> <p>The proposed design takes into account public / stakeholder</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>existing plans, for B1135 traffic would appear to be a diversion east. But that would add local north-south traffic to the A47 dual carriageway between Wood Lane junction and the Norwich Road junction e.g. skip lorries, farm vehicles. I suggest analysis of B1135 traffic crossing the A47 would be in order, to assess the volume and options available for existing local traffic. Future options would appear to be (a) not stopping Berry Lane, thus keeping a very useful north-south local route open, or (b) improving local roads south of Fox Lane junction and/or south of the Mattishall Lane crossing but noting the increased traffic possible through Hockering.</p> <p>I would expect (a) to be the cost effective choice, with further improvement once the Norwich Western Link connection is made, for north south local traffic that currently uses the B1135 as a route across Norfolk.</p>		<p>feedback from the Statutory Consultation, Parish Council Meetings, Local Liaison Group Meetings, MP Meetings and engagement with Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>This engagement led to the closure of Berrys Lane to through traffic, to discourage north- south traffic which is a significant wider local concern.</p> <p>The route for traffic heading north, is via Mattishall Lane to the existing Honingham roundabout, where there is a proposed connection route west to the A47 at Wood Lane junction, or east at the Norwich Road junction.</p> <p>The B1535 Wood Lane is Norfolk County Councils appointed HGV route locally.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council as the local planning authority, are responsible for the wider local road network.</p>
Environment	<p>This road goes extremely near the Tud river, touching its flood plain (nearer than the Option 3 of the original proposal). The visual intrusion to the whole beautiful valley will be massive; the road could have been located further away from the river, in a cutting, to reduce this impact, and also noise. Why was this not done?</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>Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the noise impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme. Details of mitigation measures are described in this chapter, including provision of noise barriers and low noise surfacing, where significant adverse noise impacts are predicted.</p>
Mitigation	<p>Although the map in the brochure makes reference to noise fencing and noise and visual screening banking, there is no detail of this. Are such details available? I am particularly keen to know what the effect of the A47 at elevation over Mattishall Lane will have on noise experienced by Hockering residents, with and without the proposed noise attenuation.</p>	N	<p>The proposed A47 at this location runs marginally above existing ground level, with the proposed Mattishall Lane Link Road set below the Dual carriageway in a cutting.</p> <p>Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the noise impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			Details of mitigation measures are described in this chapter, including provision of noise barriers and low noise surfacing, where significant adverse noise impacts are predicted.
Mitigation	I cannot find any reference to lighting within the brochure, though various people have told me that there are to be lights in various places. What is planned? Most of us in Norfolk value our dark skies, and this is an aspect of increasing importance throughout Britain.	N	<p>The proposed scheme includes lighting at the proposed junctions at Wood Lane and Norwich Road only.</p> <p>Engagement undertaken with Norfolk County Council confirmed that no lighting provision was required on the local road network.</p> <p>Section 2.4 in Chapter 2 The Proposed Scheme of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) describes the proposal lighting arrangements for the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) has assessed both the impacts of temporary lighting during the construction phase and the permanent lighting provision during operation of the Scheme.</p>
Access	It is very good to see that access to Mattishall is to be retained with a road under the A47. However, I am concerned that this will result in an excessively-elevated A47 here, with attendant increase in noise. Could not the A47 be in a cutting here, and Mattishall Lane be an overbridge?	N	<p>The proposed A47 at this location runs marginally above existing ground level, with the proposed Mattishall Lane Link Road set below the Dual carriageway in a cutting.</p> <p>An overbridge design solution at this location was not possible due to geometry constraints and would have resulted in significant visual impacts.</p> <p>Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the noise impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures, including provision of noise barriers and low noise surfacing, are proposed where significant adverse noise impacts are predicted.</p>
Access	There is still no connection shown between Sandy Lane and Church Lane, East Tuddenham. As far as I understand the law,	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

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>a road is still a right of way; the difference between it and a PROW is that motor vehicles are permitted.</p> <p>Therefore there surely has to be a good reason to sever this connection, which currently permits access between all the house in Rotten Row and Church Lane, and houses to the north of the A47, including the new development at Hill House, Albatross Road. The alternative road distance adds around 3 miles to the journey.</p>		<p>making is explained in the Case for the Scheme (TR010038/APP/7.1).</p> <p>The Scheme has been designed in accordance with the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges. It is not feasible to maintain every existing access point / junction along the route corridor and the Scheme therefore rationalises the number of north / south crossing points of the A47.</p> <p>The Scheme removes all direct accesses to the A47 Dual Carriageway, and provides safe access points to the Strategic Road Network via the proposed grade separated junctions at Wood Lane and Norwich Road; the wider local road network provides the connections to the junction locations.</p> <p>Routes north of the A47 from Church Lane are provided via the proposed Mattishall Lane Link Road to the west, or via the proposed Wood Lane junction to the east.</p>
Design and traffic	<p>Despite being alerted a long time ago to the fact that traffic currently going through Lower Easton to access the A47 will not be able to do so if the Easton Roundabout is removed, there is still no plan in the brochure to redirect this traffic. If Taverham Road is not to take the traffic, where will it go, and where is the justification for Taverham Road being connected to the A47 in the first place? With Blind lane disconnected, the only function of the whole junction it to provide access to Easton, which would be available via Longwater and Wood Lane.</p>	N	<p>Along the A47 corridor between North Tuddenham to Easton, there are 5 routes north, of which only one is classified as a "B" Road and is assigned as the local authority HGV route, 3 "C" Roads and one unclassified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lyng Road (C198) • Heath Road (C173) • Wood Lane (B1535) (Local Authority HGV Route) • Taverham Road (C174) • Church Lane (unclassified) <p>Presently, local traffic heading north towards Ringland from the strategic road network (A47), does so via the Easton roundabout and Church Lane; as this is the fastest route based on the present road layout and egress point from the A47 Easton roundabout.</p> <p>It is not possible to locate the required form of junction (a fully</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			<p>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.</p> <p>Taverham Road, as a result of the junction being located west of the existing Easton roundabout, becomes the most direct route which is reflected in the traffic model.</p> <p>The removal of Church Lane was based on stakeholder feedback, existing safety concerns and traffic modelling data. The modelling demonstrated that this route would not be used, due to the longer route, and increased journey time which was reflected in the scheme traffic model.</p> <p>There are presently 41 direct accesses onto the A47 between North Tuddenham and Easton which directly contribute to the congestion and poor safety record.</p> <p>The proposed scheme addresses this by removing all direct access to the Strategic Road Network in line with the UK DMRB; and providing safe access points via the proposed junctions at Wood Lane and Norwich Road.</p> <p>Local roads where possible were connected to the existing / new sideroad network and proposed junctions, with some north – south routes severed where this was not feasible.</p> <p>Highways England continue to engage and support Norfolk County Council in regard to the local road network and NWL scheme.</p>
Design and traffic	Once built, the Honingham roundabout had an immediate effect of creating massive queues in the rush hours. Why do you not install traffic lights at the Wood Lane junction, and remove the Honingham roundabout? This could be done very quickly If congestion is a major issue.	N	The single carriageway section linking to a dual carriageway either side, has 41 direct accesses and 2 at grade roundabouts which lead to frequent delays and contribute to a high accident rate - twice the average of the strategic road network nationally.

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
			<p>The Junction & Sideroad Strategy for the scheme presented at Statutory Consultation, and available on the Highways England website provides the technical summary outlining how junction form was selected following the UK Design Manual for Roads & Bridges.</p> <p>An at grade roundabout solution was not viable due to the Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) values being above 30,000 AADT. The technical information covering the assessment is presented within the Junction & Sideroad Strategy report.</p>
Mitigation	Concern sound proofing doesn't cover the culdesac at the start of the Easton section of the A47, from 116 to 122 Dereham Road	N	<p>The proposed design includes the upgrading of the existing dual carriageway road surface at Easton, to low noise asphalt, to mitigate increased noise emissions from the change in traffic speeds at this location.</p> <p>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (TR010038/APP/6.1) assesses the noise impacts during construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are proposed where significant adverse impacts are predicted, such as provision of low noise surfacing on the A47 and noise barriers.</p> <p>These commitments are in the Environmental Management Plan (TR010038/APP/7.4) and secured through a legal Requirement of the DCO to deliver the commitments in this document.</p>
Design	I'm aware of the Sheringham Shoal Extension project which will be tunnelling very close to this bridge. Can someone confirm this has been accounted for and will not weaken the bridge in any way.	N	<p>Highways England has considered the Sheringham Shoal Extension Project and is liaising with Equinor, the promoters of the scheme so their design can cater for and manage the risks of interacting with the proposed A47 Scheme.</p> <p>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).</p>

Topic area	Response	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design and walking	<p>We recently received confirmation from yourselves telling residents in the Church Lane area of our plans of making Church Lane a 'DEAD END'. But if not written request was ever issued indicating a 'Walkway' was no-longer required. I remember at your meetings you promoted that communities very much mattered to you and it would always be important that this was always considered when making any decisions. At this time, not only do we have a huge road coming close to our property, but now no walking access to get across this road. Please make it possible somehow to safety cross the new bypass from Church Lane by foot.</p>	N	<p>The scheme update newsletter issued to all residents in Dec 2020 outlined the changes to the proposed scheme as a result of Statutory Consultation feedback.</p> <p><u>Church Lane – East Tuddenham</u></p> <p>A review of the wider existing and proposed walking, cycling, horse riding network was undertaken after receipt of statutory consultation feedback.</p> <p>As a result, the proposed Church Lane route was removed, in place of a combined vehicular and WCH crossing at Mattishall to provide a spread of cross route infrastructure along the scheme corridor.</p> <p><u>Church Lane - Easton</u></p> <p>The proposed scheme now provides a segregated walking /cycling route linking Easton with Lower Easton via a pedestrian / cyclist bridge across the A47.</p> <p>This in line with Highways England commitment to provide a safer route between communities for walkers, cyclists and other non-motorist groups</p>