

# A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Dualling

**Scheme Number: TR010038**

**Volume 6**

## **6.3 Environmental Statement Appendices** **Appendix 4.1 - Scoping Opinion Response** **Table**

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)

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]

---

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT APPENDICES**  
**Appendix 4.1 - Scoping Opinion Response Table**

---

<b>Regulation Number:</b>	5(2)(a)
<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b>	TR010038
<b>Application Document Reference</b>	TR010038/APP/6.3
<b>BIM Document Reference</b>	HE551489-GTY-EGN-000-RP-LX-30012
<b>Author:</b>	A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Dualling Project Team, Highways England

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
Rev 0	March 2021	Application Issue

## **Table of contents**

4.	Scoping Opinion Response Table	1
----	--------------------------------	---

## **Tables**

	Table 1: Planning Inspectorate Scoping Opinion	2
--	--	---

## **4. Scoping Opinion Response Table**

- 4.1.1. The Scoping Opinion and the comments from consultees have been considered in undertaking the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and in preparing the Environmental Statement (ES).

Table 1: Planning Inspectorate Scoping Opinion

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
<b>1.1 Background</b>		
Paragraph 1.1.1	On 23 September 2019, the Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) on behalf of the Secretary of State (SoS) received a scoping request from Highways England (the Applicant) under Regulation 10 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) for the proposed A47 North Tuddenham to Easton (the Proposed Development).	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.2	In accordance with Regulation 10 of the EIA Regulations, an Applicant may ask the SoS to state in writing its opinion 'as to the scope, and level of detail, of the information to be provided in the environmental statement'	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.3	This document is the Scoping Opinion (the Opinion) provided by the Inspectorate on behalf of the SoS in respect of the Proposed Development. It is made based on the information provided in the Applicant's report entitled A47 North Tuddenham to Easton EIA Scoping Report (the Scoping Report). This Opinion can only reflect the proposals as currently described by the Applicant. The Scoping Opinion should be read in conjunction with the Applicant's Scoping Report.	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.4	The Applicant has notified the SoS under Regulation 8(1) (b) of the EIA Regulations that they propose to provide an Environmental Statement (ES) in respect of the Proposed Development. Therefore, in accordance with Regulation 6(2) (a) of the EIA Regulations, the Proposed Development is EIA development.	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.5	Regulation 10(9) of the EIA Regulations requires that before adopting a scoping opinion the Inspectorate must take into account: (a) any	N/A

A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	information provided about the proposed development; (b) the specific characteristics of the development; (c) the likely significant effects of the development on the environment; and (d) in the case of a subsequent application, the environmental statement submitted with the original application.	
Paragraph 1.1.6	This Opinion has taken into account the requirements of the EIA Regulations as well as current best practice towards preparation of an ES.	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.7	The Inspectorate has consulted on the Applicant's Scoping Report and the responses received from the consultation bodies have been taken into account in adopting this Opinion (see Appendix 2) (TR010038/APP/6.3).	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.8	The points addressed by the Applicant in the Scoping Report have been carefully considered and use has been made of professional judgement and experience in order to adopt this Opinion. It should be noted that when it comes to consider the ES, the Inspectorate will take account of relevant legislation and guidelines. The Inspectorate will not be precluded from requiring additional information if it is considered necessary in connection with the ES submitted with the application for a Development Consent Order (DCO).	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.9	This Opinion should not be construed as implying that the Inspectorate agrees with the information or comments provided by the Applicant in their request for an opinion from the Inspectorate. In particular, comments from the Inspectorate in this Opinion are without prejudice to any later decisions taken (e.g. on submission of the application) that any development identified by the Applicant is necessarily to be treated as part of a Nationally	N/A

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) or Associated Development or development that does not require development consent.	
Paragraph 1.1.10	Regulation 10(3) of the EIA Regulations states that a request for a scoping opinion must include:  (a) a plan sufficient to identify the land; (b) a description of the proposed development, including its location and technical capacity; (c) an explanation of the likely significant effects of the development on the environment; and (d) such other information or representations as the person making the request may wish to provide or make.	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.11	The Inspectorate considers that this has been provided in the Applicant's Scoping Report. The Inspectorate is satisfied that the Scoping Report encompasses the relevant aspects identified in the EIA Regulations.	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.12	In accordance with Regulation 14(3)(a), where a scoping opinion has been issued in accordance with Regulation 10 an ES accompanying an application for an order granting development consent should be based on 'the most recent scoping opinion adopted (so far as the proposed development remains materially the same as the proposed development which was subject to that opinion)'.	N/A
<b>1.2 Planning Inspectorate's Consultation</b>		
Paragraph 1.2.1	In accordance with Regulation 10(6) of the EIA Regulations the Inspectorate has consulted the consultation bodies before adopting a scoping opinion. A list of the consultation bodies formally consulted by the Inspectorate is provided at Appendix . The consultation bodies have been	N/A

A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	notified under Regulation (a) of the duty imposed on them by Regulation 11(3) of the EIA 11(1) Regulations to make information available to the Applicant relevant to the preparation of the ES. The Applicant should note that whilst the list can inform their consultation, it should not be relied upon for that purpose.	
Paragraph 1.2.2	The list of respondents who replied within the statutory timeframe and whose comments have been considered in the preparation of this Opinion is provided, along with copies of their comments, at Appendix 2, to which the Applicant should refer in preparing their ES.	N/A
Paragraph 1.2.3	The ES submitted by the Applicant should demonstrate consideration of the points raised by the consultation bodies. It is recommended that a table is provided in the ES summarising the scoping responses from the consultation bodies and how they are, or are not, addressed in the ES.	This table addresses this requirement.
Paragraph 1.2.4	Any consultation responses received after the statutory deadline for receipt of comments will not be considered within this Opinion. Late responses will be forwarded to the Applicant and will be made available on the Inspectorate's website. The Applicant should also give due consideration to those comments in preparing their ES.	All consultee comments have been considered in the preparation of the ES.
<b>1.3 Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union</b>		
Paragraph 1.3.1	The European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 came in to force on 26 June 2018. This provides that existing EU law will be retained in accordance with s5(2) and s (6) from the point of exit and this opinion is provided on that basis. Relevant EU Directives have been transposed into UK law and those are unchanged until amended by Parliament.	N/A
<b>2. The Proposed Development (2.1 Introduction)</b>		



A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 2.1.1	The following is a summary of the information on the Proposed Development and its site and surroundings prepared by the Applicant and included in their Scoping Report. The information has not been verified and it has been assumed that the information provided reflects the existing knowledge of the Proposed Development and the potential receptors/ resources.	N/A
<b>2. The Proposed Development (2.2 Description of the Proposed Development)</b>		
Paragraph 2.2.1	The Applicant provides a high-level description of the Proposed Development, its location and technical capacity (where relevant) in Scoping Report Section 2.	N/A
Paragraph 2.2.2	The Proposed Development is for the upgrade of approximately 8km of the existing A47 between North Tuddenham and Easton, from a single carriageway to a dual carriageway, as stated in Paragraph 1.3.1.	N/A
Paragraph 2.2.3	The Proposed Development deviates slightly from the existing A47 which is located between the settlements of North Tuddenham and Easton approximately 8km west of Norwich City centre within the jurisdiction of Norfolk County Council. The Proposed Development would commence at the A47/ Fox Lane Junction, near Oak Farm at National Grid Reference (NGR): TG06067, 13529, and extend south eastwards passing south of the village of Hockering, north of Honingham village. The Proposed Development concludes north of Easton village after the A47/ Dereham Road/ Church Lane Roundabout, known as the Easton roundabout, where the existing A47 is already a dual carriageway. The location of the Proposed Development is depicted on Figure 1-1 and the Proposed	N/A

A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	Development's Red Line Boundary (RLB) is presented on Figure A - Scoping boundary overview.	
Paragraph 2.2.4	The land within the Proposed Development's RLB consists of mainly agricultural land, with the land around Honingham consisting of woodland, the River Tud and adjoining open space, Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and a restricted byway. The surrounding land uses includes a mixture of rural settlements, the River Tud, agricultural land, and woodland which include ancient woodland. A sewage plant and residencies on Mattishall Lane are located adjacent to but not included within the Proposed Development's RLB.	N/A
Paragraph 2.2.5	The Proposed Development is in proximity to three Noise Action Planning Important Areas (NAPIA); one immediately south of Hockering village, the second around the A47/ Blind Lane roundabout between Honingham and Easton and the third is located at the A47 immediately north of Easton. The NAPIA are illustrated on Figure B.1 - Environmental Constraints Site Level.	N/A
Paragraph 2.2.6	Scoping Report Figure B.1 depicts the locations of listed buildings. No listed buildings are located within the RLB, but two Grade I, one Grade II* and ten Grade II listed buildings are located in close proximity to the Proposed Development.	N/A
Paragraph 2.2.7	Scoping Report Table 8-2 lists the designated ecological sites in proximity to the Proposed Development. The Scoping Report identifies one internationally designated ecological site, three nationally designated sites, and 21 locally designated sites. The internationally designated site identified includes the River Wensum Special Area of Conservation (SAC) located approximately 1.6km northeast of the Proposed Development. The following nationally designated sites have been identified: Hockering Wood	N/A

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), located approximately 0.5km north, River Wensum SSSI approximately 1.6km northeast and Rosie Curston's Meadows SSSI located 1.7km southwest of the Proposed Development. The location of the 21 locally designated sites are stated in Table 8-2 of the Scoping Report.	
Paragraph 2.2.8	The majority of the Proposed Development is within Flood Zone 1. Where the Proposed Development is located in proximity to the River Tud, the Proposed Development is situated within Flood Zones 2 and 3 as depicted in Scoping Report Figure 13.1 - Surface water features.	N/A
<b>2. The Proposed Development (2.3 The Planning Inspectorate's Comments)</b>		
Paragraph 2.3.1 <i>Description of the Proposed Development</i>	The Scoping Report does not include a complete or consistent description of the Proposed Development.	A full description of the Proposed Scheme is provided in Section 2.5 of Chapter 2 (The Proposed Scheme) (TR010038/APP/6.1)
Paragraph 2.3.2 <i>Description of the Proposed Development</i>	<p>Section 2 of the Scoping Report includes a description of the Proposed Development, however, further detail, absent from the overall description, is interspersed throughout the report. The description being presented in this way detracts from the overall understanding of the Proposed Development. The ES should include a clear and detailed description of the Proposed Development and form a single point of reference for all relevant aspect chapters. The details absent from Section 2 but embedded within different chapters of the Scoping Report include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The construction of 3 new junctions as illustrated on Figure 1-1.</li> <li>• The creation and usage of bunds, drainage, landscaping, compounds, haul roads and planting as stated in Paragraph 6.7.3.</li> </ul>	A clear and detailed description of the Proposed Scheme is provided in Section 2.5 of Chapter 2 (The Proposed Scheme) (TR010038/APP/6.1)

A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The removal of existing vegetation as stated in Paragraph 7.7.1.</li> <li>• The construction of Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) as stated in the Scoping Report Biodiversity and Road Drainage and Water Environment chapters.</li> <li>• During construction earthworks, culverting, link roads, embankment ramps, piled foundations and reinforced concrete abutments are stated to be required in Paragraph 10.7.3.</li> <li>• The Scoping Report Road Drainage and Water Environment chapter states that the Proposed Development may consist of:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o In-channel workings and diversions of the River Tud;</li> <li>o A proposed bridge over the River Tud east of Honingham;</li> <li>o A crossing over an Ordinary Watercourse south of Hockering;</li> <li>o Demolition of the existing bridge across the River Tud;</li> <li>o Removal of the side roads that are to be severed; and</li> <li>o Removal of the main carriageway.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p>Paragraph 2.3.3 <i>Description of the Proposed Development</i></p>	<p>It would be useful for the description of the Proposed Development to include details relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land-use requirements during the construction phase, including the location of any access roads, haul roads, storage bunds and construction compounds;</li> <li>• The dimensions of the junctions, river and road crossings, construction structures and construction bunds;</li> <li>• A detailed description of the removal/ demolition process of the Easton roundabout, and any other structures that require removal/ demolition;</li> </ul>	<p>Further detail has been provided in Section 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7 of Chapter 2 of the ES (The Proposed Scheme) (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>)</p>

A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A detailed description of the construction of the 3 new junctions including land plans, traffic management measures and the locations of any construction compounds and storage bunds;</li> <li>• A detailed description of the works required to the existing A47 including those necessary for its removal or de-trunking;</li> <li>• A detailed description of construction works required for bridge and road crossings, junction works, link roads, traffic management measures and other alterations to the highway network; and</li> <li>• A detailed description of any in-channel workings within the River Tud, including further water management and river diversion measures.</li> </ul>	
Paragraph 2.3.4 <i>Alternatives</i>	The EIA Regulations require that the Applicant provides 'A description of the reasonable alternatives (for example in terms of development design, technology, location, size and scale) studied by the developer, which are relevant to the proposed project and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of the environmental effects'.	A description of reasonable alternatives is provided in Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )
Paragraph 2.3.5 <i>Alternatives</i>	The Inspectorate acknowledges the Applicant's intention to consider alternatives within the ES. The Inspectorate would expect to see a discrete section in the ES that provides details of the reasonable alternatives studied and the reasoning for the selection of the chosen option(s), including a comparison of the environmental effects.	A description of reasonable alternatives is provided in Section 3.2 of Chapter 3 (Assessment of Alternatives) ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )
Paragraph 2.3.6 <i>Alternatives</i>	Chapter 3 of the Scoping Report sets out the assessment of alternatives. Paragraph 3.1.1 states that fourteen original options were developed with four options being taken forward to the consultation stage. The four options are illustrated in Scoping Report Figures 3-1 to 3-4. Route 2 was selected	Noted. Further detail has been provided in Section 3.2 of Chapter 3 (Assessment of alternatives) ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	as the preferred option and the Proposed Development is a variation of the Route 2 design.	
Paragraph 2.3.7 <i>Flexibility</i>	The Applicant's attention is drawn to the Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine 'Using the 'Rochdale Envelope'1, which provides details on the recommended approach to follow when incorporating flexibility into a draft DCO (dDCO).	Noted.
Paragraph 2.3.8 <i>Flexibility</i>	The Applicant should make every attempt to narrow the range of options and explain clearly in the ES which elements of the Proposed Development have yet to be finalised and provide the reasons. At the time of application, any Proposed Development parameters should not be so wide-ranging as to represent effectively different developments. The development parameters will need to be clearly defined in the dDCO and in the accompanying ES. It is a matter for the Applicant, in preparing an ES, to consider whether it is possible to robustly assess a range of impacts resulting from a large number of undecided parameters. The description of the Proposed Development in the ES must not be so wide that it is insufficiently certain to comply with the requirements of Regulation 14 of the EIA Regulations.	Section 2.6 of Chapter 2 (The Proposed Scheme) of the ES outlines the limits of deviation considered as part of the assessment and the maximum parameters of the design <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b>
Paragraph 2.3.9 <i>Flexibility</i>	It should be noted that if the Proposed Development materially changes prior to submission of the DCO application, the Applicant may wish to consider requesting a new scoping opinion. 1 Advice Note nine: Using the Rochdale Envelope. 2012. Available at: <a href="https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/legislation-and-advice/advice-notes/">https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/legislation-and-advice/advice-notes/</a>	Noted.
<b>3. ES Approach (3.1 Introduction)</b>		

A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 3.1.1	<p>This section contains the Inspectorate’s specific comments on the scope and level of detail of information to be provided in the Applicant’s ES. General advice on the presentation of an ES is provided in the Inspectorate’s Advice Note Seven ‘Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements’ and associated appendices. Advice Note Seven: Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements and annex. Available from: <a href="https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/legislation-and-advice/advice-notes/">https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/legislation-and-advice/advice-notes/</a></p>	Noted.
Paragraph 3.1.2	<p>Aspects/ matters (as defined in Advice Note Seven) are not scoped out unless specifically addressed and justified by the Applicant and confirmed as being scoped out by the Inspectorate. The ES should be based on the Scoping Opinion in so far as the Proposed Development remains materially the same as the Proposed Development described in the Applicant’s Scoping Report.</p>	Noted.
Paragraph 3.1.3	<p>The Inspectorate has set out in this Opinion where it has/ has not agreed to scope out certain aspects/ matters on the basis of the information available at this time. The Inspectorate is content that the receipt of a Scoping Opinion should not prevent the Applicant from subsequently agreeing with the relevant consultees to scope such aspects/ matters out of the ES, where further evidence has been provided to justify this approach. However, in order to demonstrate that the aspects/ matters have been appropriately addressed, the ES should explain the reasoning for scoping them out and justify the approach taken.</p>	Noted.

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 3.1.4	Where relevant, the ES should provide reference to how the delivery of measures proposed to prevent/ minimise adverse effects is secured through DCO requirements (or other suitably robust methods) and whether relevant consultees agree on the adequacy of the measures proposed.	Noted.
<b>3. ES Approach (3.2 Relevant National Policy Statements (NPSs))</b>		
Paragraph 3.2.1	Sector-specific NPSs are produced by the relevant Government Departments and set out national policy for NSIPs. They provide the framework within which the Examining Authority (ExA) will make their recommendation to the SoS and include the Government’s objectives for the development of NSIPs. The NPSs may include environmental requirements for NSIPs, which Applicants should address within their ES.	Noted.
Paragraph 3.2.2	The designated NPS relevant to the Proposed Development is the NPS for National Networks (NPS NN).	Noted.
<b>3. ES Approach (3.3 Scope of Assessment)</b>		
Paragraph 3.3.1 <i>General</i>	<p>The Inspectorate recommends that in order to assist the decision-making process, the Applicant uses tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to demonstrate how the assessment has taken account of this Opinion;</li> <li>• to identify and collate the residual effects after mitigation for each of the aspect chapters, including the relevant interrelationships and cumulative effects;</li> <li>• to set out the proposed mitigation and/ or monitoring measures including cross-reference to the means of securing such measures (e.g. a dDCO requirement);</li> <li>• to describe any remedial measures that are identified as being necessary following monitoring; and</li> </ul>	<p>This table demonstrates how the assessment has taken account of the Scoping Opinion. Each technical assessment has considered the Scoping Opinion</p> <p>Residual effects and presented in each of the technical assessments and assessed as part of the Cumulative effects assessment <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b></p> <p>Mitigation measures are presented in each technical assessment and committed in the</p>



Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to identify where details are contained in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA report) (where relevant), such as descriptions of European sites and their locations, together with any mitigation or compensation measures, are to be found in the ES.</li> </ul>	Environmental Management Plan <b>(TR010038/APP/7.4)</b>  Monitoring recommendations are presented in each technical assessment <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b>  Details of European sites are presented in the HRA <b>(TR010038/APP/6.9)</b> and ES Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b>
Paragraph 3.3.2 <i>General</i>	The Inspectorate considers that where a DCO application includes works described as ‘Associated Development’, that could themselves be defined as an improvement of a highway, the Applicant should ensure that the ES accompanying that application distinguishes between; effects that primarily derive from the integral works which form the proposed (or part of the proposed) NSIP and those that primarily derive from the works described as Associated Development. This could be presented in a suitably compiled summary table. This will have the benefit of giving greater confidence to the Inspectorate that what is proposed is not in fact an additional NSIP defined in accordance with s22 of the PA2008.	Noted.
Paragraph 3.3.3 <i>General</i>	Figures within the ES should be clear, legible, avoid using similar patterns and colours to identify key aspects, and depict all receptors/ sensitive locations stated within the EIA aspect chapters.	Noted. The figures for the ES are submitted as part of the DCO application <b>(TR010038/APP/6.2)</b>
Paragraph 3.3.4 <i>General</i>	The ES should ensure that any data used is correctly referenced.	Noted.

A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 3.3.5 <i>General</i>	Accurate geographic locations should be used when referring to the Proposed Development.	Noted. These are provided in section 2.3 of Chapter 2 (The Proposed Scheme) <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b>
Paragraph 3.3.6 <i>General</i>	If the baselines within the ES are to rely on previous surveys/ investigations/ assessments, then those surveys/ investigations/ assessments should be included within the ES.	Noted. These have been included where appropriate.
Paragraph 3.3.7 <i>General</i>	The ES should expand on the timeline set out in Section 2.5 of the Scoping Report by stating whether a phased approach would be implemented, the order and timings of the removal and construction of new junctions, road crossings, river crossings and how long the storage bunds and construction compounds would be required.	Noted. Construction phasing has been provided in Section 2.6 of Chapter 2 (The Proposed Scheme) <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b>
Paragraph 3.3.8 <i>General</i>	It should be made clear in the ES how the traffic and transport assessment undertaken to demonstrate the need for the Proposed Development relates to the assessments within the ES aspect chapters such as, air quality, noise and people and communities.	Chapter 4 (Environment assessment methodology) <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> highlights the traffic assessment and how it related to traffic dependent chapters.
Paragraph 3.3.9 <i>Baseline Scenario</i>	The ES should include a description of the baseline scenario with and without implementation of the development as far as natural changes from the baseline scenario can be assessed with reasonable effort on the basis of the availability of environmental information and scientific knowledge.	Description of the baseline is provided in Section 2.4 of Chapter 2 (The Proposed Scheme) and technical chapters 5 – 14 <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b>
Paragraph 3.3.10 <i>Baseline Scenario</i>	In light of the number of ongoing developments within the vicinity of the Proposed Development application site, the Applicant should clearly state which developments will be assumed to be under construction or operational as part of the future baseline.	The technical assessments <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> have identified the developments considered as part of the future baseline.

A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 3.3.11 <i>Forecasting Methods or Evidence</i>	The ES should contain the timescales upon which the surveys which underpin the technical assessments have been based. For clarity, this information should be provided either in the introductory chapters of the ES (with confirmation that these timescales apply to all chapters), or in each aspect chapter.	The timescales of all surveys undertaken is clearly presented within each technical chapter ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )
Paragraph 3.3.12 <i>Forecasting Methods or Evidence</i>	The Inspectorate expects the ES to include a chapter setting out the overarching methodology for the assessment, which clearly distinguishes effects that are 'significant' from 'non-significant' effects. Any departure from that methodology should be described in individual aspect assessment chapters.	Chapter 4 (Environmental assessment methodology) ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ) sets out the overarching methodology followed in the ES. Detailed methodologies are presented in each technical chapter
Paragraph 3.3.13 <i>Forecasting Methods or Evidence</i>	The ES should include details of difficulties (for example technical deficiencies or lack of knowledge) encountered compiling the required information and the main uncertainties involved.	Limitations to the assessment have been presented in Section 4.3 of Chapter 4 (Environmental assessment methodology) and in each technical chapter ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )
Paragraph 3.3.14 <i>Residues and Emissions</i>	The EIA Regulations require an estimate, by type and quantity, of expected residues and emissions. Specific reference should be made to water, air, soil and subsoil pollution, noise, vibration, light, heat, radiation and quantities and types of waste produced during the construction and operation phases, where relevant. This information should be provided in a clear and consistent fashion and may be integrated into the relevant aspect assessments.	The respective technical chapters considers the requirements stated ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )
Paragraph 3.3.15 <i>Mitigation</i>	Any mitigation relied upon for the purposes of the assessment should be explained in detail within the ES. The likely efficacy of the mitigation proposed should be explained with reference to residual effects. The ES should also address how any mitigation proposed is secured, with	Noted. This has been included in the ES and outlined in the Schedule of Mitigation chapter ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).

A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	reference to specific DCO requirements or other legally binding agreements.	
Paragraph 3.3.16 <i>Risk of Major Accidents and/or Disasters</i>	The ES should include a description and assessment (where relevant) of the likely significant effects resulting from accidents and disasters applicable to the Proposed Development. The Applicant should make use of appropriate guidance (e.g. that referenced in the Health and Safety Executives (HSE) Annex to Advice Note 11) to better understand the likelihood of an occurrence and the Proposed Development's susceptibility to potential major accidents and hazards. The description and assessment should consider the vulnerability of the Proposed Development to a potential accident or disaster and also the Proposed Development's potential to cause an accident or disaster. The assessment should specifically assess significant effects resulting from the risks to human health, cultural heritage or the environment. Any measures that will be employed to prevent and control significant effects should be presented in the ES.	Chapter 4 (Environmental assessment methodology), Section 4.1, highlights how accidents and disasters have been considered in the Proposed Scheme ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )
Paragraph 3.3.17 <i>Risk of Major Accidents and/or Disasters</i>	Relevant information available and obtained through risk assessments pursuant to European Union legislation such as Directive 2012/18/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council or Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom or relevant assessments carried out pursuant to national legislation may be used for this purpose provided that the requirements of this Directive are met. Where appropriate, this description should include measures envisaged to prevent or mitigate the significant adverse effects of such events on the environment and details of the preparedness for and proposed response to such emergencies.	Not to be included. The Planning Inspectorate agree that this topic can be scoped out.

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 3.3.18 <i>Climate and Climate Change</i>	The ES should include a description and assessment (where relevant) of the likely significant effects the Proposed Development has on climate (for example having regard to the nature and magnitude of greenhouse gas emissions) and the vulnerability of the project to climate change. Where relevant, the ES should describe and assess the adaptive capacity that has been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development. This may include, for example, alternative measures such as changes in the use of materials or construction and design techniques that will be more resilient to risks from climate change.	Noted. This has been included in the Climate chapter of the ES ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
Paragraph 3.3.19 <i>Transboundary Effects</i>	Schedule 4 Part 5 of the EIA Regulations requires a description of the likely significant transboundary effects to be provided in an ES.	Noted. This is provided in Chapter 4 (Environmental assessment methodology) ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )
Paragraph 3.3.20 <i>Transboundary Effects</i>	The Scoping Report concludes that the Proposed Development is not likely to have significant effects on another European Economic Area (EEA) State and proposes that transboundary effects do not need to be considered within the ES.	Noted. Transboundary effects are scoped out as highlighted in Section 4.1 of Chapter 4 (Environmental assessment methodology) ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
Paragraph 3.3.21 <i>Reference List</i>	A reference list detailing the sources used for the descriptions and assessments must be included in the ES.	References are provided in each relevant chapter of the ES ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )
<b>3.4 Confidential Information</b>		

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 3.4.1	In some circumstances it will be appropriate for information to be kept confidential. In particular, this may relate to information about the presence and locations of rare or sensitive species such as badgers, rare birds and plants where disturbance, damage, persecution or commercial exploitation may result from publication of the information. Where documents are intended to remain confidential the Applicant should provide these as separate paper and electronic documents with their confidential nature clearly indicated in the title and watermarked as such on each page. The information should not be incorporated within other documents that are intended for publication or which the Inspectorate would be required to disclose under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.	Noted. Confidential information will not be incorporated in other documents intended for publication. Confidential reports will be highlighted to the Planning Inspectorate.
<b>4. Aspect Based Scoping Tables</b>		
<b>5 Air Quality</b>		
Paragraph 4.1.1 Ref 5.7.6 <i>An assessment for all pollutants/emissions except:</i> • <i>NOx (including NO2);</i> • <i>PM10; and</i> • <i>CO2</i>	The Scoping Report states that only NOx (including NO2), PM10 and CO2 will be scoped into the assessment of air quality.  The Inspectorate does not agree that sufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that there will not be significant effects from increases in other pollutants/ emissions.  The ES should assess impacts from increases in all relevant pollutants identified under the EU ambient air quality directive including changes in PM2.5 concentrations resulting from the Proposed Development, where likely significant effects can occur.	PM <sub>2.5</sub> has been included within the assessment as presented in Chapter 5 (Air Quality) ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ). The assessment has been undertaken in line with the requirements of the updated DMRB LA 105.
Paragraph 4.1.2 Ref 5.3.2 and 5.3.5	The Scoping Report has not provided sufficient evidence that the Proposed Development in conjunction with other proposed highway schemes, such	Cumulative impacts of the scheme have been assessed within the Cumulative effects

A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
<i>An assessment of the Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) in Swaffham and Central Norwich</i>	as the A47 Blofield to North Burlingham and Norwich Western Link schemes, will not result in significant effects to the Swaffham and Central Norwich AQMAs. Therefore, the Inspectorate does not agree that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.	assessment chapter of the ES ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ). The other A47 schemes (Thickthorn and Blofield) are included within Tuddenham's Do-Minimum traffic data, and therefore within our AQ assessment.
Paragraph 4.1.3 Ref 5.1.2 <i>DMRB HA207/07</i>	The Applicant proposes to use the DMRB HA207/07 methodology to assess effects from changes to air quality during construction. The Inspectorate is aware of more recent guidance produced by the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction (2014). The Applicant should have regard to this guidance in conducting their air quality assessment.	Construction dust assessment follows the methodology of the updated DMRB LA105.  This is stated in the assessment methodology section (5.4) of the ES ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
Paragraph 4.1.4 Ref 5.2.2. <i>Study Area</i>	The ES should include a map/ figure that depicts the air quality study area used for the assessment as described at Paragraph 5.2.3 and 5.2.5 of the Scoping Report.	Figures of AQ study area have been provided in the ES chapter ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ). The study area includes roads meeting the criteria in paragraphs 5.2.3 and 5.2.5 of the scoping report.  The study area is shown on figure 5.3 ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.2</b> )
Paragraph 4.1.5 Ref 5.3.1 <i>Baseline Data</i>	The ES air quality assessment should be informed by relevant and recent data. The Applicant should make effort to agree the baseline data with the appropriate consultation bodies.	Consultation was carried out with Highways England to discuss the base year traffic of 2015 and assessment approach for the ES. It was concluded that the most recent available tools for assessment has been used in the assessment alongside the 2015 baseline traffic

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
		data. This summary is provided in Section 5.7 of Chapter 5 (Air Quality) ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )
Paragraph 4.1.6 Ref 5.37 and Table 5-1 <i>Scheme specific monitoring</i>	The Inspectorate notes that of the four proposed monitoring site locations listed in Table 5-1 of the Scoping Report, none are located within proximity to North Tuddenham and the westernmost section of the Proposed Development. The monitoring used to inform the assessment and relied upon in the ES should be fully representative of the study area and include sufficient geographical coverage. Any deviation from this approach should be explained and justified within the ES.	Additional monitoring locations have been added for the updated monitoring study. The monitoring survey now includes monitoring locations at the western end of the scheme. Full details have been provided in Section 5.7 of Chapter 5 (Air Quality) of the ES ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )
Paragraph 4.1.7 Ref 5.4.1 <i>Assumptions and uncertainties</i>	Any assumptions and uncertainties that apply to the air quality assessment should be presented and explained within the ES.	All assumptions and limitations have been outlined in Section 5.5 of ES chapter 5 and associated technical appendices ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
Paragraph 4.1.8 Ref 5.8.2 <i>Previous Survey</i>	Paragraph 5.8.2 of the Scoping Report states that a “previous survey” indicates that the potential impacts are not likely to be significant, however the Scoping Report does not include any further information regarding the previous survey. All relevant baseline data, necessary to inform the assessment of significant effects, should be included in the ES.	The most up to date and relevant baseline data has been used in the ES along with the results of the new NO <sub>2</sub> diffusion tube survey ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ). Some baseline data refers to 2015 as this is the baseline year of the traffic model.
Paragraph 4.1.9 Ref 5.9.2 <i>Traffic Management measures</i>	The ES should include a full description of the traffic management measures that will be used and state how these measures will be secured through the DCO or other legal mechanism.	An outline Traffic Management Plan has been compiled and submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application ( <b>TR010038/APP/7.5</b> )
Paragraph 4.1.10 Ref 5.10.1	A full description of the “relevant measures to minimise the air quality impact of construction activities” as stated in the Scoping Report	Noted.



Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
<i>Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)</i>	Paragraph 5.10.1 should be included in the CEMP and the ES should state how the CEMP will be secured through the DCO or other legal mechanism.	Measures proposed are listed in section 5.9 Design, mitigation and enhancement measures and the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (TR010038/APP/7.4).
Paragraph 4.1.11 Ref N/A <i>Cumulative Assessment</i>	The air quality assessment within the ES should take into account the cumulative effect of the Proposed Development and the proposed Norwich Western Link having regard to the proximity of the two proposals and the potential for overlapping construction periods.	Cumulative impacts of the have been assessed within the Cumulative Effects chapter (TR010038/APP/6.1).
<b>6 Cultural Heritage</b>		
Paragraph 4.2.1	No matters have been proposed to be scoped out of the assessment	Noted.
Paragraph 4.2.2 Ref 6.2.1 and 6.4.1 <i>Study Area</i>	A study area of 1km has been defined by the Applicant to identify designated and non-designated cultural heritage assets. The Applicant should make effort to agree with Historic England and relevant local authorities if there are any heritage assets located beyond the 1km study area which could be affected by the Proposed Development.	Scoping responses have not identified any such assets. However, consultation on the study area has been undertaken, as detailed in Section 6.7 of Chapter 6 (TR010038/APP/6.1).
Paragraph 4.2.3 Ref 6.2.3 <i>Zone of Influence (Zol)</i>	The Scoping Report states that a Zol will be produced as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment but will also be used within the Cultural Heritage assessment. The Applicant should make effort to agree the extent of the Zol with Historic England and relevant local planning authorities. The Zol used to inform the assessment should be clearly stated within the ES Cultural Heritage chapter.	<p>The study area consists of the Zone of Theoretical Views (ZTV) and footprint of the scheme as required by DMRB LA 106</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The study area should include the settings of any designated or other cultural heritage resource in the footprint of the scheme or within the zone of visual influence or potentially affected by noise</li> <li>• Where a new road is proposed the study area shall include the footprint of the</li> </ul>

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
		<p>scheme plus any land outside that footprint which includes any heritage assets which could be physically affected.</p> <p>Consultees were made aware of the study through informal discussions during the design process. These are summarised in Section 6.6 of Chapter 6 (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>)</p>
<p>Paragraph 4.2.4                      Ref 6.4.2  <i>Buildings of local importance</i></p>	<p>The Applicant should make effort to agree with relevant consultation bodies which buildings of local importance should be assessed within the ES. A figure that depicts the buildings of local importance relative to the Proposed Development should be included in the ES.</p>	<p>The local list and Historic Environment Records (HER) data on non-listed buildings has been consulted and detailed in the 6.4 Assessment methodology, consultation section of the ES. A site walkover has been undertaken to identify any other buildings of heritage value not included in these data sources (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
<p>Paragraph 4.2.5                      Ref 6.4.6 and 6.4.7  <i>Further Investigations</i></p>	<p>The Scoping Report Paragraph 6.4.6 states that the interpretation of archaeological sites may be revised in the light of further investigation. The ES should include details of the archaeological investigations which have been undertaken and provide an explanation of how the findings have been taken into account in refining any survey parameters during production of the ES.</p>	<p>Archaeological trial trenching has been carried out in 2020 and reported in the ES Chapter 6 (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Geophysical survey carried out in 2020 and reported in the ES Chapter 6 (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
<p>Paragraph 4.2.5                      Ref 6.7.2  <i>Historic park</i></p>	<p>The location of the Historic Park as stated in Scoping Report Paragraph 6.7.2 should be included on the figures provided within the ES.</p>	<p>Honingham Park has been fully included and assessed in the ES Chapter 6 as a heritage asset and included in the figures showing the location of non-designated heritage assets (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>)</p>

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 4.2.7 Ref 6.7.3 and 6.7.5 <i>Mitigation– construction and operation</i>	The Scoping Report states that best practice measures to limit impacts on heritage assets would be employed during construction through the implementation of a CEMP. The Applicant should explain the mitigation techniques which are to be employed and effort should be made to agree them with relevant consultation bodies. The ES should contain details of how the mitigation measures set out in the CEMP would be secured.	The project heritage specialists have been involved in the design process including design workshops to deisgn out impacts where possible and practicable. Discussions have been held with consultees before formal consultation regarding physical and setting impacts of the Proposed Scheme and appropriate mitigation. The ES contains details of the mitigation measures in Section 6.9 of the ES chapter ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ). The mitigation mesures set out in the EMP ( <b>TR010038/APP/7.4</b> ) will be secured through the preparation of a mitigation strategy – Detailed Heritage Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI). The WSi will be subject of approval from relevant consultees.
Paragraph 4.2.8 Ref Table 6-2 <i>Indirect effects on heritage assets</i>	The ES should assess indirect impacts on heritage assets during the construction and operation of the Proposed Development ES.	Assessment of indirect impacts during the construction and operation of the scheme have been included in the ES cultural heritage chapter ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
<b>7 Landscape</b>		
Paragraph 4.3.1	No matters have been proposed to be scoped out of the assessment	Noted
Paragraph 4.3.2 Ref 7.2.1 <i>Study Area</i>	The Scoping Report suggests that the study area may be extended to include receptors located outside of the 1km study area. The ES should assess impacts on receptors likely to result in significant effects and clearly	Agreed. Based on site visits and consultations it is unlikely that there will be any receptors beyond 1km with potential to experience significant effects. Explained in secton 7.6

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	describe why receptors were chosen. The sensitive receptors identified should be depicted on a plan/ figure to be included in the ES.	Study area, of the ES Chapter 7 <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> . The focus of assessment is in accordance with the Inspectorate's comments, with clear reference to the relevance of the receptors identified. A figure has been included in the ES (figure 7.4) to identify the locations of receptors. <b>(TR010038/APP/6.2)</b>
Paragraph 4.3.3. Ref 7.6.2 <i>Viewpoints</i>	The Applicant should make effort to agree the viewpoints with the relevant consultation bodies. The viewpoints used in the assessment should be depicted on supporting plans/ figures in the ES.	<p>Agreed. We have engaged in dialogue with the relevant Local Planning Authorities to agree the locations of viewpoints. The locations of viewpoints have been shown on a figure in the ES supported by baseline and, where relevant, visualisation views.</p> <p>Viewpoint locations have been confirmed with the Director of Planning and Building Control at Breckland Council, and the Landscape Officer at Broadland District Council (including South Norfolk Council).</p> <p>Viewpoints are shown on figure 7.6 <b>(TR010038/APP/6.2)</b>.</p>
Paragraph 4.3.4 Ref 7.6.2 <i>Mitigation</i>	The measures to be included in the landscape design and mitigation strategy referred to in the Scoping Report should be described within the ES and appropriately secured through the DCO.	Agreed. The Environmental Masterplan <b>(TR010038/APP/6.8)</b> has been developed in conjunction with all relevant technical and design specialists in accordance with latest DMRB requirements. Relevant mitigation

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
		<p>measures is also described in Section 7.9 of ES Chapter 7 (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been described in section 7.9 design, mitigation and enhancement measures (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
<p>Paragraph 4.3.5                      Ref 7.6.2 and Section 7.7.  <i>Mitigation</i></p>	<p>The ES should describe the mitigation methods relied upon in the assessment. The Scoping Report suggests that planting is the only mitigation method that will be applied in the Proposed Development. The ES should explain what level of consideration has been given to other methods of mitigation.</p>	<p>Landscape mitigation has been embedded in the design development in accordance with latest DMRB requirements. This has included influencing the siting of scheme components and materials selection. The scope of landscape mitigation notably overlaps with ecological requirements to promote habitat diversity, which has been represented by variety in the form and species composition of plant and grass types. All of the above has been summarised in the ES section 7.9 design, mitigation and enhancement measures (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>), and identified in the Environmental Masterplan (<b>TR010038/APP/6.8</b>).</p>
<p>Paragraph 4.3.6                      Ref 7.7.1  <i>Removal of vegetation</i></p>	<p>The ES should describe the areas where temporary and permanent vegetation and tree loss will take place. Any such vegetation and tree loss should be accounted for in the landscape and visual impact assessment.</p>	<p>Agreed. This has been defined in conjunction with the Arboricultural survey/statement which establishes the extent of vegetation removal and its implication for landscape elements/character and views (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>).</p>

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 4.3.7 Ref 7.7.1 and Appendix C <i>Lighting</i>	The assessment of lighting impacts in the ES should describe the night time lighting required during the construction and operational phases. The assessment should assess impacts from lighting on sensitive receptors and include night-time photomontages where appropriate.	Agreed. The landscape and visual assessment component of the ES has been developed in conjunction with the lighting specialists to identify the potential for night time effects ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ). Any effects are reported in Section 7.10 of Chapter 7 of the ES.
Paragraph 4.3.8 Ref N/A <i>Structures – construction and operation</i>	An assessment of the potential landscape and visual impacts arising from construction compounds and other structures that will be incorporated into the final design of the Proposed Development should be included in the ES.  The ES should also describe the parameters applicable to the assessment, such as the elevations of all structures required during construction and operation.	Agreed. Details of temporary and permanent structures has been established with reference to the respective stage project descriptions to ensure understanding of the scale and appearance of scheme components. Discussed in assessment of likely significant effects section (7.10) of chapter 7 ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
<b>8 Biodiversity</b>		
Paragraph 4.4.2 Ref Table 8-1 <i>Designated sites – functionally linked habitat</i>	The ES should assess indirect effects on European designated sites from impacts to functionally linked habitats. The study area for the assessment should be based on the extent of impacts (direct and indirect).	Noted. Direct and indirect effects upon European designated sites has been assessed in the ES, in section 8.10 assessment of likely significant effects ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
Paragraph 4.4.3 Ref 8.4.4 and 8.7.6 <i>Construction activities</i>	The Scoping Report Paragraphs 8.4.4 and 8.7.6 states that the Proposed Development will involve significant in-channel works and potential river diversions, as well as a bridge and an Ordinary Watercourse (drain) crossing but no further information is provided.	The design of the scheme and the ecological impacts it will create has been discussed with the Road Drainage and Water Environment team before being finalised. Assessment of likely significant effects included in section 8.10 of ES chapter ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	<p>The ES should describe all construction works in sufficient detail in order to inform a meaningful assessment of likely significant effects on watercourse hydraulics and ecology.</p>	
<p>Paragraph 4.4.4                      Ref 8.3.23 and 8.7.6  <i>Migratory fish species</i></p>	<p>The Applicant states that they are not proposing to undertake any fish surveys as stated in Paragraph 8.3.23. Given the proposed extent of in-channel works and structures, the Inspectorate considers that there is potential for the Proposed Development to impede/ obstruct the movements of migratory fish, including European eel. The Applicant should therefore undertake fish surveys where significant effects are likely to occur.</p> <p>The Applicant should make effort to agree the need for and approach to such surveys with relevant consultation bodies, including Natural England (NE) and the Environment Agency (EA). Any reliance placed on data available from alternative sources, as stated in Paragraph 8.3.23, should be explained in the ES and effort should be made to agree the approach with relevant consultation bodies.</p> <p>The ES should assess any impacts on European eels, and have regard to the requirements specified in The Eels (England and Wales) Regulations 2009.</p>	<p>Eels and migratory fish have been considered in Chapter 8 (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>).</p> <p>Outfalls have yet to be designed and will be done so prior to construction. It has been proposed that outfalls are set back from the River Tud so there is an obvious ditch between them and the river to reduce construction impacts / erosion and create backwater habitat. Eel mesh will be installed if needed.</p> <p>Stream gradients and velocities will be maintained when lengthening and installing the culverts. Pollution prevention and fish rescue will be used.</p> <p>The bridge over the River Tud is not to be constructed in or within 5m of the water.</p>
<p>Paragraph 4.4.5                      Ref 8.3.24 and 8.3.5  <i>Invasive non-native species (INNS)</i></p>	<p>Scoping Report Paragraph 8.3.24 states that “specific surveys will not be undertaken for non-native invasive species, although their presence will be recorded if any non-native invasive species are found during surveys and recommendations will be made for appropriate mitigation”.</p> <p>The Inspectorate notes the potential for hydrological/ ecological connectivity from the Proposed Development to protected sensitive habitats and species. The Applicant should undertake surveys for INNS where</p>	<p>INNS and biosecurity precautions have been detailed in the ES Chapter 8 (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>), REAC (<b>TR010038/APP/7.4</b>) and the oLEMP (<b>TR010038/APP/7.4</b>).</p> <p>White-clawed crayfish surveys have been undertaken. These are discussed in the 8.9</p>

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	<p>significant effects are likely to occur. The Scoping Report identifies the presence of native white-clawed crayfish, as well as non-native signal crayfish, within the study area in the River Tud. The Scoping Report does not, however, specifically consider the potential for the Proposed Development to facilitate the spread of non-native crayfish and crayfish plague, which could impact native crayfish and their habitats. The Inspectorate notes that the Scoping Report does not assess the potential of the Proposed Development to facilitate the spread of invasive species of freshwater mussel.</p> <p>The ES should assess impacts in this regard and describe any necessary mitigation and/ or biosecurity precautions required to prevent the spread of INNS. Any measures relied upon in the ES should be discussed with relevant consultation bodies, including NE and the EA, in effort to agree the approach. Measures relied upon in the ES should be adequately secured e.g. through a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).</p>	<p>Assessment of likely significant effects section of the ES, and the results are located in appendix 8.5 white-clawed crayfish survey report. Spread of non-native crayfish and crayfish plague discussed in chapter under 8.7 baseline conditions (<b>TR010038/APP/6.3</b>).</p>
<p>Paragraph 4.4.6                      Ref 8.3.27  <i>Desmoulin's whorl snail</i></p>	<p>The Scoping Report Paragraph 8.3.27 states that no Desmoulin's whorl snail were found during the autumn 2017 survey. The Inspectorate notes that according to recognised guidance (Monitoring Desmoulin's Whorl Snail Conserving Natura 2000 River Monitoring Series No.6) these surveys should be undertaken in mid to late summer. Furthermore, Paragraph 8.3.27 of the Scoping Report acknowledges that the species is "relatively mobile" and therefore there is potential for the species to have migrated into the River Tud since the 2017 survey was undertaken. The Applicant should make effort to agree the need for further surveys with relevant consultation bodies.</p>	<p>Further surveys for this were undertaken during 2019. The impacts on Desmoulin's whorl snail are presented in Chapter 8 (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>)</p>



Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
<p>Paragraph 4.4.7 Ref 8.4.5; 8.7.19 <i>Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures</i></p>	<p>The Scoping Report Paragraphs 8.4.5 and 8.7.19 indicate that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and attenuation ponds may be used to provide habitat for wetland birds and to compensate for the potential loss of any reedbed or marshy grassland habitats, respectively.</p> <p>Details of the location and design parameters of SuDS and attenuation ponds should be presented on a figure(s) in the ES. The ES should describe the proposed methods for habitat creation utilising the aforementioned drainage components, highlighting any susceptibility/ sensitivity of these habitats to pollution events.</p> <p>The ES should clearly describe any mitigation measures relied upon for the assessment of likely significant effects and set out how the delivery of such mitigation measures, including SuDS and attenuation ponds, will be secured through the DCO or other legal mechanism.</p>	<p>Eight wildlife ponds and two wetland areas which will include undulating terrain where parts of the ground are below the water table to create permanently wet pond features are to provide habitat for invertebrates, birds, great crested newts and other animals.</p> <p>Attenuation ponds will be provided separately that will only hold water after rainfall events.</p> <p>These along with securing mechanisms have been described in the Biodiversity and Road Drainage and Water Environment ES chapters <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b>.</p>
<p>Paragraph 4.4.8 Ref 8.7.3 and 8.7.13 <i>Mitigation measure – fish spawning season</i></p>	<p>Paragraphs 8.7.3 and 8.7.12 of the Scoping Report states that an important mitigation measure will be timing the construction work to avoid key and sensitive periods to species. This should extend to avoiding the spawning season of important fish species within the River Tud.</p>	<p>Work will be timed to avoid key fish spawning seasons and this has been advised in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) <b>(TR010038/APP/6.4)</b>.</p> <p>It is also detailed in EMP that where works are to be undertaken in water, the Ecological Clerk of Works (EcoW) will be present to check for fish. If fish are detected a fish rescue will be required prior to works in water.</p>
<p>Paragraph 4.4.9 Ref 8.7.13 <i>Culvert</i></p>	<p>The ES should assess and state the potential effects on aquatic/ semi-aquatic species if the proposed culvert in the River Tud will result in a barrier to movement or migration. The ES should also state whether</p>	<p>The design of the scheme and the ecological impacts it will create have been discussed with the Road Drainage and Water Environment team before being finalised. A bridge and no</p>

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	<p>alternative designs, other than a culvert, was assessed and if so, the reasons why a culvert was chosen over the alternatives.</p>	<p>culvert within the River Tud have been chosen and stated in the ES. Effects will be reported in the ES, in section 8.10 Assessment of likely significant effects (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
<p>Paragraph 4.4.10 Ref 8.7.20 <i>Potential impacts – habitat loss</i></p>	<p>The Scoping Report Paragraph 8.7.20 states that vegetation clearance (including tree and hedgerow removal) and earthworks will be required to facilitate the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The ES should demonstrate the effort made (including all permanent and temporary land-take) to avoid direct and indirect impacts on existing species and habitats. Any habitat lost as a result of the Proposed Development should be described and quantified according to type and the area of loss, which should include the extent of any anticipated vegetation/ tree clearance. The location of any affected hedgerows and/ or ancient/ veteran trees should be depicted on a supporting plan.</p> <p>Any avoidance or mitigation measures proposed should be described in the ES and details provided to explain how such measures will be secured.</p>	<p>Any habitat lost has been described and quantified in the ES Chapter 8 (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>). Avoidance and mitigation measures have been described in the ES in section 8.9 Design, mitigation and enhancement measures (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>).</p>
<p>Paragraph 4.4.11 Ref N/A <i>Potential impacts – road mortality</i></p>	<p>The Scoping Report does not reference the potential for the Proposed Development to cause an increase species mortality due to traffic collisions. An assessment to determine whether an increase in species mortality due to traffic collisions may occur should be included in the ES, and if mitigation measures are required, the ES should describe the measures and state how they will be secured through the DCO.</p>	<p>Consultation has been undertaken and is still ongoing with Norfolk County Council and statutory environmental bodies regarding the Norwich Western Link Road and Northern Distributor Road.</p> <p>Bat crossing point surveys have been undertaken in 2020 and results and mitigation reported in Section 8.9 of the ES Chapter 8 (<b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b>).</p>

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
<b>9 Geology and Soils</b>		
Paragraph 4.5.1 Ref 9.1.2 <i>Effect on agricultural land</i>	The Inspectorate agrees that an assessment of agricultural land can be scoped out of the Geology and Soils aspect chapter as the assessment will instead be included within the People and Communities aspect chapter. Where relevant, the ES should cross reference between the two aspects chapters.	Comment noted. However this appears to be in contradiction with LA 109 with regards to location of section.  ES reflects the most up to date guidance in assessment methodology section 9.4 <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> .
Paragraph 4.5.2 Ref 9.7.7 <i>Effect on geology and soils during operation of the proposed development</i>	The Inspectorate agrees that significant effects to geology and soils are unlikely to occur during the operation of the Proposed Development and therefore this matter can be scoped out of the ES.	Comment noted. Item not to be included within the ES.
Paragraph 4.5.3 Ref 9.8.1 <i>Effect on groundwater</i>	The Inspectorate agrees that an assessment of the effect on groundwater can be scoped out of the Geology and Soils aspect chapter as the assessment is to be included within the Road Drainage and Water Environment aspect chapter. Where relevant, the ES should cross reference between the two aspects chapters.	Comment noted. Effect on groundwater has been included within Chapter 13 Road Drainage and Water Environment only <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> .
Paragraph 4.5.4 Ref Table 9-1 <i>Baseline Data</i>	To aid the reader's understanding of the baseline information relating to geology and soils within and surrounding the Proposed Development, the ES should include a plan/ figure depicting the locations of the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disused marl, sand and gravel and brick pits; and</li> <li>• Areas of potential contamination risks.</li> </ul>	Comment noted. A plan depicting location of disused marl, sand and gravel and brick pits, and areas of potential contamination risk has been included within the ES Chapter 9 <b>(TR010038/APP/6.2)</b> .

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 4.5.5 Ref Table 9-1 <i>Water abstraction and Source Protection Zone (SPZ)</i>	A new water abstraction in East Tuddenham has been constructed and subsequently a further SPZ has been created. The location of the SPZ should be incorporated into the ES baseline assessment for Geology and Soils. The ES should also include this new water abstraction and SPZs on a figure. The Applicant should make effort to consult with the EA to confirm the location and extent of the SPZ.	Comment noted. Details of additional SPZ have been included in the hydrogeological summary, baseline, assessment and figure for the geology and soils chapter as well as the Road drainage and water environment chapter <b>(TR010038/APP/6.2)</b> .
Paragraph 4.5.6 Ref Table 9-1 <i>Potential risk to groundwater</i>	The ES should justify the risk classification to groundwater, abstractions, and surface water courses as moderate/ low considering the close proximity of construction works to the River Tud and the permeability and hydraulic connectivity of the Principal Aquifer, Superficial Aquifer, bedrock and superficial deposits.	Risk to groundwater abstractions and surface water courses has been considered in Chapter 13 Road drainage and the water environment <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b>
Paragraph 4.5.7 Ref Table 9-1 <i>Unexploded ordnance (UXO)</i>	The Scoping Report identifies a moderate risk of UXO within the study area. The ES should include measures that outline the activities that will take place in the situation where UXOs are discovered; and effort should be made to agree the approach with relevant consultation bodies and secure the required measures through the DCO or other legal mechanism.	Comment noted. Appropriate measures as stipulated by 6 Alpha has been included within the geology and soils ES <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> and outlined in the EMP <b>(TR010038/APP/7.4)</b> .
Paragraph 4.5.8 Ref 9.6.2 <i>Consultation – mineral sterilisation</i>	The ES should assess impacts to known mineral deposits and the potential for sterilisation. The Applicant should make effort to agree the approach to the assessment with relevant consultation bodies.	Comment noted. The extents of potential mineral resources has been confirmed following intrusive works. Currently, only localised sand and gravel deposits are indicated.  This has been addressed within the Material Assets and Waste chapter of the ES in accordance with DMRB LA 110 <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> .

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 4.5.9 Ref N/A <i>Piling</i>	If piling is required for the construction of the Proposed Development, the ES should include a map/ figure depicting where piling would take place.	Comment noted. Any areas requiring piling has been included within the geology and soils ES chapter ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
Paragraph 4.5.10 Ref N/A <i>Cumulative Impacts</i>	The ES should assess cumulative impacts associated with the installation of underground cables for nearby windfarm developments where significant effects are likely to occur.	Impacts associated with the installation of underground cables for nearby windfarm developments has been included in the Cumulative effects chapter (chapter 15) ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
<b>10 Materials</b>		
Paragraph 4.6.1 Ref 10.8.2 <i>An assessment of materials and waste during the operational phase of the Proposed Development</i>	The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES as it is unlikely for significant effects to arise from the use of materials or generation of waste during the operational phase of the Proposed Development.	Agree with the Inspectorates comment.  Any changes to the contrary have been included in the ES Chapter 10 ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
Paragraph 4.6.2 Ref 10.3.3 and 10.3.4 <i>Baseline</i>	The baseline information in the ES should contain the location of the proposed waste facilities where construction waste is likely to be disposed of, the capacity of the waste facilities and their ability to receive the waste generated by the Proposed Development.	The baseline information in the ES Chapter 10 (section 10.7) contains the location of the proposed waste facilities where construction waste is likely to be disposed of, the capacity of the waste facilities and their ability to receive the waste generated by the Proposed Development.

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
		Remaining capacities of landfill sites within the east of England region have been considered in the assessment. <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b>
Paragraph 4.6.3 Ref 10.6.1 <i>Consultation</i>	The Applicant should make effort to consult with relevant consultation bodies to attain relevant and up to date waste capacity baseline information to inform the assessment.	Assessment uses latest data published by the Environment Agency as accessed via the EA Waste Interrogator tool.
Paragraph 4.6.4 Ref Table 10-1 <i>Demolition</i>	Table 10-1 makes no mention of the removal of the Easton roundabout as stated in Paragraph 2.3.6 of the Scoping Report. The ES assessment of materials should include the anticipated waste generated from the removal of the Easton roundabout and any other demolition/ removal associated with the Proposed Development.	The ES assessment uses volumes contained within the BoQ provided by the design team. This includes demolition volumes <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> .
<b>4.7 Noise and Vibration</b>		
Paragraph 4.7.1	No matters have been proposed to be scoped out of the assessment.	Noted
Paragraph 4.7.2 Ref 11.2.2 <i>Operational Study</i>	The Scoping Report states that the long-term operational study area includes receptors within 600m of the Proposed Development that incur a 3dB LA10,18h change in noise level but does not state what constitutes 'long term'. A definition of long term should be included in the ES.	The operational study area for this assessment has been defined as the area within 600m of new road links or road links physically changed or bypassed by the project. This has been extended to include the area 50 m either side of road links with the potential to experience a short term (year of opening) basic noise level change of more than 1.0 dB(A), as described in DMRB LA 111 <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> .

A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 4.7.3 Ref 11.2.4 <i>Diversion Routes</i>	The ES should describe the assumed diversion routes during construction, and to aid the readers understanding, include a map/ figure of the potential diversion routes.	Acknowledged. Diversion routes have been included in the construction assessment within the ES ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
Paragraph 4.7.4 Ref Table 11-1 <i>Receptors – graveyards</i>	The Scoping Report Chapter 9 Geology and Soils states that the Proposed Development passes close to two graveyards [Paragraph 9.7.2] but no reference to these graveyards have been included in the noise assessment. The ES noise assessment should consider the two graveyards as 'Community facilities' as stated in Table 11-1 and state any significant effects that may arise and if required, mitigation measures including how they will be secured through the DCO.	Acknowledged. The two graveyards (St Peter's Church and St Andrew's Church) have been assessed as 'Other sensitive receptors - Community facilities' in the ES Chapter 11 ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
Paragraph 4.7.5 Ref 11.4.1 <i>Assumptions and Limitations</i>	The ES should describe the limitations encountered and assumptions used when undertaking the noise assessment, and the effect the limitations and assumptions have on the results of the noise assessments.	Acknowledged. The ES Chapter 11 (section 11.5) has described assumptions, limitations and uncertainty and the effect that these may have on the assessment results ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )
Paragraph 4.7.6 Ref 11.5.1 <i>Guidance and best practice</i>	The Scoping Report identifies 4 Noise Important Areas (NIA) within the study area, the Applicant should consider the guidance Noise Action Plan: Roads when undertaking the noise assessment due to this guidance setting out the roles and responsibilities associated with NIA.	Acknowledged. The ES Chapter 11 (section 11.3) ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ) has taken into consideration guidance presented in 'Noise Action Plan: Roads (2019)' as necessary.
Paragraph 4.7.7 Ref 11.9.1 <i>Magnitude of impact</i>	The Scoping Report Paragraph 11.9.1 states the "mitigation strategy will depend upon the magnitude of impact" but no criteria for defining the magnitude has been provided. The ES should clearly state the criteria used for determining impact magnitude.	Acknowledged. The ES has defined magnitude of impact in accordance with DMRB LA 111 Section 11.4 of Chapter 11 ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 4.7.8 Ref 11.9.3 <i>Construction noise – Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOEAL)</i>	The Scoping Report does not provide baseline noise levels. The ES should justify the use of SOAEL levels of 75dB and 70dB as stated in Paragraph 11.9.3 instead of using SOAEL levels that are derived from the ambient noise level. The ES should also explain the regard given to the World Health Organisation (WHO) Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region when setting the SOAEL noise level.	Baseline noise survey data was not available for this Scheme at the time of writing the Scoping Report. A baseline noise survey has now been undertaken as part of the ES ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ). Following the recent publication of DMRB LA 111 (formerly HD 213/11, IAN 185/15) in November 2019, for construction noise it sets up LOAEL as the Baseline Noise Levels and SOAEL based on threshold level determined as per BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 Section E3.2 and Table E.1 (known as the ABC Method). This is the basis of the construction noise assessment. It is also noted that the latest guidelines from WHO are 'Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region (2018)', and this has been referred to as necessary." ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )
Paragraph 4.7.9 Ref 11.9.7 <i>Potential vulnerable buildings to vibration</i>	A plan/ figure presenting the location of the vulnerable buildings to vibrations should be included in the ES.	Acknowledged. Figure 11.1 submitted as part of the ES presents this information ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.2</b> )
Paragraph 4.7.10 <i>Piling</i>	If piling is required, the noise and vibrational effects relating to piling should be assessed in the ES where significant effects are likely to occur.	The construction impacts as a result of the Proposed Scheme on noise and vibration has been considered as part of the ES ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )
<b>12 People and Communities (now Population and human health)</b>		



A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 4.8.1	No matters have been proposed to be scoped out of the assessment.	Noted
Paragraph 4.8.2 Ref 12.2.2 <i>Community facilities</i>	The ES should include religious buildings and cemeteries in the assessment of impacts on community land and community facilities.	The ES Chapter 12 has included an assessment religious buildings and cemeteries <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b>
Paragraph 4.8.3 Ref 12.3.5 and Table 12-2 <i>Local economy baseline</i>	<p>The ES should justify using data for Great Yarmouth to inform the local economy baseline data and explain how the data accurately represents the local economy relevant to the Proposed Development and the wider economic area.</p> <p>The Scoping Report does not explain why in Table 12-2 the population in employment is greater than the population of persons of working age. Paragraph 12.3.5 also states that the data is relevant to Great Yarmouth but the Table states Norfolk. The ES should ensure data is clearly explained and accurate.</p>	<p>Data included within the ES Chapter 12 <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> is clearly explained and accurate.</p> <p>DMRB LA112 has been updated since the issue of the scoping report. The local economy baseline is no longer required in the assessment of population and human health.</p> <p>The local economy baseline is considered within the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010038/APP/7.1)</b>.</p>
Paragraph 4.8.4 Ref 12.4.2 <i>Sources</i>	Paragraph 12.4.2 of the Scoping Report states that the “baseline social and community conditions has been compiled from existing published sources” but does not state the sources used. Where data has been used to inform the assessment in the ES, the source of the data should be accurate and clearly stated.	The sources of all data have been reported in the ES Chapter 12 (Section 12.13) <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> .
Paragraph 4.8.5 Ref 12.7.11 <i>Community land and community facilities</i>	Scoping Report Paragraph 12.7.11 states that no impact to community land or community facilities within the study area are anticipated. However, it is unclear how this conclusion has been reached. The Inspectorate notes that there are community land and facilities within the stated 250m study area and therefore could be affected by the Proposed Development. The ES should provide justification to support any conclusions reached with regard to impacts on community land and facilities within the study area.	The ES Chapter 12 <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> has provided justification to support any conclusions reached with regard to impacts on community land and facilities within the study area (Section 12.6).

A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 4.8.6 Ref 12.7.13 ad 12.7.14 <i>Demolition of private property</i>	The ES should clearly describe any buildings required to be demolished and depict these on a supporting plan/ figure. The ESs should also state any mitigation measures required and how the measures will be secured through the DCO or other legal mechanism.	No buildings are to be demolished as part of the Proposed Scheme, noted within the ES Chapter 12 ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
Paragraph 4.8.7 Ref 12.7.19 and 12.7.20 <i>Severance impacts on farmland</i>	The ES should assess effects associated with the provision of new agricultural land to be provided as mitigation measures for the loss of existing farmland.	The ES Chapter 12 has assessed these effects on agricultural land ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
Paragraph 4.8.8 Ref 12.7.21 <i>Land take</i>	Temporary and permanent land take should be documented in the ES along with an explanation as to why the land take is required.	The ES (Chapter 2 and Chapter 12) ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ) has documented the temporary and permanent land take with explain as to why it is required.
Paragraph 4.8.9 Ref 12.7.22 and 12.7.23 <i>Impact on restricted byway and footpath</i>	The ES should assess impacts to the restricted byway (Honingham RB1) and footpath (Hockering FP7) where significant effects are likely to occur.	The ES Chapter 12 has assessed the impacts on all affected ProW ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
Paragraph 4.8.9 Ref 12.7.24 <i>Side roads</i>	The ES should describe the number of side roads which will be stopped up, including whether this will be on a permanent or temporary basis. Any significant effects associated on road users should be assessed and reported in the ES. If the effect on sideroads could result in permanent severance, this should be stated in the ES and assessed.	DMRB LA 112 has been updated since the issue of the scoping report. An assessment of Driver Stress is no longer required in the assessment of population and human health.  The ES Chapter 12 has, however, documented the number of side roads to be severed and

A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
		assess the impact on severance <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> .
Paragraph 4.8.11 Ref 12.7.26 <i>New road junctions</i>	The ES should include the number and location of new road junctions and state whether there will be access points for non-motorised users.	DMRB LA112 has been updated since the issue of the scoping report. An assessment of View from the Road is no longer required in the assessment of population and human health.
Paragraph 4.8.12 Ref 12.7.8.28 <i>Severance</i>	The Scoping Report Paragraph 12.7.28 states that “The Proposed Scheme could cause permanent severance for local communities due to some villages and facilities being cut off from one another”. The ES should assess alternative designs that prevent or limit severance where possible. The ES should also take into account the need for continued access to Hockering Nursey from the village of Hockering.  The Applicant should make effort to engage with relevant consultation bodies to ensure that the importance of local facilities to local communities are accurately accounted for in the assessment.	The ES Chapter 12 has assessed the impact of the Proposed Scheme on severance <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> .
Paragraph 4.8.13 Ref 12.7.33 <i>Cumulative effect on local business</i>	The ES should present an assessment of the impact which the Proposed Development, along with the other proposed schemes on the A47, could have on the local economy.	DMRB LA112 has been updated since the issue of the scoping report. The local economy baseline is no longer required in the assessment of population and human health.  The local economy is considered within the Case for the Scheme <b>(TR010038/APP/7.1)</b> .
Paragraph 4.8.14 Ref Table 12-5 and Table 12-6	The ES should take into account persons of reduced or limited mobility as well as total change in journey length when determining the significance of effect on walkers.	The ES has assessed the significance of the effect on walkers in line with the sensitivity and magnitude of impact criteria outlined in Tables

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
<i>Significance of effect on walkers</i>		3.11 and 3.12 of LA 112 Population and human health ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )
Paragraph 4.8.15 <i>Rat running</i>	The ES should include an assessment to determine the potential significant effects that may occur in the local area due to rat running.	The ES has investigated whether rat-running may occur and if so, an assessment has been made of the potential for significant effects.  The ES addresses rat-running under information collated from stakeholder engagement including the human health assessment, within section 12.6 of the ES ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
Paragraph 4.8.16 <i>Local businesses</i>	The ES should include an assessment of the potential effects the Proposed Development will have on local businesses, with particular focus on the effects likely to arise from changes to the local road network including severance.	The potential effects of the Proposed Scheme on local businesses in terms of changes in journey length has been considered in Chapter 12 of the ES ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> )
<b>13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment</b>		
Paragraph 4.9.1	No matters have been proposed to be scoped out of the assessment.	Noted.
Paragraph 4.9.2 Ref 13.2.1 <i>Study area</i>	Where features have been identified down-gradient of the Proposed Development and included in the assessment study area, these features should be described in the ES and included on a plan/ figure.	This has been assessed as part of Chapter 13 of the ES ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ) and presented in Figure 13.1 ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.2</b> )
Paragraph 4.9.3 Ref Table 13-1	The assessment of potential impacts to licenced abstractions and water supplies should be accompanied by a plan/ figure that presents the locations of these features. This figure should also include the new water	A figure showing the abstractions (including the proposed abstraction site) assessed in Chapter 13 is presented in Figure 13.7  ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.2</b> )

A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
<i>Licensed abstractions and private water supplies</i>	abstraction in proximity to East Tuddenham. See the EA's response in Appendix 2 for further information.	
Paragraph 4.9.4 Ref 13-1 <i>Groundwater flood risk</i>	The groundwater flood risk locations are described by reference to the Proposed Development's chainage, but a map/ figure with the chainage lengths has not been provided. If chainages are to be used in the ES, then a map/ figure with the chainage lengths should be included.	Chainages have not been used in the assessment.
Paragraph 4.9.5 Ref 13.4.4 and 13.4.5 <i>Water crossings and diversions</i>	The ES should include sufficient detail to enable a robust assessment and understanding of the proposed water crossings and watercourse diversions. The detail should include but not be limited to the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location;</li> <li>• Timeframe of the work;</li> <li>• Significant effects; and</li> <li>• Mitigation measures and how they will be secured, if required.</li> </ul>	The detail suggested has been assessed and included in Chapter 13 of the ES <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b>
Paragraph 4.9.6 Ref 13.7.3 <i>Nitrate management</i>	The ES should provide sufficient detail to describe the mitigation measures required to address the potential for increased levels of nitrates to enter the River Tud as a result of the Proposed Development. The anticipated efficacy of the mitigation measures proposed should also be described. The Applicant should make effort to agree the mitigation measures with the relevant consultation bodies.	Mitigation measures proposed as part of the Proposed Scheme are detailed in Chapter 13 <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> and secured in the EMP <b>(TR010038/APP/7.4)</b>
Paragraph 4.9.7 Ref 13.7.9 and 13.7.12 <i>Pollution incidents</i>	The Scoping Report provides limited information to support the conclusion that the risk of pollution incidents effecting the drainage and water environment is minimal. The ES should include an assessment of the potential effects that may arise from pollution events, and describe in	Chapter 13 presents the assessment of the potential effects that may arise from pollution events as well as proposed mitigation measures <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b> . The measures are also

A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	sufficient detail the mitigation measures proposed and how such measures will be secured through the DCO or other legal mechanism.	presented and secured through the EMP (TR010038/APP/7.4)
Paragraph 4.9.8 Ref 13.7.10 <i>Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS)</i>	The ES should include a plan/ figure depicting the location and dimensions of the proposed SuDS. The effects of the SuDS on potential flood risk and the drainage regime should also be included in the ES.	SuDS features are presented in Figure 2.3 Proposed Works (TR010038/APP/6.2)
Paragraph 4.9.9 Ref 13.7.11 <i>Downstream effects</i>	The ES should describe the mitigation measures required for preventing significant effects occurring downstream of the Proposed Development and outside of the order limits. The ES should also state the efficacy of the mitigation measures used and how the measures will be secured through the DCO.	Mitigation measures proposed as part of the Proposed Scheme are detailed in Chapter 13 (TR010038/APP/6.1) and secured in the EMP (TR010038/APP/7.4)
Paragraph 4.9.10 Ref 13.7.12 <i>Aquatic ecology</i>	The ES should ensure the assessment of aquatic ecology includes appropriate cross references between the Road Drainage and Water Environment and the Biodiversity aspect chapters.	The assessment of aquatic ecology has been considered in both the Biodiversity Chapter (TR010038/APP/6.1) and the Road drainage and the water environment chapter (TR010038/APP/6.1)
Paragraph 4.9.11 Ref 13.7.15 <i>Demolition</i>	The ES should include a full assessment of the potential significant River Tud, and state any proposed mitigation measures, the efficacy of the mitigation measures, and how the measures will be secured through the DCO or other legal mechanism.	Chapter 13 provides a full assessment on the impact onto the River Tud and any required mitigation measures (TR010038/APP/6.1)
Paragraph 4.9.12 Ref 13.7.19 <i>Compensatory flood zone</i>	The ES should include a map/ figure depicting the location of the compensatory flood storage area and include justification for the chosen location of the compensatory flood storage area.	Compensatory flood storage areas are presented in Figure 2.3 Proposed Works (TR010038/APP/6.2). Justification for this proposed area is provided in Chapter 13 (TR010038/APP/6.1)

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 4.9.13 Ref 13.7.20 <i>Underground structures</i>	<p>The ES should assess significant effects associated with the effects that may arise from removal of the existing bridge across the construction and implementation of underground structures. If measures are required to mitigate significant effects, then the mitigation measure, their efficacy and how they will be secured should be included.</p> <p>If an underpass is proposed as part of the Proposed Development, the ES should include a full description of the underpass and a map/ figure depicting its location and dimensions.</p>	The existing River Tud bridge will not be removed as part of the Proposed Scheme.
Paragraph 4.9.14 Ref 13.8.7 <i>Drinking Water Protection Area (DrWPA)</i>	The Scoping Report infers that mitigation measures will be in place for DrWPA but no specific measures have been presented. The ES should describe mitigation measures in sufficient detail and describe how they address significant effects within the DrWPA.	Specific mitigation measures have been presented in the ES Chapter 13 <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b>
Paragraph 4.9.15 <i>Agricultural drainage regimes</i>	The ES should include an assessment to determine whether the Proposed Development will significantly affect agricultural field drainage regimes. If significant effects to agricultural field drainage regimes are likely to occur, then a full description of the mitigation measures, their efficacy, and how they will be secured through the DCO or other legal mechanism should be included in the ES.	The RDWE assessment considers the impact of the Proposed Scheme on agricultural field drains <b>(TR010038/APP/6.1)</b>
Paragraph 4.9.16 <i>Sequential and exception test</i>	As the Proposed Development is situated within Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b, sequential and exception tests should be undertaken and be submitted with the application documents, either within the ES or the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).	A FRA has been undertaken as part of the ES (Appendix 13.1) <b>(TR010038/APP/6.3)</b>
<b>4.10 Climate</b>		

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 4.10.1 Ref 14.7.5 <i>Climate change effects on construction of the Proposed Development</i>	The Inspectorate agrees that climate change effects on the construction of the Proposed Development can be scoped out of the ES due to the construction phase being relatively short term and unlikely to be significantly affected by climate change.	Noted. This approach has been continued through the EIA process.
<b>14 Combined and Cumulative Effects</b>		
Paragraph 4.11.1	No matters have been proposed to be scoped out of the assessment	Noted
Paragraph 4.11.2 Ref 15.3.2 and 15.6.1 <i>Consultation</i>	To inform the cumulative assessment, consultation with all relevant local authorities within the study area should be undertaken.	Consultation with the relevant local authorities has been undertaken as presented in Chapter 15 (Section 15.3) ( <b>TR010038/APP/6.1</b> ).
Paragraph 4.11.3 <i>Cumulative assessment</i>	The cumulative assessment should include the other developments identified within the People and Communities chapter of the Scoping Report.	All developments which could potentially cause a cumulative effect have been included, including those assessed in the population and human health chapter.
Paragraph 4.11.4 <i>Cumulative assessment</i>	The cumulative assessment should include the Norwich Link Road which is proposed to be built in proximity to the Proposed Development and may have an overlapping construction period with the Proposed Development.	Noted. The cumulative assessment includes the Norwich Western Link Road in the ES.
<b>4.12 Other aspects to be scoped out</b>		
Paragraph 4.12.1 Ref 1.8.2 <i>Major accidents and disasters</i>	The Inspectorate agrees that a separate assessment for major accidents and disasters can be scoped out of the ES. This is due to the information within Scoping Report Paragraph 1.8.2 and 1.8.4 that state the legal requirements, codes and standards the Proposed Development will adhere	Noted.



A47 NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON DUALLING  
 Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion Response Table

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	to, and that assessments of accidents will be embedded with other ES aspect chapters within the ES.	
Paragraph 4.12.2 Ref 1.9.2 <i>Heat and radiation</i>	The Inspectorate agrees that an assessment of heat and radiation can be scoped out of the ES as the Proposed Development is unlikely to cause significant heat and radiation effects to the surrounding environment.	Noted.