



**Application by Highways England for A47 North Tuddenham to Easton
The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)
Issued on 18 August 2021**

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information - ExQ1. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ2.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Annexe B to the Rule 6 letter of 6 July 2021. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 1 (indicating that it is from ExQ1) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on air quality and emissions issues is identified as Q2.0.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please contact A47NorthTuddenhamtoEaston@planninginspectorate.gov.uk and include 'ExQ1 – A47 North Tuddenham to Easton' in the subject line of your email.

Responses are due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021.

Abbreviations used:

PA2008	The Planning Act 2008	LPA	Local Planning Authority
Art	Article	MP	Model Provision (in the MP Order)
ALA 1981	Acquisition of Land Act 1981	MP Order	The Infrastructure Planning (Model Provisions) Order 2009
BoR	Book of Reference	NCC	Norfolk County Council
BC	Breckland Council	NE	Natural England
BDC	Broadland District Council	NPS	National Policy Statement
CA	Compulsory Acquisition	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
CPO	Compulsory purchase order	NWL	Norwich Western Link
dDCO	Draft DCO	R	Requirement
EA	Environment Agency	RR	Relevant Representation
EM	Explanatory Memorandum	SI	Statutory Instrument
ES	Environmental Statement	SNC	South Norfolk Council
ExA	Examining Authority	SoS	Secretary of State
HE	Historic England	TP	Temporary Possession
LIR	Local Impact Report		

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR010038/TR010038-000251-Examination%20Library%20-%20PDF%20Version%20-%20A47NTE.pdf>



It will be updated as the Examination progresses.

Citation of Questions

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, eg ExQ1.0.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



Index

1. General and Cross-topic Questions.....	5
2. Air Quality and Emissions.....	6
3. Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))	8
4. Climate.....	11
5. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations.....	12
6. Cumulative Effects.....	14
7. Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	15
8. Geology and soils.....	20
9. Historic Environment	21
10. Landscape and Visual.....	23
11. Material Assets and Waste	25
12. Noise and Vibration	25
13. Population and human health.....	27
14. Transportation and Traffic	29
15. Water Environment.....	29

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.	General and Cross-topic Questions	
Q1.0.1	The Applicant	How would the Proposed Development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meet the requirements to deliver 'good design' in accordance with paragraphs 4.28 to 4.35 of the National Networks NPS; and • satisfy the National Infrastructure Commission's Design Principles for National Infrastructure?
Q1.0.2	The Applicant	'The Road to Good Design' describes the role of Highways England's Strategic Design Panel as overseeing the independent design review of individual Highways England projects. To what extent has the Strategic Design Panel been involved in the design of the Proposed Development and in particular new interchanges / junctions, bridges and underpasses? Is the Panel likely to be involved in reviewing detailed design proposals? If so, how would their comments be presented to the ExA?
Q1.0.3	The Applicant	Under the general heading of Legislative and policy framework, Chapter 1 of the ES [APP-040] refers to various elements of Highways England Policy. Being the Applicant's own guidance and standards, what weight would the Applicant suggest these documents are given?
Q1.0.4	The Applicant	Scheme objectives are set out in paragraph 2.2 of Chapter 2, The Proposed Scheme [APP-041]. How were these objectives determined? Why is there no specific reference to the delivery of good design?
Q1.0.5	The Applicant	Please provide a table setting out the maximum parameters of the Proposed Development to understand what maximum parameters have been assessed within each aspect of the ES Chapter.
Q1.0.6	The Applicant	Comments have been submitted from Interested Parties (IPs) with regards to the design of the proposed Wood Lane Junction. Please provide details of alternatives considered and explain how and why the design approach as submitted was determined.
Q1.0.7	The Applicant	The Wood Lane Junction makes provision for a new link to the Norwich Western Link (NWL). Please explain what assumptions have been made with regards to the delivery of the NWL in terms of the scheme design and supporting modelling. Should the NWL not be delivered or be delayed, what would the implications be for the surrounding road network?

ExQ1: 18 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.0.8	The Applicant	The construction programme is set out in Table 2.1 of ES Chapter 2 [APP-041] and identifies that construction is anticipated to take approximately 23 months. Please provide an additional table which identifies the Works reference numbers to be carried out during each phase of the construction programme to help understand the timescale of the Works listed in Schedule 1 of the dDCO [APP-017].
Q1.0.9	The Applicant	The construction compound duration in Table 2.2 of ES Chapter 2 does not match with that in Table 2.1 as they are anticipated to be present/in use for 32 months but decommissioned in month 23. A longer duration may require additional assessment/modelling work. Please clarify this discrepancy.
Q1.0.10	The Applicant	What level of contingency has been built into the programme and what would be the implications for the various assessments, should the programme be delayed?
Q1.0.11	The Applicant	Paragraph 2.6.22 of ES Chapter 2 [APP-041] states that all imported materials would arrive to the site via the existing A47 (50/50 distribution from east and west) with approximately 50 to 150 Heavy Goods Vehicles accessing the site each day over the construction period. Some deliveries will arrive as Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) but the number of movements as AILs are not specified. Can the Applicant clarify the number of movements of AILs that it anticipates will be accessing the Proposed Development site over the assessment period and confirm that this has been taken into account in the assessment of the worst case scenario presented in the ES?
Q1.0.12	The Applicant	The ES refers to the need for utility diversions in paragraphs 2.6.37 to 2.6.41 but it is unclear regarding the length and likely location of any utility diversions. Although their limits of deviation are shown as limit of deviation along with other minor works on the Works Plans please describe their length and other likely dimensions. Please confirm that these diversions have been included as part of the assessment of likely effects arising from the Proposed Development
Q1.0.13	The Applicant	The Applicant should provide a list of all plans and other documents that will require Secretary of State (SoS) certification (including plan / document references). This should be updated throughout the Examination process for ease of tracking document versions and a final list supplied to the ExA before the close of the Examination.

2. Air Quality and Emissions

ExQ1: 18 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q2.0.1	The Applicant	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-044], paragraph 4.3.1 makes reference to potential changes to legislative requirements in Autumn 2021. Please explain what the likely implications are and how this effects the assessments. Has any sensitivity testing been undertaken? If not, please explain.
Q2.0.2	The Applicant	In Table 2.2 of ES Chapter 2[APP-041] the construction compound is anticipated to be present/in use for 32 months but decommissioned in month 23. Can the Applicant justify the assumption made in paragraphs 5.4.5 to 5.4.7 of ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-044] that construction traffic air quality impacts are unlikely to lead to significant effects if the construction period is under 2 years in duration and provide evidence that will ensure the construction period will not extend beyond 2 years, potentially triggering significant effects? How confident can the ExA be that the construction programme would not be subject to delays to take it beyond two years?
Q2.0.3	The Applicant	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-044] paragraph 5.4.8, please provide further explanation as to why 2015 represents the baseline year. Can the ExA be confident that there have been no substantial changes within the intervening period?
Q2.0.4	The Applicant	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-044] paragraph 5.4.9 observed that only those instances where PM10 in the baseline year have been assessed. Given the baseline year is 2015, how confident can the ExA be that no exceedances have occurred since the baseline period?
Q2.0.5	NCC, BC, BDC, SNC	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-044] paragraph 5.4.10, are the parties happy with the approach taken with regards to PM2.5? If not, please explain.
Q2.0.6	The Applicant	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-044], paragraph 5.4.12, states that the opening year represents the worst case in terms of air quality impacts. Please explain and provide further justification for this statement.
Q2.0.7	The Applicant	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-044], paragraph 5.4.26, states that consultation was undertaken with Highways England specialists. Please explain what other consultation took place to inform the air quality assessment, such as agreement on receptors, methodology etc? How were the results of this consultation reflected in the final assessment?

ExQ1: 18 August 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q2.0.8	NCC, BC, BDC, SNC	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-044], paragraph 5.4.39 states that professional judgement was used when selecting the ecological receptors. Are the parties satisfied that this approach has identified all the appropriate receptors?
Q2.0.9	The Applicant	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-044], paragraph 5.5.1 states that using 2015 baseline data adds extra uncertainty as traffic flows and background concentrations will not be representative of the current climate. Please comment on the appropriateness of this approach and the implications for the assessment.
Q2.0.10	The Applicant	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-044], paragraph 5.5.1, has any sensitivity testing/analysis been undertaken on the results to ensure robustness and address the identified assumptions and limitations. If so what, if not why?
Q2.0.11	NCC, BC, BDC, SNC	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-044], section 5.7, Baseline conditions, are the parties satisfied that this provides an accurate assessment of the current conditions? If not, please explain why.
Q2.0.12	The Applicant	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-044], paragraph 5.8.20, are these trees either within the Applicants control or protected? What would be the implications should these trees be removed? Please explain why only a desk-based review was considered sufficient?
Q2.0.13	The Applicant	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-044], paragraph 5.11.1, given the importance placed by the UK Government on improving air quality and the potential for future changes to limit values, please provide further justification as to why no additional monitoring is proposed.
Q2.0.14	The Applicant	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-044], paragraph 5.12.5, please explain what new tools have been made available and what the likely changes would have been had these new tools been utilised.
3. Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))		
Q3.0.1	NE, NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	Can the parties comment on the approach taken by the Applicant in its HRA Report [APP-139] and confirm whether it is satisfactory? If not, please explain why.
Q3.0.2	The Applicant	ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-047], paragraph 8.4.13, should consideration be given to the in-combination effects of the proposed development with the NWL. If so, please explain what these would be. If not, why not?

ExQ1: 18 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q3.0.3	The Applicant	ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-047], paragraph 8.4.20, is the Applicant able to provide an update on these discussions, especially in light of a number of comments raised in the Relevant Representations with regards to bats and the NWL? It would be helpful to the ExA if there can be a regular provision of updates on these discussions during the course of the Examination.
Q3.0.4	NE, NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-047], Section 8.7, Baseline conditions, are the parties satisfied that this section provides an accurate and robust assessment of the baseline conditions. If not, why not?
Q3.0.5	The Applicant NE, NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-047], Table 8.3, please confirm that all the surveys are still valid and in-date and can therefore be relied upon by the ExA during the course of the Examination and Recommendation stage. If not, please explain what is required to address them.
Q3.0.6	NE, NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-047], paragraph 8.8.6, please confirm that you are content with the approach and the justification and evidence for it? If not, please explain why.
Q3.0.7	The Applicant	ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-047], would the Proposed Development result in an overall biodiversity net gain and if so, to what extent?
Q3.0.8	The Applicant	With regards to the Great Crested Newt (GCN) translocation sites, how long is this envisaged to take, has this been built into the construction programme and the assumptions with regards to start of construction? What contingency has been allowed for should the translocation take longer than anticipated?
Q3.0.9	The Applicant	ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-047], paragraph 8.11.4, identifies that further barn owl surveys should be conducted in 2021. Please update the ExA on the progress of these.
Q3.0.10	The Applicant	ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-047], paragraph 8.11.6 refers to crossing points and identifies that if a reduction in numbers crossing is observed, further mitigation will be required. Please provide further explanation of this, including at what level would further mitigation be required and what form would this mitigation take?
Q3.0.11	NE, NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-047], in general, are the parties content with the proposed receptor sites? If not, why not.

ExQ1: 18 August 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q3.0.12	The Applicant	ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-047] Table 8.14, impacts on Barn Owls are described as being moderate adverse, but once landowner mitigation is agreed, this would change to slight adverse. Please update the ExA on the progress of these discussions.
Q3.0.13	The Applicant	ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-047] Table 8.14 identifies that there would be a large adverse and thus a significant residual effect on bats. Please provide further justification to demonstrate that all potential options have been fully explored to mitigate such effects?
Q3.0.14	The Applicant NE, NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-047], paragraph 8.12.2 states that the underpasses on the Proposed Scheme are not directly on existing bat flight paths as that could not be designed into the Proposed Scheme but will have planting to encourage bats to use them. Please provide further justification to explain this statement. Are NE, NCC, BC, BDC and SNC satisfied with this approach?
Q3.0.15	The Applicant	Can the Applicant signpost to where an in-combination assessment of effects arising from Sheringham and Dudgeon Extension Offshore Wind Farm has been undertaken, or explain how this site has been screened out? Where necessary an updated HRA in combination assessment should be provided.
Q3.0.16	The Applicant	The Proposed Development is located within the 6km radius Core Sustenance Zone of a nationally important 'super-colony' of a very rare Annex II bat species, the western barbastelle (<i>Barbastella barbastellus</i>). This super-colony is located in the Ringland/Attlebridge/Weston Longville/Lenwade area and includes a known 77 confirmed barbastelle roosts (to date - located from radio-tracking), one of which is the largest known extant barbastelle roost in the country. The area exceeds criteria for Special Area of Conservation designation and as such should be treated in the same manner. (Wild Wings Ecology [RR-084]). Norfolk County Council (NCC) [RR-061] states that the bat activity survey area (all species) was up to 1km from the DCO boundary. NCC states that in its comments in response to the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, it requested that bat survey work should consider in-combination impacts with the NWL and that it should be acknowledged that core sustenance zones for bats varies with species (6km for barbastelles). NCC went on to note that the Core Sustenance Zones for Barbastelle bats is 6km away and there is moderate confidence in zone size. There is a known colony of bats at Morton-on-the-Hill which is less than 6km from the site. Can the Applicant comment on whether they have consulted with relevant consultees on the potential effects of the Proposed Development on the colonies of barbastelle bat

ExQ1: 18 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		species as highlighted by Norfolk County Council and Wild Wings Ecology in their relevant representations and clarify whether these colonies were considered as part of the Habitats Regulations Assessment.
4. Climate		
Q4.0.1	The Applicant	ES Chapter 14: Climate [APP-053], paragraph 14.3.3 refers to the publication of the sixth Carbon Budget to be published in June 2021. This is now available. An assessment and conclusion of likely significant effects should be provided against this budget. In addition, a conclusion should be drawn regarding emissions during subsequent carbon budgets periods based on worst case assumptions.
Q4.0.2	The Applicant	ES Chapter 14: Climate [APP-053], paragraph 14.3.8, confirmation has now been made that this date is 2030. Please explain how this change alters the conclusions of the assessment.
Q4.0.3	The Applicant NE NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 14: Climate [APP-053], paragraph 14.4.3, can the Applicant explain why no further consultation has taken place? Are NE, NCC, BC, BDC and SNC satisfied with approach?
Q4.0.4	The Applicant	ES Chapter 14: Climate [APP-053] paragraph 14.4.8, please explain what the Applicant considers the level of material impact to be?
Q4.0.5	The Applicant	ES Chapter 14: Climate [APP-053] paragraph 14.5.1, please explain why some assumptions cannot be made? Does the Applicant not have information available from other developments that could be used to provide a benchmark?
Q4.0.6	The Applicant NE NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 14: Climate [APP-053] paragraph 14.5.2 please explain what levels of maintenance are expected? Are NE, NCC, BC, BDC and SNC satisfied with approach?
Q4.0.7	The Applicant	ES Chapter 14: Climate [APP-053] paragraph 14.5.4, please clarify how this has been calculated?
Q4.0.8	The Applicant	ES Chapter 14: Climate [APP-053] Table 14.6, please provide more explanation of the figures, how they are calculated and what assumptions underly them?

ExQ1: 18 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q4.0.9	The Applicant	ES Chapter 14: Climate [APP-053] paragraph 4.8.5, do these figures include changes to vehicle types as outlined in paragraph 14.3.8? What are the assumptions behind the do-something figures?
Q4.0.10	The Applicant	A number of the RRs highlight the that on 1 May 2019, the UK Government declared a climate emergency and that the proposed development will significantly increase carbon emissions and undermine efforts to reach net zero carbon emissions by 2050 (Climate Change Act 2008). Please provide a response.
Q4.0.11	The Applicant	A number of RRs and a number of the responses received at Preliminary Deadlines A and B consider that there is a need to include an in-combination assessment of the proposed development with other A47 projects, along with other road development in the locality. Please provide a response.
Q4.0.12	The Applicant	Environmental Statement Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects Assessment [APP-054], Table 15-1, states the construction and operational phase traffic data includes traffic associated with other developments and that the emissions assessment reported within the climate chapter is therefore inherently cumulative. However, this does not account for other sources of emissions, for example, through the use of construction materials such as cement and the use of construction machinery as outlined in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 114 Table 3.11.1. Considering the requirements of the NNNPS and paragraphs 3.21.1 and 3.21.2 of DMRB LA 104 guidance applied to the cumulative assessment, can the Applicant either further justify an omission of cumulative effects on climate or provide such an assessment.
5.	Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations	
Q5.0.1	The Applicant	The Book of Reference (BoR) [APP-023] includes several Statutory Undertakers with interests in land. Can the Applicant: a) Provide a progress report on negotiations with each of the Statutory Undertakers listed in the BoR, with an estimate of the timescale for securing agreement with them; b) Indicate whether there are any envisaged impediments to the securing of such agreements; and c) State whether any additional Statutory Undertakers have been identified since the submission of the BoR with the application.

ExQ1: 18 August 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q5.0.2	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.11.3 of the Statement of Reasons (SoR) [APP-021] states that the Applicant has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land take and securing sufficient land to ensure delivery of the Scheme. Please provide evidence to support this statement.
Q5.0.3	The Applicant	What assurance and evidence can the Applicant provide of the accuracy of the land interests identified as submitted and indicate whether there are likely to be any changes to the land interests, including the identification of further owners/interests or monitoring and update of changes in interests?
Q5.0.4	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.15.3 of the SoR [APP-021] makes reference to seeking to acquire by negotiation, please provide regular updates on the progress of these negotiations.
Q5.0.5	BDC	At paragraph 4.17.11 of the SoR [APP-021], the Applicant does not consider the presence of the unimplemented Local Development Order to be a risk or an impediment to the Scheme. What is BDC's view of this statement?
Q5.0.6	The Applicant	In the summary, paragraph 8.1.2 of the SoR [APP-021] states that there is a compelling case in the public interest for CA. Please address the following: a) What assessment, if any, has been made of the effect upon individual Affected Persons and their private loss that would result from the exercise of CA powers in each case?; b) How has it been demonstrated within the application that the public benefits of the scheme outweigh any residual adverse effects including private loss suffered by individual landowners and occupiers?; and c) Demonstrate how such a conclusion has been reached and how the balancing exercise between public benefit and private loss has been carried out?
Q5.0.7	The Applicant	Paragraph 5.1.14 of the SoR [APP-021] refers to most appropriate option. Please explain and expand on this, and how did land acquisition feature within the decision-making process?
Q5.0.8	The Applicant	Section 6 of the SoR [APP-021] addresses human rights. Where is it demonstrated that interference with human rights in this case would be proportionate and justified? How has the proportionality test been undertaken and explain how this approach has been undertaken in relation to individual plots?
Q5.0.9	The Applicant	Reference is made with the SoR [APP-021] to The Land over which compulsory acquisition powers are sought as set out in the draft DCO is the minimum necessary to ensure the

ExQ1: 18 August 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		delivery of the Scheme (6.1.7). How does this statement sit with the RRs on behalf of the owners of Berry Farm Estate [RR-075]?
Q5.0.10	The Applicant	Please review Section 7.6 of the SoR [APP-021] in light of the submission from Berry Farm Estate [RR-075]?
Q5.0.11	The Applicant	Given that at Paragraph 7.1.3 of the SoR [APP-021], reference is made to no consultation having been taken place with the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs or the Ministry of Defence, please provide further evidence and justification to support the conclusion in paragraph 7.1.4 that these interests do not present an impediment for the Scheme.
Q5.0.12	The Applicant	The former Department for Communities and Local Government published guidance related to procedures for CA (September 2013) in Planning Act 2008: procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land. This states that <i>"Applicants should be able to demonstrate that adequate funding is likely to be available to enable the compulsory acquisition within the statutory period following the order being made, and that the resource implications of a possible acquisition resulting from a blight notice have been taken account of."</i> The Funding Statement [APP-022] does not identify the CA costs separately from the project costs or explain in detail how a figure for CA costs was arrived at. Please clarify further the anticipated cost of CA and how this figure has been estimated.
Q5.0.13	The Applicant	The Applicant is requested to complete the annexed Compulsory Acquisitions Objections Schedule (Annex A) and to make any entries that it believes would be appropriate, and at each successive deadline to make any new entries or delete any entries that it considers would be appropriate, taking account of the positions expressed in Relevant Representations and Written Representations, and giving reasons for any additions.
6. Cumulative Effects		
Q6.0.1	NE, HE, NCC, BC, BDC, SNC	Are the parties satisfied with the Applicant's cumulative effects assessment and the shortlist of projects considered, as set out in Appendix 15.2 [APP-133]. If not, please explain why.
Q6.0.2	The Applicant	Please review Appendix 15.1 [APP-132] as there appear to be a number of developments which have an uncertainty level of 'more than likely', but are attributed Tier 3, whereas

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		others are attributed Tier 1. Please review and confirm that all entries accord with Table 2 of Advice Note 17.
7. Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)		
Q7.0.1	The Applicant	Please supply subsequent versions of the dDCO in both .pdf and Word formats and in two versions, with the first forming the latest consolidated draft and the second showing changes from the previous version in tracked changes, along with comments/explanations outlining the reason for the change. The consolidated draft version in Word is to be supported by a report validating that version of the dDCO as being in the SI template and with updated revision numbers.
Q7.0.2	The Applicant	The Applicant is asked to ensure that all application or subsequent plans and documents referred to in the dDCO in whatever provision are identified by Drawing or Document and Revision Numbers in subsequent versions of the dDCO. Where revisions are prepared to plans and documents, these should be reflected in the latest version of the dDCO. The Applicant should undertake a final audit of plans and documents referred to in the dDCO prior to submitting its final preferred dDCO to the Examination. Where it is necessary to refer to document numbers the Applicant should use the Examination Library system.
Q7.0.3	The Applicant	The Applicant should confirm that Schedule 10 (Documents to be Certified) will be updated in each subsequent version of the dDCO provided during the Examination. This should accompany an update to the Applicant's Guide to the Application [AS-010] recording the latest version of each plan and documents.
Q7.0.4	The Applicant	Please demonstrate that the 'associated development' meets the guidance provided by the SOS.
Q7.0.5	The Applicant	Interpretation 2(1) – this defines commencement but excludes the laying of cables and site clearance. How does this fit with retained elements/protection of archaeology and biodiversity interests? Please explain and justify.
Q7.0.6	The Applicant	Art 2: The definition of "maintain" is not as clear as it could be particularly in relation to the interface with the ES. The definition should make it clear that any of the activities classed as maintenance can only be carried out if they do not give rise to any materially new or different environmental effects to those identified in the ES.

ExQ1: 18 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q7.0.7	The Applicant	Please review the dDCO to ensure that 'Book of Reference' is consistently referred to with capitals.
Q7.0.8	The Applicant	Please review the dDCO to ensure that 'Environmental Statement' is constantly referred to with capitals.
Q7.0.9	The Applicant	Article 2(3) please confirm that this approach is reflected within the assessments undertaken within the ES.
Q7.0.10	The Applicant	Art 7: Please explain why this article is required and what is the likelihood of the Applicant needing to secure a planning permission within the Order limits for development not associated with the Proposed Development?
Q7.0.11	The Applicant	Art 8: Have these limits been assessed within the ES and if so, explain and demonstrate how. Please justify the provision for exceedances beyond the stated vertical limits of deviation.
Q7.0.12	The Applicant	Art 10: This Article appears to be drafted in such a way that it gives the Applicant the power to transfer or grant to these entities for the purposes of carrying out the Works listed in sub-section 4. The EM suggests that the intention is to allow these entities to move their own apparatus where this needs to be diverted for the NSIP. However, the relevant Works (as set out in Schedule 1) would appear to be far wider than this. This Article should be modified to limit the transfer/grant for the (limited) purposes set out in the EM and not for the entirety of the relevant Works.
Q7.0.13	The Applicant	Neither Art 11(4) nor the EM identify the specific streets to which this provision applies. Should it and, if not, why not?
Q7.0.14	NCC	Art 12(1): It includes wording ' <i>the highway including any culverts or other structures laid under it must be maintained by and at the expense of the local highway authority from its completion with the exception of the culvert to be delivered as Work No. 5' – are NCC happy with this?</i>
Q7.0.15	The Applicant	Art 12 (6): There appears to be words missing from within the third line, where it states ' <i>(being those elements over the waterproofing membrane and)</i> ..'. Please review and update as necessary.

ExQ1: 18 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q7.0.16	The Applicant	Art 13 (4): This sets speed limits for specified roads. Have these speed limits been the basis for the ES assessments and if so, how?
Q7.0.17	The Applicant	Art 13(6): This includes the words ' <i>unless otherwise agreed in writing with the relevant planning authority</i> '. Please justify what these circumstances may be and would result in the footpaths, cycle tracks, footways and bridleways not being constructed in the specified locations?
Q7.0.18	The Applicant	Art 13(7): The explanation for this in the EM is noted, but should this not include some agreement or consultation with the developer of the NWL to ensure delivery of this element? More justification is required, along with a better indication/undertaking to provide certainty over its delivery.
Q7.0.19	The Applicant	Art 14: This is a wide power – authorising alteration etc. of any street within the Order limits. It should be clear why this power is necessary. Has consideration been given to whether or not it should be limited to identified streets?
Q7.0.20	The Applicant	Art 14: The EM refers to a period of 28 days, yet there appears to be no such wording in the dDCO. Please clarify and confirm.
Q7.0.21	The Applicant NCC	Art 15 Street works: Should this article be restricted to specific streets set out in a Schedule? Should it confirm that the power is "without the consent of the street authority"? Should the powers be exercised with the consent of the street authority subject to consultation? What is the view of NCC in respect of this Article?
Q7.0.22	NCC	Art 16 (6): Are NCC happy with a period of 28 days.
Q7.0.23	The Applicant	Art 22: In justification of this article, please indicate which buildings may require protective works and why? How does this relate to the scope of commencement defined in Art 2?
Q7.0.24	The Applicant	Art 26: The EM states that this article sets a 5 year time limit on the power of Highways England to take temporary possession of land, although it does not prevent Highways England from remaining in possession of land after that time if it took possession within the 5 year limit. What is the rationale for the power to remain in temporary possession of land after the initial 5-year period has expired?

ExQ1: 18 August 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q7.0.25	The Applicant	Art 27: The EM at paragraph 4.99 refers to Paragraph (5), but there are only 4 listed within the dDCO, please clarify and amend accordingly.
Q7.0.26	The Applicant	Art 27: The EM at 4.97 identifies that Paragraph (2) provides that the power to impose restrictive covenants under paragraph (1) is exercisable only in respect of plots specified in column (1) of Schedule 3. This does not appear to be reflected in the dDCO. Please clarify and amend accordingly.
Q7.0.27	NCC	Art 28: Are NCC content with a period of 28 days?
Q7.0.28	The Applicant	Art 34(1): References to "that land" in (b) and (c) should specify that this is as referred to in sub-paragraph (a). Art 34(1)(d) refers to "mitigation works". This phrase does not appear in the definitions, nor is any further explanation given in the EM. The phrase should either be defined or an explanation of the need for these works/this power provided within the EM.
Q7.0.29	The Applicant	Art 37: The SoS will be unable to authorise removal or repositioning of apparatus unless satisfied that the extinguishment or removal is necessary for the purpose of carrying out the development to which the order relates in accordance with section 138 of the Planning Act 2008. Justification is needed to show that extinguishment or removal is necessary.
Q7.0.30	The Applicant	Art 39: As this is not taken from the Model Provisions, further qualification and justification in relation to this application is required.
Q7.0.31	The Applicant	Art 40(1): This uses the phrase "... any tree or shrub within or overhanging land within the Order limits" but the EM uses "... any tree or shrub that is near the project". Please clarify and amend accordingly.
Q7.0.32	The Applicant	Art 40(4)(c): The Applicant has identified the hedgerows to be removed in Part 1 of Schedule. 8. The EM should explain why the additional general power in Article 40 (4)(c) is required.
Q7.0.33	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	Art41: What are the respective parties views of the imposition of a date of 24 July 2020?
Q7.0.34	The Applicant	Art 42: The EM should explain why this power is required in the context of the Proposed Development.
Q7.0.35	The Applicant	Art 49: Further justification for the use of consecrated grounds is required and whether alternatives were considered to avoid its use. If they were, please explain and provide

ExQ1: 18 August 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		justification as to why they were deemed unsuitable. It is claimed that the area is unused, however evidence should be provided to confirm this and that there is no intention to use the land prior to the commencement of development.
Q7.0.36	The Applicant	Art 51: Should the certified plans and documents be made publicly available? If so, how should this be delivered, and for what length of time?
Q7.0.37	The Applicant	Art 53: Please clarify the reason why it would fall on the President of the Institution of Civil Engineers to appoint an arbitrator should parties not agree on one?
Questions / comments relating to Requirements (R):		
Q7.0.38	The Applicant	R3: Should this requirement make provision for the detailed design of some aspects of the Proposed Development to be submitted to and approved by the SoS after consultation with relevant parties (for example Easton Footbridge, given that this would be a prominent feature)?
Q7.0.39	The Applicant	R4(1): Should this specify any other consultees, such as the EA? (The ExA also notes that the EA requests to be a named consultee on this requirement within its RR [RR-033]).
Q7.0.40	The Applicant	R6: Please review the RR from the EA [RR-033] and amend accordingly.
Q7.0.41	The Applicant	R8: Should this requirement make provision for the long-term management and maintenance of surface and foul water drainage systems?
Q7.0.42	The Applicant	R8: Should this specify any other consultees, such as the EA? (The ExA also notes that the EA requests to be a named consultee on this requirement within its RR [RR-033]).
Q7.0.43	The Applicant	R9: Should this include a reference to consultation with Historic England (HE) and NCC on the written scheme of investigation?
Q7.0.44	The Applicant	R9: Should this requirement make provision for the reporting and publishing of data?
Q7.0.45	The Applicant	R10: Should the word constructed be replaced with the word implemented?
Q7.0.46	The Applicant	R11: As written this is difficult to understand and interpret. Please review and amend accordingly.

ExQ1: 18 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q7.0.47	The Applicant	R12: Work Nos 56 and 97 identify a number of ponds within their description. It would be clearer and more precise, if the Requirement referred to the specific ponds covered by this requirement. Should this Requirement make provision for the long-term management and maintenance of these ponds?
Q7.0.48	The Applicant	R15(2): Why is it considered appropriate for the agreement of the SoS to be deemed after the period specified?
Q7.0.49	The Applicant	R18: Please provide more explanation and justification for this requirement.
Q7.0.50	NCC	R19: Do the parties consider 10 business days sufficient time to respond to consultation on the discharge of requirements?
8. Geology and soils		
Q8.0.1	The Applicant	ES Chapter 9: Geology and Soils [APP-048], table 9.12, identifies that the loss of Agricultural Land Classification Grade 2 would be moderate adverse, due to the amount, with the loss of Grade 3a being major adverse because the amount would exceed 20ha. Given that both classifications fall within the Best and Most Versatile category identified in 9.7.14, what is the rationale for splitting these two categories in terms of assessing the magnitude? Please also review Table 9.13 in light of this question.
Q8.0.2	The Applicant	ES Chapter 9: Geology and Soils [APP-048], paragraph 9.9.5 states that the key principle considered to minimise effects on soils is to ensure that the footprint of the Proposed Scheme is reduced as much as practicable, without adversely affecting the design. Please demonstrate how this principle was achieved.
Q8.0.3	The Applicant	ES Chapter 9: Geology and Soils [APP-048], paragraph 9.9.13 identifies that where there are excess soils generated, these will be saved and reused outside the Proposed Scheme where there are opportunities to do so. Please explain this statement in more detail, including where will soil be stored until required and what are the implications of moving the soil? Have these storage areas and movements formed part of other assessment work? If so how, if not, why not?
Q8.0.4	The Applicant	ES Chapter 9: Geology and Soils [APP-048], Table 9-13 identifies large adverse significance for Grade 2 soils and very large adverse for Grade 3a. Given paragraph 9.4.20 which identifies that residual effects that are of moderate, large or very large

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		significance will give rise to significant effects, please explain and clarify whether the construction impacts presented in Table 9-13 are significant?
9.	Historic Environment	
Q9.0.1	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage (APP-045), paragraphs 6.4.15/16 – were the locations and the methods for initial surveys subject to consultation and agreed with relevant parties? If so, please provide evidence to demonstrate this.
Q9.0.2	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage (APP-045), paragraph 6.5.5 states that the final archaeological trenching report will not be available till a later date. Will this be made available during the course of the Examination, and if not, what are the implications for this?
Q9.0.3	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage (APP-045), paragraph 6.5.6 what assumptions have been made and which locations do they apply to? Has the applicant any intention of revisiting these locations during the course of the Examination? If not, why not?
Q9.0.4	HE, NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], Section 6.7, identifies the baseline conditions. Are BC, SNC, BDC, NCC and HE in agreement with this list and the overall assessment of effects on these?
Q9.0.5	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], paragraph 6.7.54 identifies that it must be assumed that the remainder of both the surveyed and un-surveyed land retains further archaeological potential. Is the Applicant proposing any further work during the examination to assess these areas and if not, why not?
Q9.0.6	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], paragraph 6.8.10 refers to low possibility of further unknown and unrecorded burials outside of the modern boundary of the churchyard. What evidence has been used to come to this view?
Q9.0.7	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], paragraph 6.8.11, as there is no detailed design for the bridge, please explain how this assessment was undertaken and justify the magnitude of impact?
Q9.0.8	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], paragraph 6.8.13 identifies that the proposal would have a major adverse effect upon St Andrew's Church, what alternatives were considered by the applicant and what mitigation is proposed?

ExQ1: 18 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q9.0.9	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], paragraph 6.8.14, what is the justification for the loss of the estate fencing and wall of Church Farm? What alternatives were considered to avoid its loss?
Q9.0.10	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], paragraph 6.8.24 refers to the operational impacts on St Peter's Church, please explain and justify how and why the impact would improve in the long-term?
Q9.0.11	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], paragraph 6.9.15 states that monitoring for vibration is not strictly necessary? Please explain and justify this, especially given the contents of paragraphs 6.8.5 and 6.8.6. How does the Applicant propose to ensure this monitoring is secured?
Q9.0.12	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], Section 6.9, sets out a number of mitigation and enhancement measures. Please clarify how these are proposed to be secured?
Q9.0.13	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], paragraph 6.9.16, what measures are in place, should unexpected burials be encountered? What is the process for dealing with any finds and how would this impact upon the scheme and its timescale for delivery?
Q9.0.14	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], paragraphs 6.9.17 and 18, has there been any discussion with HE with regards to the suitability for listing of the milestones?
Q9.0.15	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], paragraph 6.9.19, is this area shown on a plan, if so, what is the reference, and if not, could it?
Q9.0.16	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], paragraph 6.9.22, how long are these pre-commencement activities expected to take?
Q9.0.17	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], given the sensitivity of St Peter's Church and St Andrew's Church, please explain what the lighting proposals are in their vicinity?
Q9.0.18	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], paragraph 6.11.1, will the measures for monitoring be agreed during the course of the Examination?
Q9.0.19		ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], please review the RR from the owner of Berry Hall [Ref-075] and their reference to the need to assess the impact of the proposals upon the wider Berry Hall Estate. Please provide further assessment in this regard.

ExQ1: 18 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q9.0.20	The Applicant	The National Networks NPS differentiates between 'substantial harm' and 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of designated heritage assets. Please qualify any harm that would arise to the significance of designated heritage assets having regard to these categories. Please also carry out the appropriate balancing exercise with regards to weighing the impacts against public benefits.
Q9.0.21	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], the RR from NCC [RR-061] raises a question that the proposal does not appear to be designed to retain pedestrian access to St Andrew's Church via the existing lychgate. Please review and clarify.
Q9.0.22	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-045], reference is made in the RRs from BDC [RR-008] to the lack of reference to a C19 lodge to Honingham Hall (to the east of St Andrew's Church) which BDC considers to be of sufficient heritage and architectural interest to be a non-designated heritage asset. Please review and clarify.
10. Landscape and Visual		
Q10.0.1	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-046], Are the Council's satisfied that the viewpoints and photomontage locations selected (as shown on ES Figure 7.5 [APP-093]) are adequately representative of the Proposed Development?
Q10.0.2	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	Are the parties satisfied with the Environmental Masterplan [APP-138] and the indicative proposals shown for the Proposed Development?
Q10.0.3	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-046], Are the Council's satisfied with the Applicant's approach to defining the baseline conditions?
Q10.0.4	The Applicant NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-046], what level of lighting/height/numbers etc was assessed. How does this compare to the existing situation? Are the parties happy with this?
Q10.0.5	The Applicant	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-046], Please explain how the form and design of the new bridge at Easton has been considered to minimise landscape and visual effects.

ExQ1: 18 August 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q10.0.6	The Applicant	Given that the bridge would be a visible feature of the Proposed Development, should there be a requirement within the dDCO for its detailed design, in consultation with BDC and / or subject to design review by Highway England's Strategic Design Panel?
Q10.0.7	The Applicant	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-046], 7.4.10, are these assessment dates reasonable and do they reflect the approach taken in other chapters?
Q10.0.8	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-046], 7.6.2 – are the parties content that 1km from the DCO boundary is sufficient for assessment purposes?
Q10.0.9	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-046], 7.7 Baseline Conditions – are the parties satisfied that the assessment provides an accurate evaluation of the existing baseline conditions? If not, please explain where it is lacking
Q10.0.10	The Applicant	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-046], 7.7.33, given that paragraph 7.7.32 identifies that ' <i>As the existing extent of lighting is concentrated around Easton, Hockering and Honingham, the surrounding areas are susceptible to a spread or coalescence of lighting beyond existing limits</i> ', please explain and justify why, in 7.3.33, the night-time context around settlements is considered to be of low sensitivity?
Q10.0.11	The Applicant NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-046], 7.7.35, please provide further explanation as to how the 20 viewpoints were selected and were any proposed locations discounted? What level of input was received from the Councils over their selection? Are the Councils happy that the viewpoints are representative?
Q10.0.12	The Applicant	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-046], paragraph 7.8.5, 2 nd Bullet point refers to the design of the flood attenuation basins having been consulted with the landscape. Please explain and review this.
Q10.0.13	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-046], Table 7.6 - are the assumptions around tree heights for Yr15 reasonable? If not, please explain.
Q10.0.14	The Applicant	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-046], what measures does the applicant intend to put in place to monitor the mitigation and for how long? In instances where new planting fails, how will this be rectified?

ExQ1: 18 August 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q10.0.15	The Applicant	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-046], 7.10.60 – on Drawing No. HE551489-GTY-ELS-000-DR-LX-30022 R11 is showing slight or neutral for 15yr, yet the text at 7.10.60, refers to it as large adverse. Please review and amend accordingly.
11. Material Assets and Waste		
Q11.0.1	NCC	ES Chapter 10: Material assets and waste [APP-049], identifies that the Proposed Development intersects part of a known sand and gravel reserve (Mineral Safeguarding Area) as shown in Norfolk County Council's mineral safeguarding area mapping. Does NCC consider that this designation has any implications for the Proposed Development and if so, what?
Q11.0.2	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 10: Material assets and waste [APP-049], are the Councils satisfied with the identified study areas and with the baseline conditions. If not, please explain why.
Q11.0.3	The Applicant	ES Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste [APP-049], paragraph 10.9.13, bullet points 5 and 6 refer to opportunities for the re-use of surplus excavated, recycled or recovered material outside of the Order limits at local developments or community projects. Have any of these opportunities been investigated further, what is the likelihood of their implementation and how would such opportunities be secured?
12. Noise and Vibration		
Q12.0.1	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] are the parties satisfied that the baseline conditions as identified in Section 11.7 is accurate? Have all the receptors been correctly identified? If not, please explain.
Q12.0.2	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] paragraph 11.4.3, are the parties satisfied with the changes to the assessment methodology from the scoping report? If not, please explain why.
Q12.0.3	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] paragraph 11.4.11 are the parties satisfied with this approach? If not, please explain why.
Q12.0.4	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] paragraphs 11.5.3 and 11.5.4 refer to hours of working. Where are these hours controlled? Should these be part of the dDCO requirements?

ExQ1: 18 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q12.0.5	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] paragraph 11.5.13, identifies that roads other than those identified would not typically be used by heavy construction vehicles. In what instances does the applicant expect heavy construction vehicles to use other roads, how often and what type of vehicles? How does this fit with 11.9.20 and the Traffic Management Plan (TMP)?
Q12.0.6	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] paragraph 11.7.3 are the parties content with the way the appellant has addressed the issue of undertaking surveys during the COVID19 pandemic? If not, why not.
Q12.0.7	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] paragraph 11.4.12 under the identified future do nothing and do something scenarios, has any allowance been made for new residential development within the study area? If so, how many and where. If not, why not.
Q12.0.8	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] for those receptors identified in paragraphs 11.8.58, 11.8.59 and 11.8.60 noting that the National Networks NPS, paragraph 3.3, states that the Government expects applicants to avoid and mitigate environmental and social impacts, what mitigation measures, other than those outlined, were explored for these properties? Why were they discounted?
Q12.0.9	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] Table 11.11 demonstrates that, within the study area, the majority of noise sensitive receptors are predicted to have a negligible or no noise change due to the Proposed Scheme over the long-term, however, this includes embedded mitigation (see 11.8.68). What are the effects without this mitigation?
Q12.0.10	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] paragraph 11.9.6 are the parties content with the triggers for the implementation of temporary mitigation? If not, please explain why.
Q12.0.11	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] paragraph 11.9.18 how will these further assessments of construction vibration be secured? During the course of the Examination can the applicant provide an indication of the types of mitigation that can be provided to avoid significant effects?
Q12.0.12	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] paragraph 11.9.29 are the parties satisfied with the justifications provided for the exclusion of these mitigation measures from the

ExQ1: 18 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		proposed scheme? As a result, do the parties consider that the proposed noise barriers are in accordance with NPS NN as mitigation measures that are considered to be proportionate and reasonable? If not, please explain why.
Q12.0.13	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] paragraph 11.10.2, at which locations does the applicant consider to be suitable for the early provision of the permanent noise barriers? Has the provision of these been included within the assessment that has led to the conclusions in Table 11.14?
Q12.0.14	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] paragraph 11.10.3, will the applicant keep the examination updated on preparation of mitigation measures for this location?
Q12.0.15	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] Table 11.16, of those receptors identified to experience significant adverse effects, what other mitigation measures, other than those identified in the assessment have been considered to reduce the impacts?
13. Population and human health		
Q13.0.1	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] are the parties satisfied with the assessment methodology? If not, please explain.
Q13.0.2	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] are the parties satisfied that Section 12.7 provides an accurate assessment of the baseline conditions?
Q13.0.3	The Applicant	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] paragraph 12.4.3, the 2020 surveys were undertaken during the COVID pandemic, has this had any implications for the results, if so, how has this been addressed?
Q13.0.4	NCC,BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] paragraph 12.4.11 are parties satisfied that the data is sufficient to enable the Applicant to state that they are representative of the average use?
Q13.0.5	The Applicant	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] paragraph 12.4.16 identifies that no response has been received from the remaining key consultees. Please explain what the implications/limitations are as a result of this. Are any attempts proposed to be made during the course of the examination to engage with these parties? If not, why not?

ExQ1: 18 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q13.0.6	NCC	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] are NCC satisfied that the proposed footpath closures and proposed diversions are justified and that the proposed alternative routes are acceptable? If not, why not?
Q13.0.7	NCC	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] paragraph 12.4.26, are NCC satisfied that the concerns raised by Norwich Cycle Campaign have been address through the proposed scheme? If not, why not?
Q13.0.8	The Applicant	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] paragraph 12.5.1, is more recent data likely to be available during the course of the examination? If so, how does the applicant intend to update the assessment?
Q13.0.9	The Applicant	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] paragraph 12.5.5 is any further consultation planned during the examination with non-responders? If not, why not?
Q13.0.10	The Applicant	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] paragraph 12.7.8 refers to existing congestion during peak hours, creating a degree of severance and accessibility issues for local communities. Please explain and justify this statement. What locations and what are the effects? What are the effects outside of peak hours?
Q13.0.11	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] Table 12.5 are the parties satisfied that this represents an accurate list of all receptors? If not, please explain why.
Q13.0.12	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] Table 12.6 are the parties satisfied with the sensitivity levels attributed to each of the receptors? If not, please explain why.
Q13.0.13	The Applicant	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] paragraph 12.7.32 are 2021 census data sets expected to be available during the course of the examination. If so, will the applicant update this section?
Q13.0.14	The Applicant	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] paragraph 12.10.26 refers to the potential for the field to be used as a burial ground before the Proposed Scheme is constructed. How does this fit with other statements in the rest of the ES and what are the implications for the proposed development if the land is used for burials?
Q13.0.15	The Applicant	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] paragraph 12.10.87 refers to no permanent property demolition or loss of curtilage of properties as a result of the

ExQ1: 18 August 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Proposed Scheme. Please explain and review this statement in light of the RRs from Ben Hooker [RR-006] Catharine Hooker [RR-015] and David Hooker [RR021]?
Q13.0.16	The Applicant	To what extent would the Proposed Development provide local employment and training opportunities?
14. Transportation and Traffic		
Q14.0.1	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	Are the parties satisfied with the Applicant's Transport Case for the Scheme as set out in Chapter 4 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-140]? Please provide reasons for any disagreement with any aspect of it.
Q14.0.2	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	Are the parties satisfied with the Applicant's revised outline TMP [APP-144] (which includes details of construction traffic routing)? Please provide reasons for any concerns with any aspect of it.
Q14.0.3	The Applicant	Does the Applicant intend to produce a Travel Plan for construction workers, and if so, how would this be secured?
Q14.0.4	The Applicant	Please explain what provision is made for the retention of public transport links?
Q14.0.5	The Applicant	The ExA has been referred by a number of IPs to the Sideroad Strategy. Please explain the status of this document.
Q14.0.6	The Applicant	Construction related traffic arriving from offsite shall be routed via the existing A47 and the haul road to be implemented in the outline TMP. The outline TM P [APP-144] states that the TMP will be subject to consultation with the local planning authority and approval by the Secretary of State as set out in the draft DCO. Can the Applicant clarify how the TMP would be secured through the DCO and under which Requirement(s)?
15. Water Environment		
Q15.0.1	EA NCC, BDC, BC, SNC	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], are the parties content with the Applicant's Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and drainage proposals? If not, please explain why and what additional information is required.

ExQ1: 18 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q15.0.2	The Applicant	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], the EA raise a number of comments in their RR [RR-033], please provide a detailed response to their observations.
Q15.0.3	The Applicant	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], do the parties agree that section 13.7, baseline conditions, is an accurate assessment of the current situation? If not, why not.
Q15.0.4	The Applicant	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], paragraph 13.4.16 identifies that Anglian Water have requested assurances that additional monitoring boreholes will not result in contamination risks, and that aquifer protection measures have been incorporated into the design, citing unexpected artesian conditions within the River Tud floodplain. How has this been addressed?
Q15.0.5	The Applicant	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], paragraph 13.4.20, states that Norfolk County Council accepted, in principle, that flood compensatory storage at Oak Farm and Hockering might not be required. However, further information is required to determine this. What is the implication for the proposed development if flood compensatory storage is required?
Q15.0.6	EA, NCC, BC, BDC, SNC	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], paragraph 13.7.6 states that as the works will not impact on the water environment, the River Wensum is not considered a direct receptor. Are the parties content with this conclusion and the justification given for it?
Q15.0.7	EA, NCC, BC, BDC, SNC	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], paragraphs 13.7.65-13.7.69, are the EA and the Councils content that these are correct?
Q15.0.8	The Applicant	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], paragraph 13.8.7 refers to horizontal directional drilling being required for the gas main diversion which will utilise bentonite. Bentonite slurry may affect ponds, groundwater and the water environment or pathways to such features. Please clarify how any likely significant effects arising from this potential impact to the water environment have been assessed as part of the ES and what mitigation is proposed and how this is to be secured as part of the DCO?

ExQ1: 18 August 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q15.0.9	The Applicant	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], paragraph 13.9, please confirm how will the mitigation be delivered and how is this to be secured as part of the DCO?
Q15.0.10	The Applicant	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], paragraph 13.9.10, identifies that consent from Norfolk County Council and the Internal Drainage Board must be obtained prior to the start of construction activities. Please confirm that this is listed within the Consents and Agreements Position Statement [APP-020].
Q15.0.11	EA, NE NCC, BC, BDC, SNC	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], paragraph 13.9.15 refers to the provision of replacement ponds. Are the parties satisfied that the replacement proposals will deliver the necessary mitigation? Do they provide an improvement to the current situation?
Q15.0.12	The Applicant	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], paragraph 13.9.16 refers to a piling risk assessment. Where and how is this to be secured as part of the DCO?
Q15.0.13	EA NE NCC, BC, BDC, SNC	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], paragraph 13.9.22 refers to the Drainage strategy (Appendix 13.2 (TR010038/APP/6.3)) which proposes all road drainage will drain by surface water outfalls to the River Tud and its tributaries at twelve locations, utilising nine new outfalls. Is this approach acceptable to parties and in their view, is it adequate to deal with surface water and does it make suitable allowances to cover the design life of the Proposed Scheme?
Q15.0.14	EA NCC, BC, BDC, SNC	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], paragraph 13.9.29, are parties satisfied that these are sufficient allowances to cover the design life of the proposed scheme?
Q15.0.15	EA NCC, BC, BDC, SNC	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], paragraph 13.9.32, are parties content that these measures are sufficient to address the identified flooding? If not, please explain.
Q15.0.16	The Applicant	ES Appendix 13.4 (para 2.9.19) [APP-129] states that there are uncertainties over the works to be undertaken intersecting the Chalk aquifer. Further investigations are required to ascertain accurate hydraulic properties of this aquifer to understand any impacts of construction.

ExQ1: 18 August 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday 14 September 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Can the Applicant clarify what uncertainties they have over the works involved which may affect the aquifer and how these have been assessed and what mitigation measures are proposed, if considered necessary.
Q15.0.17	The Applicant EA	Consultation with the Environment Agency has led to an agreement of a 35% climate change allowance to be applied for the FRA [APP-124 and APP-125]. In July 2021 the peak river flow allowances were updated by the Environment Agency to reflect the latest projections in UKCP18. Can the Applicant and the Environment Agency confirm that the agreed climate change allowance is still applicable for the FRA.

ANNEX A

[case name]:

List of all objections to the grant of Compulsory acquisition OR TEMPORARY POSSESSION powers (eXq1: Questions [Insert Nos.])

In the event of a new interest in the land, or Category 3 person, being identified the Applicant should inform those persons of their right to apply to become an Interested Party under s102A PA2008.

Obj No. ⁱ	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref No ⁱⁱ	RR Ref No ⁱⁱⁱ	WR Ref No ^{iv}	Other Doc Ref No ^v	Interest ^{vi}	Permanent / Temporary ^{vii}	Plot(s)	CA? ^{viii}	Status of objection

i Obj No = objection number. All objections listed in this table should be given a unique number in sequence.

ii Reference number assigned to each Interested Party (IP) and Affected Person (AP)

iii Reference number assigned to each Relevant Representation (RR) in the Examination library

iv Reference number assigned to each Written Representation (WR) in the Examination library

v Reference number assigned to any other document in the Examination library

vi This refers to parts 1 to 3 of the Book of Reference:

- Part 1, containing the names and addresses of the owners, lessees, tenants, and occupiers of, and others with an interest in, or power to sell and convey, or release, each parcel of Order land;
- Part 2, containing the names and addresses of any persons whose land is not directly affected under the Order, but who “would or might” be entitled to make a claim under section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, as a result of the Order being implemented, or Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, as a result of the use of the land once the Order has been implemented;
- Part 3, containing the names and addresses of any persons who are entitled to easements or other private rights over the Order land that may be extinguished, suspended or interfered with under the Order.

vii This column indicates whether the applicant is seeking compulsory acquisition or temporary possession of land/ rights

viii CA = compulsory acquisition. The answer is ‘yes’ if the land is in parts 1 or 3 of the Book of Reference and National Grid are seeking compulsory acquisition of land/ rights.