

Broadland District Council Response to Examining Authority's Written Questions (ExQ1)

Deadline D2 (14th September 2021)

Question Number	Question	Response
2.0.5	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.	Given the evolving but uncertain position and the focus now on reducing long term average concentrations of PM 2.5 Broadland District Council is of the opinion that it would be helpful if the applicant could use modelling to demonstrate the impact, if any, of the proposed development for this pollutant.
2.0.8	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?	Broadland District Council has no comments to make on this issue.
2.0.11	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.	Broadland District Council is satisfied with the baseline assessment and have no comments to make.
3.0.1	Can the parties comment on the approach taken by the Applicant in its HRA Report [APP139] and confirm whether it is satisfactory? If not, please explain why.	Broadland District Council has no comments to make on this issue.
3.0.4	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?	Broadland District Council has no comments to make on this issue.

Broadland District Council Response to Examining Authority's Written Questions (ExQ1)

Deadline D2 (14th September 2021)

3.0.5	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.	Broadland District Council has no comments to make on this issue.
3.0.6	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.	Broadland District Council has no comments to make on this issue.
3.0.11	ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-047], in general, are the parties content with the proposed receptor sites? If not, why not.	Broadland District Council has no comments to make on this issue.
3.0.14	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?	Broadland District Council has no comments to make on this issue.
4.0.3	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?	Broadland District Council has no objection to this approach.
4.0.6	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?	Broadland District Council Has no objection to the approach subject to the levels of maintenance not being likely to materially affect the baseline calculations.

Broadland District Council Response to Examining Authority's Written Questions (ExQ1)

Deadline D2 (14th September 2021)

5.0.5	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?	<p>Broadland District Council consider that you can't describe the Local Development Order (LDO) as 'unimplemented'. The LDO is in place for an initial 15 years from its adoption and two buildings are currently being delivered 'under' the LDO.</p> <p>Direct access to the strategic road network is an integral element of delivering the FEP vision in its entirety and improved access will help to expedite the delivery of the FEP. If an access to the FEP is not provided in the vicinity of Blind Lane there is likely to be an unacceptable increase in heavy goods movements through the village of Easton. The Council would continue to request that the A47 Scheme includes this important access and helps facilitate its delivery.</p> <p>The operators of the FEP have submitted a planning application to Broadland District Council for a proposed access into the FEP in the vicinity of Blind Lane and to tie in with the proposed A47 scheme. Application reference 20211335.</p>
6.0.1	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.	Broadland District Council is satisfied with the cumulative effects assessment and the shortlist of projects in so far as they relate to sites within their respective districts.
7.0.33	Art41: What are the respective parties views of the imposition of a date of 24 July 2020?	Comments to be provided by 23 September 2021

Broadland District Council Response to Examining Authority's Written Questions (ExQ1)

Deadline D2 (14th September 2021)

9.0.4	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?	Broadland District Council has no objections to the list and overall assessment of effects.
10.0.1	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?	Comments to be provided by 23 September 2021
10.0.2	Are the parties satisfied with the Environmental Masterplan [APP-138] and the indicative proposals shown for the Proposed Development?	Comments to be provided by 23 September 2021
10.0.3	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-046], Are the Council's satisfied with the Applicant's approach to defining the baseline conditions?	Comments to be provided by 23 September 2021
10.0.4	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?	Comments to be provided by 23 September 2021
10.0.8	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?	Comments to be provided by 23 September 2021
10.0.9	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	Comments to be provided by 23 September 2021

Broadland District Council Response to Examining Authority's Written Questions (ExQ1)

Deadline D2 (14th September 2021)

10.0.11	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?	Comments to be provided by 23 September 2021
10.0.13	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.	Comments to be provided by 23 September 2021
11.0.2	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	Broadland District Council has no comments on this issue and defer to the views of Norfolk County Council as Minerals and Waste Authority.
12.0.1	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.	Broadland District Council consider that the applicant should provide further information about their reasoning in Appendix 11.4 and in particular in para11.1.9.
12.0.2	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.	Has the applicant considered para 3.50 of LA 111Rev2 when determining Table 11.2 of APP- 050? Our understanding is that the parameters in Table 3.49.1 are not fixed.
12.0.3	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] paragraph 11.4.11 are the parties satisfied with this approach? If not, please explain why.	Please see Q12.0.1 above.
12.0.6	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] paragraph 11.7.3 are the parties content with the way	Please see Q12.0.1 above.

Broadland District Council Response to Examining Authority's Written Questions (ExQ1)

Deadline D2 (14th September 2021)

	the appellant has addressed the issue of undertaking surveys during the COVID19 pandemic? If not, why not.	
12.0.10	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.	Childhood First are expressing concern about impacts on their residents at Merrywood House. Broadland District Council are not familiar with current discussions but would hope that effective mitigation or other measures will be provided to avoid distress.
12.0.12	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 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.	It would appear that the applicant has explored a barrier for Hall Farm and cottages, Honingham, 442m long x 3m high and that due to the topography presumably this does not provide worthwhile attenuation.
13.0.1	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] are the parties satisfied with the assessment methodology? If not, please explain.	In 2018 the World Health Organisation published health based Environmental Noise Guidelines for road traffic noise for the whole day (53 dB Lden) and for night time (45 dB Lnight) BDC and SNC believes it would be helpful if an assessment could be carried out to determine the effect of the applicant's proposal by comparing noise levels from the existing road with the proposed completed road using the noise units above.
13.0.2	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?	Broadland District Council has no objection to this section.
13.0.4	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] paragraph 12.4.11 are parties satisfied that the data is	Broadland District Council has no comments to make on this and defer to the views of Norfolk County Council as

Broadland District Council Response to Examining Authority's Written Questions (ExQ1)

Deadline D2 (14th September 2021)

	sufficient to enable the Applicant to state that they are representative of the average use?	Highway Authority and who maintain the public rights of way network.
13.0.11	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.	Broadland District Council has no comments to make on this and defer to the views of Norfolk County Council as highway authority and who maintain the public rights of way network
13.0.12	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.	Broadland District Council has no comments to make on this and defer to the views of Norfolk County Council as highway authority and who maintain the public rights of way network
14.0.1	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.	Broadland District Council are supportive of the scheme in principle, being in accordance with Policy 6 of the Joint Core Strategy 2011/2014 which seeks to, inter alia, promote improvements to the A47 including improvements to reduce the significant stretches that remain single carriageway. Accordingly, Broadland District Council is supportive of the applicants transport case for the scheme.
14.0.2	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.	Broadland District Council and has no comments and defer to the views of the Norfolk County Council as Highway Authority on this issue.
15.0.1	ES Chapter 13: Road drainage and the water environment [APP-052], are the parties content with	Broadland District Council is concerned to ensure that the development poses no risk to private drinking water

Broadland District Council Response to Examining Authority's Written Questions (ExQ1)

Deadline D2 (14th September 2021)

	<p>the Applicant's Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and drainage proposals? If not, please explain why and what additional information is required.</p>	<p>supplies. It was noted in Appendix 13.4 para 2.45 that the applicant has made a request to BDC for details of private water supplies in the vicinity but had not received a response to this request. We will look back at our records to see whether we can clarify what occurred and in the meantime will provide the applicant and the Inspector with information concerning boreholes and wells that we are aware of. Whilst we will make every effort to assist, our view is that it is for the applicant to determine the location of all private water supplies. Our records are not complete and it might be necessary to ask property owners to confirm whether they have a private supply for example. Once every effort has been made to determine locations the applicant should assess whether the development might pollute the supplies taking account of the drainage proposals both in normal operation and in situations such as accidents and tanker spillages for example.</p>
15.0.3	<p>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.</p>	<p>Please see answer to 15.0.1</p>
15.0.6	<p>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?</p>	<p>Broadland District Council has no comments and defer to the views of the Norfolk County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency on this issue.</p>

Broadland District Council Response to Examining Authority's Written Questions (ExQ1)

Deadline D2 (14th September 2021)

15.0.7	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?	Broadland District Council has no comment and defer to the views of the Norfolk County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency on this issue.
15.0.11	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?	Broadland District Council has no comments to make on this issue.
15.0.13	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?	Broadland District Council has no comments and defer to the views of the Norfolk County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency on this issue.
15.0.4	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?	Broadland District Council has no comments and defer to the views of the Norfolk County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency on this issue.
15.0.15	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	Broadland District Council has no comments and defer to the views of the Norfolk County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency on this issue.

Application by: Highways England for an Order Granting Development Consent for the A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Project
Planning Inspectorate Reference: TR010038

Broadland District Council Response to Examining Authority's Written Questions (ExQ1)

Deadline D2 (14th September 2021)