

**Application by Highways England for the A47 Blofield to North Burlingham project**  
**The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)**  
**Issued on 27 April 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 Annex C to the Rule 6 letter of 27 April 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 general and cross-topic issues is identified as 1.1.1. 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 [A47BlofieldtoNorthBurlingham@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:A47BlofieldtoNorthBurlingham@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021.**

**Abbreviations used:**

<b>PA2008</b>	The Planning Act 2008	<b>HRA</b>	Habitats Regulations Assessment
<b>Art</b>	Article	<b>LIR</b>	Local Impact Report
<b>BDC</b>	Broadland District Council	<b>LPA</b>	Local Planning Authority
<b>BoR</b>	Book of Reference	<b>NCC</b>	Norfolk County Council
<b>CA</b>	Compulsory Acquisition	<b>NE</b>	Natural England
<b>dDCO</b>	Draft Development Consent Order	<b>NPS</b>	National Policy Statement
<b>DMRB</b>	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges	<b>NSIP</b>	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
<b>EA</b>	Environment Agency	<b>R</b>	Requirement
<b>EM</b>	Explanatory Memorandum	<b>RR</b>	Relevant Representation
<b>EMP</b>	Environmental Management Plan	<b>REAC</b>	Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments
<b>ES</b>	Environmental Statement	<b>SOAEL</b>	Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level
<b>ExA</b>	Examining Authority	<b>SoR</b>	Statement of Reasons
<b>HE</b>	Historic England	<b>SoS</b>	Secretary of State
<b>HGV</b>	Heavy Goods Vehicle	<b>TP</b>	Temporary Possession

**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 is updated throughout the examination progresses.

**Citation of questions**

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, eg 1.1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.

## Index

<b>1. General and cross-topic .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Air Quality and Emissions.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)) .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. Climate Change.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>5. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession (and other land or rights considerations) .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>6. Cultural Heritage .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>7. Cumulative Effects.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>8. Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO).....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>9. Geology and Soils .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>10. Landscape and Visual.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>11. Material Assets and Waste .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>12. Noise and Vibration .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>13. Population and Human Health .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>14. Transportation and Traffic .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>15. Water Environment.....</b>	<b>36</b>

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>1. General and cross-topic</b>		
1.1.1	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 Examining Authority (ExA) before the close of the examination.
1.1.2	The Applicant	Any subsequent versions of the application draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [APP-016] submitted to the examination should be supplied as both 'clean' and separately with track changes to highlight any changes from the previous version. Please provide in both .pdf and Word formats. It should also be accompanied by a document explaining the changes made.
1.1.3	The Applicant	The description of the Proposed Development throughout the application documents includes "2.6km of dual carriageway on the A47". Please explain how this measurement has been arrived at and how it relates to the figure of '4570 metres in length' cited under Work No. 1 of Schedule 1 of the dDCO [APP-016].
1.1.4	The Applicant	The Consents and Licenses Position Statement [APP-018] at paragraph 3.1.3, bullet point 8, makes reference to the dDCO [APP-016] making provision for any works required to trees, including those protected by tree preservation orders. However, the dDCO does not appear to refer to protected trees and it is unclear from the application document whether there are any. Please address and clarify this matter.
1.1.5	The Applicant	ES Chapter 3: Consideration of Alternatives [APP-041] at paragraph 3.1.1 provides a link in respect of the Scheme Assessment Report (2017) relating to the scoring of alternative routes considered. However, the location of the report is not clear from the link provided. Please provide either a link to the actual report or a copy of the report which can then be added to the Examination Library.
1.1.6	The Applicant	In the Equalities Impact Assessment [APP-126], the part D: Assessment (Stage 2) table concludes based on race in respect of 'Pregnancy and maternity' and 'Marriage and civil partnership'. Is this an error which needs to be corrected?
1.1.7	The Applicant	The revised Environmental Management Plan (EMP) [AS-009] is not fully searchable by keyword (ie the Ctrl+F 'Find' function). Please provide a version that is and ensure that any documents submitted into the Examination in the future are fully searchable in this way.

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.1.8	The Applicant	<p>Many of the application documents refer to the diversion of a 'medium pressure' gas pipeline (including the Application Form, the dDCO and the EMP). However, the ExA notes that the Relevant Representation (RR) from Cadent Gas Limited [RR-007] suggests that it is an 'intermediate pressure' gas pipeline. Please clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) The pressure and category of the gas pipeline to be diverted;</li><li>b) If it is an intermediate pressure gas pipeline, whether this has any bearing on the consideration of the application; and</li><li>c) If it is an intermediate pressure gas pipeline, whether any of the relevant application documents should be amended to reflect this.</li></ul>
1.1.9	The Applicant BDC	<p>The Environment Agency (EA), in its RR [RR-008], indicates that, rather than itself, Broadland District Council (BDC) would be responsible for some consents or licence agreements relating to waste and materials as identified in Appendix A of the Consents and Licences Position Statement document [APP-018]. Does BDC agree with this, and if so, can the Applicant please make any changes necessary to the document?</p>
1.1.10	The Applicant	<p>The construction programme is set out in Table 2-2 of ES Chapter 2: The Proposed Scheme [APP-040] and is anticipated to last over 22 months and 8 phases (9 including phase 0). Please clarify which works, with the works reference numbers, will be carried out during each phase of the construction programme to understand the timescale of the works listed in Schedule 1 of the dDCO [APP-016].</p>
1.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Please provide a table setting out the maximum parameters of the Proposed Development to understand what maximum parameters have been assessed within each aspect ES Chapter?</p>
1.1.12	The Applicant	<p>How would the Proposed Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) achieve 'good design' in accordance with paragraphs 4.28 to 4.35 of the National Networks NPS; and</li><li>b) accord with the National Infrastructure Commission's Design Principles for National Infrastructure?</li></ul>
1.1.13	The Applicant	<p>The Scheme Design Report [APP-123], paragraph 3.1.3, make reference to Highway England's Strategic Design Panel. Has the Proposed Development been subject to review by this panel, and if not, why not?</p>

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.1.14	The Applicant BDC	The ExA understands that the development plan for Broadland District, within the administrative boundaries of which the Proposed Development is located, includes: the Greater Norwich Development Partnership Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2011 (amended 2014); the Broadland District Council Development Management DPD 2015; the Broadland District Council Site Allocations DPD 2016; the Broadland District Council Growth Triangle Area Action Plan 2016; and various neighbourhood plans, including the Blofield Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2016. Please provide a definitive list of relevant development plan policies, reasons for conformity or otherwise with these and a copy of the policies (this could be done as part of the Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and Broadland District Council and / or within Broadland District Council's Local Impact Report).
1.1.15	The Applicant	Please provide a summary table of the likely significant residual effects identified within the ES Chapters.
1.1.16	The Applicant	Please address the following discrepancies: a) In paragraph 2.4.1 of ES Chapter 2: The Proposed Scheme [APP-040], is the reference to 'Figure 2.1' correct?: and b) Paragraph 2.6.9 of ES Chapter 2: The Proposed Scheme [APP-040] appears to be incomplete or missing some words.
<b>2. Air Quality and Emissions</b>		
1.2.1	The Applicant	The ExA issued a Procedural Decision [PD-004] following the Acceptance of the application, which included a request (No.2) for further detail on dust management during the construction of the Proposed Development. The Applicant provided a revised EMP [AS-009] in response. Whilst the ExA notes the content (at Appendix B.5), it provides very little material as to proposed measures to be adopted to control dust. Given the importance of dust management, the ExA was expecting to be provided with more detail as to proposed methods and measures to be adopted. Please address this by providing greater detail within Appendix B.5 of the EMP and within the Air Quality section of the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) within the EMP [AS-009].
1.2.2	The Applicant	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-043], paragraph 5.4.7, sets out that Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 advises that where construction activities are programmed to last less than two years, it is unlikely that there would be a significant effect on air quality or would affect the UK's ability to comply with the Air Quality Directive. On this basis, the Applicant has scoped out construction traffic from the air quality assessment. Please clarify the following:

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>a) How confident can the ExA be that the construction programme would not be subject to delays to take it beyond two years (noting that the Scheme Design Report [APP-123], paragraph 9.3.3, says "approximately 22 months" and the Transport Assessment [APP-122], paragraph 1.4.2, refers to "approximately two years");</p> <p>b) The reason why the Applicant has used the method set out in DMRB LA 105 guidance rather than using the Institute of Air Quality Management guidance as proposed in the Scoping Report?; and</p> <p>c) Provide justification for the assumption that construction traffic air quality impacts are unlikely to lead to significant effects if the construction period is under 2 years in duration, for example with reference to predicted vehicle numbers for Average Annual Daily Traffic?</p>
1.2.3	The Applicant	The RR from Norfolk County Council (NCC) [RR-002], at section 1.24, suggests that the Applicant should give consideration to the possible impacts on agricultural and allotment lands through increased NOx and associated ozone generation. Please provide a response to this.
1.2.4	The Applicant	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-043], paragraph 5.4.13, states that the opening year represents the worst case in terms of air quality impacts as emissions are expected to improve in future year. Please provide further justification for this assertion.
1.2.5	The Applicant	<p>Table 5-12 of ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-043], cites modelled receptors 'PCM_3' and 'PCM_4' as being along the A12. Please clarify:</p> <p>a) Whether the reference to the A12 is correct?; and</p> <p>b) The relevance of these two particular Pollution Climate Mapping locations?</p>
1.2.6	The Applicant	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-043], paragraph 5.4.26, states that consultation was undertaken with Highways England to discuss the base year traffic data of 2015 and the assessment approach for the ES. It was concluded the most recent available tools for assessment will be used in the assessment alongside the 2015 baseline traffic data. Please explain if and what other consultation has taken place to inform the air quality assessment such as agreement on receptors, methodology etc?
1.2.7	NCC	The Transport Assessment [APP-072] uses a 2015 base year model for verification. The Applicant states in paragraph 5.5.1 that using 2015 baseline data adds extra uncertainty as traffic flows and background concentrations will not be representative of the current climate; this approach has only been agreed with Highways England (the Applicant). Please comment on the appropriateness of this approach.
1.2.8	The Applicant	ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-043], paragraph 5.4.38, states that professional judgement was used when selecting the ecological receptors. Three designated ecological sites within 200m of the ARN are

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		identified in paragraph 5.7.25 that are sensitive to nitrogen deposition but there is no explanation why other sites, such as Trinity Broads Site of Special Scientific Interest, have been omitted. Please explain why these are not included in the assessment?
<b>3. Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))</b>		
1.3.1	NE NCC BDC	Can Natural England (NE), NCC and BDC please comment on the approach taken by the Applicant in its HRA Report [AS-007] and confirm whether it is satisfactory?
1.3.2	NE	Can NE please comment on the approach to the HRA screening for Paston Great Barn Special Area of Conservation and Barbastelle bat features in Table A.4 of the HRA Report [AS-007]?
1.3.3	The Applicant NE NCC BDC	Changes were made to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 from 1 Jan 2021 due to the United Kingdom's 's exit from the European Union. Does this have any implications for the HRA Report [AS-007]?
1.3.4	The Applicant	The HRA Report [AS-007] concludes no likely significant effects on Breydon Water Special Protection Area and Ramsar sites on the basis that it is unlikely that species would travel from the designated sites to the Proposed Development. Survey results for 2017 to 2019 indicate that Golden Plover and Lapwing, which are qualifying features of the sites, used arable fields within the study area (Tables 4.5 and 4.6 of the HRA Report). Please explain how the conclusion of no likely significant effects has been reached when these species have been found in the study area, particularly Lapwing, which were found in 'large numbers'?
1.3.5	The Applicant	Please provide a detailed explanation as to why the mitigation measures relied on within the HRA Report [AS-007] do not constitute measures intended to avoid or reduce the harmful effects of a project, therefore requiring an Appropriate Assessment in line with the Sweetman ruling (People Over Wind and Peter Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta). Otherwise, provide an updated HRA Report and consideration of adverse effects on the integrity of the designated sites.
1.3.6	The Applicant	There appear to be a number of minor discrepancies in the HRA Report [AS-007] and some related figures. Please clarify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The reason why, in respect of Figure 2 of the HRA Report [AS-007], Golden Plover and Lapwing, which are identified in the key, do not appear to have been plotted on the map;</li> </ul>

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>b) The reason why, in respect of Figure 2 of the HRA Report [AS-007], the key refers to Golden Plover and Lapwing surveys from 2018 only, whereas the HRA Report makes reference to surveys in 2017 and 2019;</p> <p>c) The reason why some figures, for example, ES Figures 8.1 and 8.2 [APP-067] and Figure 1 of the HRA Report [AS-007], have two small dashed red lines near to the edge of the northern extent of the study area; and</p> <p>d) The reason why, in the HRA Report [AS-007], there are numerous instances where the explanatory text in the tables refers to other site designations than the one the table is relating to (for example, Table 4.1 relates to The Broads Special Area of Conservation, whereas, 'Ramsar' is referred to in the explanatory text).</p> <p>Please correct these discrepancies as necessary.</p>
1.3.7	The Applicant	In ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-046], where have effects of the medium pressure gas pipeline diversion (and changes to the Order limits boundary in 2020) on biodiversity / ecology been considered and how has this aspect of the Proposed Development informed the surveys undertaken?
1.3.8	NE NCC BDC	ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-046], paragraph 8.8.2, lists biodiversity resources which have not been carried forward in / scoped out of the assessment. Are NE, NCC and BDC content with this and the justification for it?
1.3.9	NE NCC BDC	Are the parties content with the Applicant's approach that some protected species surveys, including for great crested newts, would be undertaken prior to construction (and any protected species licences sought subsequently if necessary), given that the COVID-19 pandemic precluded these from being undertaken prior to the submission of the application?
1.3.10	The Applicant	BDC suggests in its RR [RR-001] that a full hedgerow survey against the criteria of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 should be undertaken. Does the Applicant intend to do so during course of the Examination?
1.3.11	The Applicant	Having regard to Table 8-8 of ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-046], would the Proposed Development result in an overall biodiversity net gain of and if so, to what extent?
1.3.12	The Applicant	Table 8-7 of ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-046] states that, in respect of 'County BAP Allotments', the car park area is to be replaced in adjacent arable land. Please clarify: a) Whether this is correct; and

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		b) Whether there would be any ecological effects on any permanent loss of allotment plots, which the ExA understands from other application documents would occur, in addition to the loss of habitat extent within the car park area as reported in the table.
1.3.13	The Applicant	Table 8-9 of ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-046] identifies a major adverse effect on Lingwood Community Woodland during construction as a result of tree removal. It goes on to identify a slight adverse residual significance of effect once new woodland planting matures. Please clarify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Whether new woodland planting would connect with Lingwood Community Woodland and where this is shown on the Masterplan [APP-118];</li> <li>b) If it does not connect with Lingwood Community Woodland, how new woodland planting would reduce adverse effects on this particular woodland over the long-term?; and</li> <li>c) Where the gas pipeline diversion crosses Lingwood Community Woodland, whether new woodland planting would be reinstated within these areas?</li> </ul>
1.3.14	The Applicant	The ExA issued a Procedural Decision [PD-004] following the Acceptance of the application, which included a request (No.4) for an outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. This was to provide a greater degree of confidence that landscape and ecological features, given their importance to mitigating adverse effects, would function effectively in the long term, should the application be recommended for approval. The Applicant provided a revised EMP [AS-009] in response. Whilst the ExA notes the content (at Appendix B.7), it provides very little material as to proposed measures to be adopted. Given the importance and sensitivity of landscape and ecological features (including new areas of woodland and grassland, the planting of large specimen trees, a new pond and the translocation of important hedgerows), the ExA was expecting to be provided with more detail as to methods and measures for the translocation / establishment / management of these features. Please address this.
1.1.15	The Applicant	ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-046] identifies that there would be a moderate adverse and thus a significant residual effect on bats. Have all potential options been explored to mitigate such effects?
1.1.16	The Applicant	In its RR, the EA [RR-008] queries the potential for improvements to a number of ponds in the study area. Please provide a response to this.
<b>4. Climate Change</b>		
1.4.1	The Applicant	The assessment has not drawn a conclusion as to whether the Proposed Development would cause a significant effect on climate change due to the absence of UK carbon budgets for the lifetime of the Proposed Development. However, the 6th carbon budget is now available for comparison. An assessment and conclusion of likely significant effects should be provided against this budget and in

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		addition a conclusion should be drawn regarding emissions during subsequent carbon budgets periods based on worst case assumptions. Please address this.
1.4.2	The Applicant	How might the Government's recent announcement about the phasing out of sales of new petrol and diesel vehicles by 2030 to accelerate the transition to electric vehicles (as indicated would be the case in ES Chapter 14: Climate [AS-004], paragraph 14.3.8) affect the assessment set out in ES Chapter 14?
1.4.3	The Applicant	C2 of the REAC [AS-009] suggests that carbon efficiencies would be made before detailed design for some aspects of the Proposed Development. What approach would be taken to decide on these efficiencies and how would their efficiency be assessed?
<b>5. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession (and other land or rights considerations)</b>		
1.5.1	The Applicant	The Applicant is requested to complete the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) / Temporary Possession (TP) Objections Schedule (Annex A) and to make any entries it believes would be appropriate, taking account of the positions expressed in RRs, and giving reasons for any additions. As the Examination progresses and at each successive deadline, please update the Schedule as necessary.
1.5.2	The Applicant	The Book of Reference (BoR) [APP-021] 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.
1.5.3	The Applicant	The former Department for Communities and Local Government published guidance related to procedures for CA (September 2013) in <i>Planning Act 2008: procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land</i> . This states that "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."  The Funding Statement [APP-020] 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.

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.5.4	The Applicant	<p>The Applicant is requested to review the RRs and subsequent Written Representations made by any Statutory Undertaker as the Examination progresses and at each successive deadline update, as necessary, a table identifying and responding to any representations made by Statutory Undertakers with land or rights to which PA2008 s127 applies. Where such representations are identified, the Applicant is requested to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) the name of the Statutory Undertaker;</li><li>b) the nature of their undertaking;</li><li>c) the land and / or rights affected (identified with reference to the most recent versions of the BoR and Land plans available at that time);</li><li>d) in relation to land, whether and if so, how the tests in PA2008 s127(3)(a) or (b) can be met;</li><li>e) in relation to rights, whether and if so, how the tests in PA2008 s127(6)(a) or (b) can be met;</li><li>f) in relation to these matters, whether any protective provisions and / or commercial agreement are anticipated, and if so:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i) whether these are already available to the ExA in draft or final form;</li><li>ii) whether a new document describing them is attached to the response to this question or</li><li>iii) whether further work is required before they can be documented; and</li></ul></li><li>g) in relation to a Statutory Undertaker named in an earlier version of the table but in respect of which a settlement has been reached:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i) whether the settlement has resulted in their representation(s) being withdrawn in whole or part; and</li><li>ii) identifying any documents providing evidence or agreement and withdrawal.</li></ul></li></ul> <p>The table should be titled ExQ1.5.4: PA2008 s127 Statutory Undertakers Land / Rights and provided with a version number that rolls forward with each deadline. If at any given deadline, an empty table is provided, a revised table need not be provided at any subsequent deadline unless the Applicant becomes aware that the data and assumptions on which the empty table was provided have changed.</p>
1.5.5	The Applicant	<p>The Applicant is requested to review its proposals relating to CA or TP of land and / or rights and to prepare, and at each successive deadline update, a table identifying if these proposals affect the relevant rights or relevant apparatus of any Statutory Undertakers to which PA2008 s138 applies. If such rights or apparatus are identified, the Applicant is requested to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) the name of the Statutory Undertaker;</li><li>b) the nature of their undertaking;</li><li>c) the relevant rights to be extinguished; and / or</li></ul>

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>d) the relevant apparatus to be removed; e) how the test is s138(4) can be met; and f) in relation to these matters; whether any protective provisions and / or commercial agreement are anticipated, and if so:     i) whether these are already available to the ExA in draft or final form;     ii) whether a new document describing them is attached to the response to this question; or     iii) whether further work is required before they can be documented; and g) in relation to a Statutory Undertaker named in an earlier version of the table but in respect of which a settlement has been reached:     i) whether the settlement has resulted in their representation(s) being withdrawn in whole or part; and     ii) identifying any documents providing evidence or agreement and withdrawal.</p> <p>The table should be titled ExQ1.5.5: PA2008 s138 Statutory Undertakers Apparatus etc. and be provided with a version number that rolls forward with each deadline. If at any given deadline, an empty table is provided, a revised table need not be provided at any subsequent deadline unless the Applicant becomes aware that the data and assumptions on which the empty table was provided have changed.</p>
1.5.6	The Applicant	To assist with the consideration of whether the extent of the land to be used temporarily is no more than is reasonably required for the purposes of the Proposed Development, please provide further details to justify the extent of the land sought to be used temporarily. For each area, including a particular focus on Plots 3/2a, 4/7c and 5/1a, explain why such a size is required and the justification for the extent of each plot.
1.5.7	The Applicant	The Statement of Reasons (SoR) [APP-019], at section 7.3, 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?

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.5.8	The Applicant	Section 5 of the SoR [APP-019] addresses human rights. Can the Applicant: a) Provide a more detailed demonstration that interference with human rights in this case would be proportionate and justified?; and b) Explain how has the proportionality test been undertaken and how this approach has been undertaken in relation to individual plots?
1.5.9	The Applicant	For the avoidance of doubt, please set out all the factors that are regarded as constituting evidence for a compelling case in the public interest for the CA and TP powers sought and where, giving specific paragraph references, are these set out in the submitted documentation?
1.5.10	The Applicant	In the light of the relevant Department of Communities and Local Government Guidance related to CA, <i>Planning Act 2008: procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land</i> and in particular paragraph 8, please describe: a) How can the ExA be assured that all reasonable alternatives to CA (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored; and b) Set out in summary form, with document references where appropriate, what assessment / comparison has been made of the alternatives to the proposed acquisition of land or interests in each case.
1.5.11	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?
1.5.12	The Applicant	The ExA notes that ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049] identifies residual significant effects related to noise for some residential and non-residential receptors along the B1140 (High Road) and Yarmouth Road. Could these receptors be entitled to make a relevant claim under the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, the Land Compensation Act 1973 or s152 of PA2008?
1.5.13	The Applicant	On the Land Plans [APP-005], is it the line which identifies a sheet separation which forms the boundary of some individual plots? This is somewhat unclear given that plot boundaries tend to be defined elsewhere by a clear red line.
1.5.14	The Applicant	On the Land Plans [APP-005], there appears to be two plots identified as 2/10 within Inset D of Sheet 2 of 8. Is this an error which needs correcting?
1.5.15	The Applicant	The description of a number of plots in the BoR [APP-021] refer to 'Church Road' (including plots 2/2k, 3/3b, 3/3d, 3/5, 3/6, 4/2/ 4/2a, 4/3, 4/5, 4/5d, 4/6 and 4/7). Is the reference to this road correct?

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.5.16	The Applicant	SoR [APP-019] paragraph 6.9.2, bullet point 2, states that "Plots 4/7C and 5.1" would be used for principle construction compounds. However, the reference to "5.1" is not consistent with plot reference numbers generally and the Work Plans [APP-006] do not appear to show a construction compound in the location of Plot 4/7c. Please explain this or amend as necessary.
1.5.17	The Applicant	The SoR [APP-019], paragraph 8.2.3, refers to 'Plot 1/10c'. There does not appear to be such a plot on the Land Plans [APP-005] or within the BoR [APP-021]. Please address this.
1.5.18	The Applicant	Please provide an update in respect of Crown Land negotiations.
1.5.19	The Applicant	Please address and provide a full response to the contents of the RR made by the Randlesome family [RR-043].
<b>6. Cultural Heritage</b>		
1.6.1	The Applicant BDC NCC HE	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage (APP-044), paragraph 6.5.6, notes that a final archaeological trenching report is to be made available at a later date. Will this be made available during the course of the examination, and if not, what are the implications for this?
1.6.2	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage (APP-044), paragraph 6.7.7, identifies that 15 key heritage assets may experience significant effects. However, the number of heritage assets listed under the following sections 'Key designated heritage assets' and 'Key non-designated heritage assets' does not appear to correlate with this figure. Please clarify this matter.
1.6.3	The Applicant	Notwithstanding ES Figures 6.1 and 6.2 [APP-056], it would be helpful and clearer to plot the heritage assets which may experience significant effects on a separate figure (given, for example, that the extents of North Burlingham Park MNF61984, also referred to as 'parkland associated with Burlingham Hall', are difficult to interpret). Please provide this.
1.6.4	BDC NCC HE	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-044], section 6.7, identifies key designated and non-designated heritage assets which may experience significant effects. Is BDC, NCC and Historic England (HE) in agreement with this list and the overall assessment of effects on these?
1.6.5	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-044], paragraph 6.7.41, relates to 'Beighton House (BLO26)' non-designated heritage asset. The location is shown on ES Figure 6.2 [APP-056]. However, the description and location appear to relate to The White House, as identified elsewhere in the application documents (for example, R42 on ES Figure 7.2 [APP-057]). In addition, the ExA observed during the recent unaccompanied site inspection, that there is a 'Beighton House' (R43 on ES Figure 7.2), which

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		does not appear to match the description given in ES Chapter 6 paragraph 6.7.41, to the immediate south-east of The White House. Please clarify this matter.
1.6.6	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage (APP-044), paragraph 6.9.18, refers to "Norwich County Council Environmental Services (NCCES)". Is reference to 'Norwich' here correct, or should it be 'Norfolk'?
1.6.7	The Applicant HE NCC	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage (APP-044), paragraph 6.9.20, states that a written scheme of investigation would be agreed with HE, NCCES and BDC. Should HE and NCCES be specified as consultees, in addition to the relevant planning authority, within Requirement 9 (Archaeological remains) of the dDCO [APP-016]?
1.6.8	The Applicant BDC NCC HE	Should Requirement 9 (Archaeological remains) of the dDCO [APP-016] make provision for the publication and archiving of any findings following archaeological investigations carried out in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation?
1.6.9	The Applicant	In some instances, ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage (APP-044) refers to the south western corner of North Burlingham Park MNF61984 as being affected (including paragraph 6.8.9 and Table 6-3), though in other instances, it refers to the south eastern corner being affected (including paragraph 6.7.26 and Table 6-2). Please clarify this matter.
1.6.10	The Applicant	Please clarify the difference between the Zone of Theoretical Visibility, as shown on ES Figures 6.1 and 6.2 [APP-056] and the Zone of Visual Influence, as referred to in Table 6-1, Table 6-2 and paragraph 6.6.1 of ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-044]?
1.6.11	The Applicant	Table 2 of ES Appendix 6.1 [APP-074] sets out the criteria for assessing magnitude of impact. This includes the terms 'major', 'moderate', 'minor', 'negligible' and 'no change'. However, Table 5 of ES Appendix 6.1 and Tables 6-2 and 6-3 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-044], under columns relating to 'magnitude of impact', include the terms 'none', 'slight' and 'no impact' in some instances. Please explain the reasons for this.
1.6.12	The Applicant	ES Appendix 6.1 [APP-074], paragraph 6.3.6, states that a moderate, large, or very large significance of effect is considered significant. ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage (APP-044), paragraph 6.10.1, states that the section (6.10) details likely significant adverse or beneficial residual effects. However, in Table 6-2 (construction effects) and Table 6-3 (operational effects) of section 6.10, there are a number of instances where the significance of effect for certain heritage assets is categorised as 'slight' or 'neutral' in the relevant column, and thus not significant. Please clarify the reason for this.

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.6.13	The Applicant	Has the heritage assessment adequately considered potential effects on heritage assets from works associated with the diversion of the medium pressure gas pipeline (Work No. 5)?
1.6.14	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.
1.6.15	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-044], paragraphs 6.9.11 to 6.9.20, sets out a number of construction mitigation measures. Please clarify how such mitigation would be secured?
1.6.16	The Applicant	The terms 'significance of effect', 'significance of impact', 'impact' or 'effect' are used interchangeably throughout ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-044]. Why is this and what does each term mean?
1.6.17	The Applicant	Please provide further justification as to why the Applicant considers that the recording of any affected archaeological remains in Zones 1-8 and outside these zones would reduce the significance of effect on the heritage assets from moderate / large (Table 5 of ES Appendix 6.1 [APP-074]) to neutral (Table 6-2 of ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-044]).
1.6.18	The Applicant	Please explain the correlation between the Historic Environment Record number referencing on Figure 1 of ES Appendix 6.4 [APP-071] and that on ES Figure 6.2 [APP-056].
1.6.19	The Applicant	Ch-8 of the REAC [AS-009] states "The proposed layby will create a new viewpoint from which Burlingham Hall will be visible." Please clarify the following: a) Is this the proposed layby shown on Sheet 3 of the General Arrangement Drawings [APP-009]?; b) How would Burlingham Hall be visible from here if, as stated in ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-044], paragraph 6.7.27, most of it was demolished in the 1950s?; and c) To what extent would North Burlingham Park MNF61984 be visible from here?
1.6.20	HE	HE's RR [RR-009] refers to a change in the setting of the Grade I listed Church of St Andrew in North Burlingham as a result of the Proposed Development. Please clarify: a) Whether this change, in HE's view, would be a positive or negative one and the reasons why; and b) If negative, the level of harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset.
<b>7. Cumulative Effects</b>		
1.7.1	BDC NCC EA	Are the parties satisfied with the Applicant's cumulative effects assessment and the shortlist of projects considered?

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	HE NE	
1.7.2	The Applicant	The methodology for assessing cumulative projects is based on Advice Note 17 (AN17). Table 2 of AN17 sets out the types of development classed as Tiers 1 to 3. Appendix 15.1 [APP-113] classes all but one of other developments as Tier 3 but labels them all either 'near certain' or 'more than likely'. Table 15-2 of ES Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects Assessment [APP-053] states that those that are 'near certain' are under construction but in line with AN17, these would be classed as Tier 1 projects. Please explain the methodology applied to determine Tiers and certainty for each development listed in Appendix 15.1 or correct these discrepancies and describe how this influences the assessment of significance?
1.7.3	The Applicant	ES Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects Assessment [APP-053] paragraph 15.5.4 notes that 'other developments' are absent from the local planning authority (LPA) website and are thus unlikely to have significant effects on the environment. Noting that, for example, project ID 88 and 88 in ES Appendix 15.1 [APP-113] (which appears to be project ID 881 in ES Appendix 15.2 [APP-114]) appear to have a planning reference number (Broadland 20161483), please clarify this assertion.
1.7.4	The Applicant	The full reference numbers are not provided for all developments listed in Appendix 15.1. Please update this document to reflect the full reference number for each development.
<b>8. Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)</b>		
<b>General</b>		
1.8.1	The Applicant	The application is currently being examined by a single appointed person. Can the parentheses around the words "single appointed person" in the second and fourth paragraphs on page 4 of the dDCO [APP-016] and the parenthesis at the end of the words "single appointed person" in the third paragraph of page 4 be removed?
1.8.2	The Applicant	Should working hour restrictions be specified and secured as a requirement in the dDCO?
1.8.3	The Applicant	Should an article for the temporary use of compounds be included in the dDCO?
1.8.4	The Applicant	Should a piling risk assessment, as referred to in W9 of the REAC [AS-009], be specified and secured as a requirement within the dDCO?
1.8.5	The Applicant	How would the installation of noise barriers and other noise mitigation during operation be secured in the dDCO?

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>Questions / comments relating to Articles (Art):</b>		
1.8.6	The Applicant	Art 2(1): The terms "Book of Reference" and "Environmental Statement" include capital letters whereas elsewhere in the dDCO they do not. Please ensure consistency in this regard and amend the dDCO as necessary/
1.8.7	The Applicant	Art 2(1): The term "commence" excludes certain works, including the diversion and laying of underground apparatus and site clearance. Might the exclusion of such works mean that they could potentially be carried out to the detriment of any protected species or archaeology prior to the undertaking of further protected species surveys as per Requirement (R) 7 and the submission and approval of a Written Scheme of Investigation as per R9?
1.8.8	The Applicant	Art 3(2)(a) and Art 20(6): In its RR, the EA [RR-008] highlights some inconsistencies between these articles relating to Environmental Permits. Please clarify the matter and provide justification for any disapplication of legislative provision sought.
1.8.9	The Applicant	Art 5(2) refers to "Any enactment applying to land within or adjacent to the Order limits". What enactments would apply to land adjacent to the Order limits and which land would be affected and in what way?
1.8.10	The Applicant	Art 7: Please expand on why this article is required and explain the likelihood of the Applicant needing to secure a planning permission within the Order limits for development not associated with the Proposed Development?
1.8.11	The Applicant	Art 7: Following on from this, might this article exclude various works from being subject to pre-commencement requirements?
1.8.12	The Applicant	Art 7(b): Should this end in a comma rather than a full stop?
1.8.13	The Applicant	Art 8: Please justify the provision for exceedances beyond the stated vertical limits of deviation.
1.8.14	The Applicant	Art 10(4), (5), (6), (7): Please justify why the SoS should be tied into a time period to make a decision?
1.8.15	The Applicant	Art 10(6): Please justify the appropriateness for decisions of the SoS to be subject to arbitration.
1.8.16	The Applicant	Art 10(11)(c): Should this end in a full stop rather that a semi-colon?

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.8.17	The Applicant	Art 11(3)(a): This disapplies s56 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (directions as to timing). Would this allow works to begin 'pre-commencement', before other, potentially relevant, requirements have been discharged?
1.8.18	The Applicant	Art 12: This article uses the terms "street" and "highway" interchangeably. What is the reason for this and should a single term be used consistently?
1.8.19	The Applicant	Art 12: If the definition of a "street" in section 48 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 includes highways and footways does this mean that the use of the term "highway" does not include footways?
1.8.20	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?
1.8.21	BDC	Art 16(6): Does BDC consider 28 days to be reasonable?
1.8.22	The Applicant	Art 20: This article relates to the use of any watercourse, public sewer or drain for the drainage of water in connection with the Proposed Development. However, ES Chapter 13 [APP-051] suggests that there would be no direct discharges to watercourses during construction or operation and that there are no proposed connections to public sewerage systems. Given this, please justify the power sought under this article.
1.8.23	The Applicant	Art 21: In justification of this article, please indicate which buildings may require protective works and why.
1.8.24	The Applicant	Art 22(1): This confers a wide power in relation to the entering of "... any land shown within the Order limits or which may be affected by the authorised development". Please provide a detailed justification for this power sought.
1.8.25	The Applicant	Art 26: Please fully justify the power sought to impose restrictive covenants. The SoS for Transport's decision (paragraph 62 of the M4 Motorway (Junctions 3 to 12) (Smart Motorway) DCO) should be noted: "to remove the power to impose restrictive covenants and related provisions as he does not consider that it is appropriate to give such a general power over any of the Order land as defined in article 2(1) in the absence of a specific and clear justification for conferring such a wide-ranging power in the circumstances of the proposed development and without an indication of how the power would be used". Other SoS for Transport decisions have included very similar positions, for example, the

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		A556 (Knutsford to Bowdon Improvement) DCO and the Lancashire County Council (Torrisholme to the M6 Link (A683 Completion of Heysham to M6 Link Road)) DCO.
1.8.26	The Applicant	Art 28(10): Please change "Order Land" to "Order land" for consistency and add a comma between the words "agents" and "contractors" for clarity.
1.8.27	The Applicant	Art 29(4)(b): Is the phrase "...end insert-" here correct, or should it just say "insert-"? Please explain and clarify.
1.8.28	The Applicant	Art 35: Please fully justify the power sought to impose restrictive covenants. The EM does not appear to address this.
1.8.29	The Applicant	Art 38(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". Could the EM be made consistent with the dDCO in this regard?
1.8.30	The Applicant	Art 38(4)(b): Please provide full justification for this power given that Schedule 8 lists hedgerows required for removal.
1.8.31	BDC	Art 38(4)(b): Is BDC content with the provisions of this article?
1.8.32	The Applicant	Art 41: Are the controls on noise elsewhere in the dDCO sufficient to justify the defence being provided by this article to statutory nuisance claims relating to noise?
1.8.33	The Applicant	Art 45: Please fully justify this article, bearing in mind there are already rights of appeal to a magistrates' court under s60(7) and s61(7) of the Control of Pollution Act 1974, and indicate whether it has been used in any other DCOs.
1.8.34	The Applicant	Art 48(2): Please confirm that this relates to any documents amended post the ExA's recommendation to the SoS rather than to any amended documents submitted during the course of the Examination (please also note later question on Schedule 10).
1.8.35	The Applicant	Art 48: Should the certified plans and documents be made publicly available? If so, how should this be delivered, and for what length of time?
1.8.36	The Applicant	Art 50: 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?
1.8.37	The Applicant	Art 50: Should the SoS be specifically excluded from this article?

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>Questions / comments relating to Requirements (R):</b>		
1.8.38	The Applicant	R3: This requirement is made from a single sentence of 8 lines which arguably makes it difficult to follow and interpret. Should it be better punctuated and made clearer?
1.8.39	The Applicant	R3: Notwithstanding the above, 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 bridges, given that these would be prominent features)?
1.8.40	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 consultee on this requirement within its RR [RR-008]).
1.8.41	The Applicant	R4(2)(f): Should this specify a "Site waste management plan" rather than "Outline site waste management plan"?
1.8.42	The Applicant	R4(2)(g): This specifies a "Soil Handling Management Plan". However, GS1 of the REAC [AS-009] cites a "Soil Management Plan to include Soil Resource Plan and Soil Handling Strategy". Please ensure consistency of plan titles.
1.8.43	The Applicant	R5(2): Should this requirement also make reference to the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan within the revised EMP [AS-009]?
1.8.44	The Applicant	R8: Should this requirement make provision for the long-term management and maintenance of surface and foul water drainage systems?
1.8.45	The Applicant	R8: Should this specify any other consultees, such as the EA? (The ExA also notes that the EA requests to be a consultee on this requirement within its RR [RR-008]).
1.8.46	The Applicant NCC HE	R9: Should this requirement make provision for the reporting and publishing of data?
1.8.47	The Applicant NCC HE	R9: Should NCC and HE also be consulted on the written scheme of investigation?
1.8.48	The Applicant	R10: Should this include more detail of what the traffic management plan should include?

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.8.49	The Applicant	R10(1): Should this refer to the Traffic Management Plan to accord with the outline Traffic Management Plan?
1.8.50	The Applicant	R12: Does this requirement relate to the pond specified in W8 of the REAC [AS-009] and the pond labelled "Biodiversity pond" on the Masterplan [APP-118], rather than the infiltration basin?
1.8.51	The Applicant	R12: Following on from the above, should this requirement refer to W8 of the REAC [AS-009] if so?
1.8.52	The Applicant	R12: Should this requirement make provision for the long-term management and maintenance of the pond?
1.8.53	The Applicant	R12(1): Please correct "timetable3" typographical error.
1.8.54	The Applicant	R12(2): Please change "Work no. 13" to "Work No. 13" and check if this error occurs elsewhere and change if necessary.
1.8.55	The Applicant	R14(2): Why is it considered appropriate for the agreement of the SoS to be deemed after the period specified?
1.8.56	The Applicant	R14 (3)(c): should the last part of this paragraph be on a separate line?
1.8.57	BDC NCC EA HE NE	R18: Do the parties consider 10 business days sufficient time to respond to consultation on the discharge of requirements?
<b>Questions / comments relating to Schedules (Sch)</b>		
1.8.58	The Applicant	Sch 1 lists further development under (a) to (e). Please justify the necessity for such development, including with regard to viaducts, pumping stations, cofferdams, outfalls, culverts and works to alter watercourses?
1.8.59	The Applicant	Sch 3, Part 1, column (2), first section: This cites "A 4.566 kilometre length of new highway...". It would be preferable to use measurements consistently. Metres is used elsewhere. Please rectify.
1.8.60	The Applicant	Sch 3, Part 1, column (2), first section: Notwithstanding the above, how does the measurement of "4.566 kilometres" relate to the measurement of "4570 metres" in Schedule 1, Work No. 1? Please explain or amend if necessary.

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.8.61	The Applicant	Sch 3, Part 1: some of the boxes within the table are not enclosed, for example at the top of page 49 and halfway down page 51. Please rectify this.
1.8.62	The Applicant	Sch 3, Part 4, column (3): Does "Removal of Restricted Road Status" effectively mean subject to the national speed limit ie 70mph in this case?
1.8.63	The Applicant	Sch 3, Part 5: Column (2) is titled "Road name, number and length". However, this column does not state any road lengths. Please explain or rectify this.
1.8.64	The Applicant	Sch 7 refers to 'laydown areas'. However, such areas are not mentioned in Sch 1 (Authorised Development). What is the reason for this?
1.8.65	The Applicant	Sch 9, Part 1, 7(1): Correct the end of the paragraph which has incorrect words "Error! Reference source not found." inserted and words missing.
1.8.66	The Applicant	Sch 10: Please ensure consistency with capital letters.
1.8.67	The Applicant	Sch 10: "environmental statement TR010040/APP/6.1 – 6/3" should be "Environmental statement TR010040/APP/6.1 – 6.3".
1.8.68	The Applicant	Sch 10: Is this list of documents to be certified complete or should other documents (including, but not necessarily limited to, Location Plan, Crown Land Plans, Drainage and Surface Water Plan, Statement Related to Statutory Nuisance, Report to Inform HRA, Transport Assessment, Scheme Design Report, outline Traffic Management Plan, outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan and Equalities Implications Assessment) be included?
1.8.69	The Applicant	Sch 10: Please ensure this list is kept updated with the correct versions of documents.
<b>Explanatory Memorandum (EM)</b>		
1.8.70	The Applicant	Art 8: The EM doesn't describe the 3 metre limits of deviation laterally and from commencement and termination as set out in this article of the dDCO. Please rectify this.
1.8.71	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.7.2: Should this refer to Art 19(4) rather than 19(5)?
1.8.72	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.8.1: The word "cope" appears to be a typographical error. Please rectify this.
1.8.73	The Applicant	Art 17(6) does not appear to have been explained in the EM.
1.8.74	The Applicant	Paragraph 5.5(m) relates to R13 rather than R12 and an explanation of R12 (new pond) has been omitted. Please rectify this.

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.8.75	The Applicant	Section 8 contains an error. Please rectify this.
<b>9. Geology and Soils</b>		
1.9.1	The Applicant	ES Chapter 9: Geology and Soils [APP-047], paragraph 9.7.13, states that an agricultural land survey would be carried out prior to the construction of the Proposed Development. Where is this secured, and if it is not, should it be?
1.9.2	The Applicant	ES Chapter 9: Geology and Soils [APP-047], paragraph 9.8.10, assesses the magnitude of impact of the temporary loss of Grade 1 agricultural land (40.2 ha according to Table 9-5) as 'moderate'. Notwithstanding the temporary nature of this loss, please explain further why the magnitude of impact, before mitigation, would not be considered 'major', as per Table 9-3, given that this would appear to result in the physical removal of >20 ha of Grade 1 agricultural land?
1.9.3	The Applicant	To ensure restored agricultural land functions effectively and as per its baseline condition, how would monitoring and any necessary remediation measures (as cited in section 9.11 of ES Chapter 9: Geology and Soils [APP-047]) be secured?
<b>10. Landscape and Visual</b>		
1.10.1	BDC	Is BDC satisfied that the viewpoints and photomontage locations selected (as shown on ES Figure 7.4 [APP-057]) are adequately representative of the Proposed Development, noting that the Applicant states that no response was received from the local authority to a further consultation in July 2020 in respect of some changes relating to the diversion of a medium pressure gas pipeline (paragraph 7.4.18 of ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-045])?
1.10.2	BDC NCC	Is BDC and NCC satisfied with the Masterplan [APP-118] and the proposed species mix as shown on the final page of the Masterplan?
1.10.3	BDC	Is BDC satisfied with the Applicant's approach to defining landscape character areas as per ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-045] paragraphs 7.7.24 - 7.7.25 and Table 7-3, ES Appendix 7.4 [APP-081] and ES Figure 7.3 [APP-057]?
1.10.4	BDC	Is BDC satisfied that G2 of the REAC [AS-009] is sufficient to ensure the minimisation of the effects of lighting?
1.10.5	The Applicant	The General Arrangement Plans [APP-009] indicate the locations of numerous lighting columns. Please explain the necessity for all of these, including on the proposed B1140 overbridge and around the Yarmouth Road junction (noting that the Lighting Assessment [APP-085], paragraph 11.7.9, identifies

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		some moderate and major adverse effects for some residential receptors along Yarmouth Road on operation).
1.10.6	The Applicant	ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-045], paragraphs 7.10.40 and 7.10.42, cite lighting column height would be either 8 or 10 metres in height. Where are such heights secured?
1.10.7	The Applicant	Please explain how the forms of the two new bridges over the proposed A47 have been considered to minimise landscape and visual effects.
1.10.8	The Applicant BDC	Given that the bridges would be prominent features of the Proposed Development, should there be a requirement within the dDCO for their detailed design, in consultation with BDC and / or subject to design review by Highway England's Strategic Design Panel?
1.10.9	The Applicant	ES Appendix 7.3 [APP-080] paragraph 7.2.2 notes that "The ZTV model does not take into account the effect of removal of existing vegetation on the potential extent of visibility of the Proposed Scheme." To what extent might the removal of vegetation affect the visibility of the Proposed Development, and if this is not taken into account in the Zone of Theoretical Visibility, has the worst case scenario been adequately assessed?
1.10.10	The Applicant	In respect of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plan within ES Appendix 7.7 [APP-084], what do the following represent: a) hatched blue areas; b) hatched green areas; c) solid red areas (for example, to west of Yarmouth Road junction); d) yellow lines; and e) blue / yellow shaded circles?
1.10.11	The Applicant	The numbering of trees and groups of trees on the Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plan within ES Appendix 7.7 [APP-084] is difficult to read given the small text size, poor definition and on occasion, yellow colour on white background. Can this document please be resubmitted to address this?
1.10.12	The Applicant	The Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plan within ES Appendix 7.7 [APP-084] identifies some trees and groups of trees within the Order limits which have not been surveyed. What is the reason for this and will this information be forthcoming?
1.10.13	The Applicant	Sheet 1 of 7 of the Masterplan [APP-118] identified locations where vegetation replacement species would be agreed with individual property owners. a) How would this be achieved?;

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>b) What size and species of vegetation could potentially be planted?; and</p> <p>c) Should agreement not be reached between the parties, how would this be resolved?</p>
1.10.14	The Applicant	The Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plan within ES Appendix 7.7 [APP-084] identifies the proposed removal of some trees from within G21. These are located between the existing A47 and the White House / Coach House. Appendix 2 of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment suggests that G21 provides screening between these properties and the A47. The Masterplan [APP-118] does not appear to show the replacement of the trees to be removed from this group. Is there scope to do so?
1.10.15	The Applicant	Please explain why the assessment considers Year 15 in summer (photomontages and paragraph 7.4.7 of ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-045]) and how this represents a worst-case scenario in terms of landscape and visual effects?
1.10.16	The Applicant	<p>Following on from the above question, the final sentence of ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects [APP-045], paragraph 7.12.6, states that "The potential for visibility of the Proposed Scheme would be greater during winter months following leaf fall but would not result in notable variation in the significance of visual effect". Please provide either:</p> <p>a) A detailed explanation for this contention; or</p> <p>b) Photomontages for Year 15 during winter months to support the contention.</p>
<b>11. Material Assets and Waste</b>		
1.11.1	The Applicant	ES Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste [APP-048], paragraph 10.9.12, sets out opportunities for the re-use of surplus excavated, recycled or recovered material outside of the Order limits. Have any of these opportunities been investigated further, what is the likelihood of their implementation and how would such opportunities be secured?
1.11.2	The Applicant	Table 10-6 of ES Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste [APP-048] sets out estimated quantities of materials and its recycled content to be imported to the site for construction of the Proposed Development. However, to what degree, where and how would the Proposed Development utilise or reuse any existing materials within the Order limits to limit the need to import these?
1.11.3	NCC	It is understood that the Proposed Development intersects a Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel. Does NCC consider that this designation has any implications for the Proposed Development and if so, what are they?
1.11.4	The Applicant	Table 10-6 (relating to quantities of materials during construction) of ES Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste [APP-048] in the 'Activity' column refers to 'Site preparation, earthworks and construction'.

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		How does this relate to Table 10-7 (relating to waste generated during construction) given that this table is split into 'Site demolition, preparation and earthworks' and 'Site construction' in the 'Activity' column and that a 5% wastage rate is applied to main construction materials only?
1.11.5	The Applicant	Please explain where the quantum of waste of asphalt (7180 tonnes), unbound aggregate (512250 tonnes) and concrete (116.17 tonnes) would arise from, as set out under activity 'Site demolition, preparation and earthworks' in Table 10-7 of ES Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste [APP-048].
1.11.6	The Applicant	The outline Site Waste Management Plan [APP-102] refers to the 'Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010'. This should be the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016. Please amend as necessary.
<b>12. Noise and Vibration</b>		
1.12.1	The Applicant	<p>ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049], paragraph 11.5.6, sets out that the maximum number of lorry trips per day for any construction phase would be 150 (or 300 movements). Paragraph 11.8.26 sets out that 'Table 2.3' in ES Chapter 2: The Proposed Scheme [APP-040] provides a summary of likely HGV movements (paragraph 11.10.9 refers to 'Table 2' and N6 of the REAC [AS-009] refers to Table 2-3). Please clarify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Whether the references to 'Table 2.3', 'Table 2' and 'Table 2-3' in the various documents are correct or whether they should rather refer to 'Table 2-4'?</li> <li>b) Table 2-4 of ES Chapter 2 highlights crossovers between construction phases; month 17 is included in phases 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Accounting for the maximum number of lorry trips in these phases, this table appears to suggest that there could be up to 425 HGV trips per day / 850 movements in month 17. However, in paragraph 11.5.6 of ES Chapter 2, the maximum number of lorry trips on which construction noise is determined is 150 / 300 movements. Please clarify this discrepancy and if necessary, update the ES and the noise and vibration assessments to account for this (including Table 11-6 of ES Chapter 11).</li> </ul>
1.12.2	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049], paragraph 11.5.1. states that most construction would take place during weekdays between 0700-1900 hours and on Saturdays between 0700-1300 hours. Paragraph 11.9.2 sets out that any work outside these hours would be subject to a noise and vibration assessment, agreed with the LPA and mitigated where necessary. How would this be achieved and secured?

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.12.3	The Applicant	Table 11-11 of ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049] specifies permanent noise barriers. Please provide further justification on the adequacy of noise barrier No 4, noting that a concern in respect of its effectiveness has been raised in a RR [RR-019].
1.12.4	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049], paragraph 11.9.2, sets out that resurfacing works using low noise road surface would be completed before the operation of the Proposed Development, to mitigate noise effects on two residential receptors (9 and 44 Highview Close). Given that this would be outside the Order limits, how confident can the ExA be that this would be implemented?
1.12.5	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049], paragraph 11.9.8, highlights the importance of communication with the public during construction to assist with lessening potential effects of noise. How would this be achieved and where is this secured?
1.12.6	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049] identifies that there would be a long-term significant adverse effect for 55 residential receptors and one non-residential along the B1140 (High Road) and Yarmouth Road in respect of noise. Notwithstanding information provided in paragraph 11.9.22 and 11.10.21, have all options for mitigating such effects been considered, noting that the National Networks NPS, paragraph 3.3, states that the Government expects applicants to avoid and mitigate environmental and social impacts?
1.12.7	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049] differentiates between noise effects in the 'short-term' and in the 'long-term'. Please clarify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the period of what is considered to be 'short-term' and 'long-term'; and</li> <li>b) the reasons why some receptors would experience significant adverse effects in the 'short-term' but not in the 'long-term'.</li> </ul>
1.12.8	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049], paragraphs 11.9.9 and 11.10.7 (and N6 of the REAC [AS-009]), suggest that alternative diversion routes would be adopted during the construction period to reduce adverse effects. However, ES Chapter 11 paragraph 11.5.3 and Table 3-9 and Figure 7 of the revised outline Traffic Management Plan [AS011] specify only one route. Please clarify this matter.
1.12.9	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049] identifies that receptors R12 and R13 would experience significant residual noise effects during construction. Have all options for mitigating such effects been adequately considered?
1.12.10	The Applicant	Tables 11-8 and 11-9 of ES Appendix 11.2 [APP-105] (and similarly Tables 11-8 and 11-9 of ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049]) set out magnitude of noise change in the short-term and

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		long-term during operation. Please explain why a moderate or major magnitude of noise change in the short-term has a lower decibel threshold than a moderate or major magnitude of noise change for the long-term?
1.12.11	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049], paragraph 11.8.28, notes that if construction related traffic uses the B1140 (Yarmouth Road) there is the potential for adverse significant noise effects and as such construction related traffic shall not use any roads other than the A47 to access site. This is also set out in Appendix H of the revised outline Traffic Management Plan [AS-011]. Please clarify: a) whether the reference to 'Yarmouth Road' is correct?; and b) if only the A47 is to be used for construction traffic, how an access road to the B1140 to and from a main compound, as annotated on the plan which forms part of Appendix H of the outline Traffic Management Plan, aligns with this?
1.12.12	The Applicant	Table 11-7 of ES Appendix 11.2 [APP-105] specifies the time period for 'day' as 0600-2400 hours and for 'night' as 2300-0700 hours. Are these time periods correct, and if not, does this have any implications for the operational noise assessment?
1.12.13	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049], paragraph 11.7.3, states that the comparison of measures baseline results is 'broadly in accordance with' the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise shortened method. Please clarify where this is not in accordance with this and any implications as a result.
1.12.14	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049], paragraphs 11.8.15 and 11.8.21 states that the use of construction plant that causes high levels of vibration at the closest point to the specified receptors would not be predicted to occur for periods of several days or would be unlikely to occur. Please provide further justification for these assertions.
1.12.15	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049], paragraph 11.8.46, states that 2 Hall Cottage would experience noise impacts above the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL) upon opening. Table 11-14 of ES Chapter 11 states that this receptor is predicted to have a minor increase in absolute noise levels in the short term, with embedded mitigation in place. It goes on to state that road traffic noise levels are predicted to reduce, stay the same or increase above the SOAEL. It then states that "At the opposite façade to the road, a minor adverse increase is predicted, however the road traffic noise level remains below the SOAEL." This information seems to be contradictory so please clarify the position in respect of noise impacts on 2 Hall Cottages and the effectiveness of

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		proposed mitigation (which the ExA understands to be a permanent noise barrier to be erected as soon as possible during construction).
1.12.16	The Applicant	Appendix 11.5 [APP-108] provides a number of tables in respect of the construction noise assessment. Are there similar tables for the operational noise assessment, and if not, please explain the reason for this?
1.12.17	The Applicant	Please clarify the units for the distances shown in Table 11-5 of ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049].
<b>13. Population and Human Health</b>		
1.13.1	NCC BDC	Can NCC and BDC comment on the assessment of Population and Human Health and its conclusions?
1.13.2	The Applicant	The Human Health assessment describes positive, neutral, negative or uncertain effects but does not define whether the effects presented in Table 12-9 are significant. Whilst sensitivity and potential health outcomes are defined, this does not align with the overarching methodology referenced in ES Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology [APP-042] and no alternative method to determine significance is presented. Please explain the method applied to determine significant effects for human health and clarify whether the impacts presented in Table 12-9 are significant?
1.13.3	The Applicant	ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-050], paragraph 12.8.1, states that where a closure of a walking, cycling or horse rider route is required, safe and appropriate alternative routes would be provided to ensure access is maintained during construction. How and where would such routes be provided during this time and where is this secured?
1.13.4	The Applicant	ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-050], paragraph 12.9.14, sets out that Table 12-9 relates to residual effects on private property and housing during operation. This table assesses the temporary land take from some residential gardens on Yarmouth Road to construct a retaining wall as having a residual moderate adverse effect (and thus significant). Please explain how this would be the case if land take would be temporary?
1.13.5	The Applicant	ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-050] identifies that the Proposed Development would adversely affect the viability of some agricultural land holdings during construction and operation. Please clarify: a) How impacts on viability have been assessed?; and

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		b) How any adverse impacts on the viability of agricultural land holdings would be compensated for?
1.13.6	The Applicant	<p>ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-050], paragraph 12.9.15, notes the loss of some allotments at Blofield as a result of the replacement car park. Please clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) The extent of the loss;</li><li>b) Whether these would be replaced, and if not, provide justification for this; and</li><li>c) Although not field and fuel allotments, whether the allotments could be classified as 'open space' as per sections 131 and 132 of PA2008, and if so, any implication for this?</li></ul>
1.13.7	The Applicant	<p>ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-049] identifies significant adverse long-term effects on some residential receptors along the B1140 (High Road) and Yarmouth Road which would not be mitigated. In light of this, please explain further the conclusions in Table 12-9 of ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-050] that long-term operational effects of noise on human health, due to mitigation, would be neutral?</p>
1.13.8	The Applicant	<p>The ExA notes that numerous RRs (including from NCC [RR-002] and BDC [RR-001]) raise concerns about the lack of a footbridge / underpass over / under the proposed A47 route to provide a direct link between footpath FP3 (and Lingwood / Lingwood Community Woodland / Burlingham Woodlands Walk) to the south with footpaths (and North Burlingham / Burlingham Woodland Walks) to the north and resulting effects on community severance and recreational opportunities. Such concerns also appear to have been raised during the consultation process in respect of the Proposed Development. Please clarify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) The additional distance which would need to be travelled to get from footpath FP3 (to the south of the proposed A47) to the nearest footpath, North Burlingham and Burlingham Woodlands Walk (to the north of the proposed A47) as a result of the Proposed Development?;</li><li>b) To what extent the Proposed Development complies with the National Networks NPS (particularly paragraphs 3.3, 3.17, 5.205 and 5.216), and any other relevant policies, which relate to mitigating environmental and social impacts, community severance, opportunities for walking and mitigating impacts for non-motorised users?;</li><li>c) The reasoning and considerations given to not providing a footbridge or underpass at this location during the design development of the Proposed Development to mitigate permanent significant adverse effects?; and</li><li>d) Can the Applicant please respond to requests in RRs for a footbridge or underpass and justify not providing such to mitigate the adverse effect?</li></ul>

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.13.9	The Applicant	ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-050], paragraph 12.6.9, states that Blofield is the main source of community assets in the study area. The ExA notes that a number of RRs suggests that Acle and Lingwood provide a wider range of services. In light of this, please clarify how Blofield was evaluated as being main source of community assets in the study area.
1.13.10	The Applicant	The ExA notes that a number of RR raise concerns at the lack of a proposed connecting footway / cycleway from North Burlingham to the footway near The Windle junction which connects to Acle. Would there be scope to provide such a footway / cycleway connection here, and if not, please explain the reasons for this?
1.13.11	The Applicant	With regard to the proposed east to west footpath running to the south of the proposed A47 route (ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-050], paragraph 12.8.11), please explain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The reason for this being a footpath only, rather than a mixed-use path, including for example, provision for cycling and horse riding; and</li> <li>b) To what extent the route would provide an attractive and safe environment for users, noting that some RRs (including from NCC [RR-002] and the Ramblers Norfolk Area [RR-015]) raise a concern over its proximity to the road.</li> </ul>
1.13.12	The Applicant	ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-050], paragraph 12.3.11, refers to surveys undertaken in line with the "Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment and Review (WCHAR) process". Please explain what the process is as it is unclear to the ExA from the information provided.
1.13.13	The Applicant	ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-050], paragraph 12.9.39, states that access for agricultural holding 10 would remain intact. Paragraph 12.9.50 states that following completion of construction there would be no physical impact upon this holding. This holding is shown on Sheet 10 of ES Figure 12.3 [APP-069]. However, RR [RR-068] suggests there would be changes to access given the closure of a layby, as does Inset H on Sheet 8 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans [APP-007]. Please clarify whether access to agricultural holding 10 would be affected, and if so, explain how this would influence the assessment of significant effects, having regard to the content of RR [RR-068]?
1.13.14	The Applicant	To what extent would the Proposed Development provide local employment and training opportunities?
1.13.15	The Applicant	Please explain why the communities of Brundall and Beighton are excluded from the study area when they are potentially linked via the source-pathway-receptor model (in line with DMRB LA 112 guidance, paragraph 3.28.1) given that they are linked to the Proposed Development via the road network and that the zone of influence from impacts such as noise and air pollution include these areas?

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.13.16	The Applicant	ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-050], paragraph 12.9.1, states that impacts from congestion will be minimal with traffic management measures aiming to reduce impacts from construction traffic. However, given paragraph 12.6.6 states that the A47 currently experiences congestion at peak hours and that there is potential for up to 425 additional HGVs / 850 movements per day between (and including) months 6 to 17 (according to ES Chapter 2: The Proposed Scheme [APP-040], Table 2-4), please further justify the assumption that congestion impacts during construction will be minimal.
1.13.17	The Applicant	Please provide further justification as to why a high sensitivity has been applied to private property and housing when scope remains that very high sensitivity could be applied based on the criteria listed in the methodology set out in ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-050].
1.13.18	The Applicant	Please provide further justification for assigning a medium sensitivity to receptors listed in Table 12-9 of ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-050], when the baseline description applies a high sensitivity to private housing receptors in Blofield, Burlingham and Acle in section 12.6 and no other receptors are identified?
<b>14. Transportation and Traffic</b>		
1.14.1	NCC BDC	Are the parties satisfied with the Applicant's Transport Assessment [APP-122]? Please provide reasons for any disagreement with any aspect of it.
1.14.2	NCC BDC	Are the parties satisfied with the Applicant's revised outline Traffic Management Plan [AS-011] (which includes details of construction traffic routing)? Please provide reasons for any concerns with any aspect of it.
1.14.3	The Applicant	The Transport Assessment [APP-122] does not appear to assess the implications of construction traffic on the highway network. ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health [APP-050], paragraph 12.6.6, determines that currently, the A47 experiences congestion at peak hours and there is potential for up to 425 HGVs / 850 movements per day between (and including) months 6 to 17 (ES Chapter 2: The Proposed Scheme [APP-040], Table 2-4) and mitigation presented in the outline Traffic management Plan includes various traffic management measures. Therefore, please provide further justification for reaching the conclusion that congestion impacts will be minimal (ES Chapter 12, paragraph 12.9.1) and for omitting an assessment of construction traffic impacts as a result of the Proposed Development?

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
1.14.4	The Applicant	N6 of the REAC [AS-009] states that construction related traffic can use the A47 as required provided that the maximum number of HGV movements described in ES Chapter 2 'Table 2-3' are not exceeded. Should this rather refer to 'Table 2-4'? If so, please amend as necessary.
1.14.5	The Applicant NCC	The RR from NCC [RR-002] raises some queries around the management and maintenance of new assets and responsibilities for verges and trees. Has there been any progress in respect of these matters?
1.14.6	The Applicant	Where footway / footpath / cycleway links would be separated by roads (for example in the vicinity of the proposed bridges), what consideration has been given to the safe crossing of these roads?
1.14.7	The Applicant	In its RR, NCC [RR-002] questions the proposed classification of some roads (section 1.3). Please provide a response to this or address the matter through the Statement of Common Ground between the parties.
1.14.8	The Applicant	Paragraph 3.1.15 of the outline Traffic Management Plan [AS-011] appears to be incomplete. Please address this.
1.14.9	The Applicant	Paragraph 3.1.14 of the outline Traffic Management Plan [AS-011] refers to the 'Cambridge Road junction'. Is this reference correct as this junction does not appear to be referred to elsewhere in the application documents that the ExA can see?
1.14.10	The Applicant	Column 3 of Table 3-3 of the outline Traffic Management Plan [AS-011], regarding road closures, does not appear to specify the time of day or stage in the programme despite the column heading. What is the reason for this?
1.14.11	The Applicant	In the Additional Submission from the Applicant on behalf of Norfolk Constabulary [AS-014], Norfolk Constabulary suggests that the Applicant gives consideration to two raised observation platforms for use by the Police and the Road Safety Camera Team. Please provide a response to this request.
1.14.12	The Applicant	The Transport Assessment [APP-122], paragraphs 7.8.4-7.8.6, 8.2.2 and 9.6.5, refer to the A47 / Brundall roundabout and indicate that it is already operating over capacity and would experience additional congestion as a result of the Proposed Development. It is understood that the Applicant intends to make improvements to this roundabout separately to address this. Please clarify: a) To what extent the roundabout would experience additional congestion; b) Whether any plans for improvements at this roundabout have progressed; c) The timescales for such improvement works; and

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		d) How confident the ExA can be that improvement works would be undertaken within the proposed timescales.
1.14.13	The Applicant	Does the Applicant intend to produce a Travel Plan for construction workers, and if so, how would this be secured?
1.14.14	The Applicant	Some RRs raise concerns about the safety of the A47 / Windle junction as a result of the Proposed Development (including the lack of proposed slip roads and the crossing of the A47 by vehicles). Please address this matter.
<b>15. Water Environment</b>		
1.15.1	EA NCC	Are the parties satisfied with the Applicant's Flood Risk Assessment and drainage proposals, and if not, please provide reasons for this?
1.15.2	The Applicant	There is limited data on groundwater conditions outside of the Order limits. Groundwater monitoring was also conducted over a dry period. Considering that all road drainage will drain by infiltration methods (ES Chapter 13: Road Drainage and Water Environment [APP-051], paragraph 13.9.16), that groundwater flooding susceptibility data is only available for a 500 metre corridor around the existing road and that there are areas to the south of the Order limits where there is potential for groundwater flooding (ES Chapter 13, paragraph 13.7.67), please explain how this influences the reliability of the assessments in Appendix 13.1: Flood Risk Assessment [APP-109] and ES Chapter 13?
1.15.3	The Applicant	The RR from NCC [RR-002] states in section 1.22 that "The climate change allowances applied within the proposed drainage strategy have been superseded." Please provide a response to this and address any implications for the drainage strategy / Flood Risk Assessment as a result.
1.15.4	The Applicant	ES Chapter 13: Road Drainage and Water Environment [APP-051], paragraph 13.4.8, states that there are no proposed outfalls discharging to surface water. However, paragraph 13.5.5 states that, during construction, the main site compound runoff will be collected within a ditch and redirected to settlement ponds before being discharged to a surface watercourse or ground. Please clarify this matter.
1.15.5	The Applicant	A Drainage Strategy is provided at ES Appendix 13.2 [APP-110]. Should reference be made to this within Requirement 8 of the dDCO [APP-016]?
1.15.6	The Applicant	ES Chapter 13: Road Drainage and Water Environment [APP-051], paragraph 13.9.6, suggests that as there are construction activities planned immediately adjacent to a number of ordinary watercourses or

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		drainage ditches, consent from NCC may be required. What consents would this involve and should these be identified in the Consents and Licences Position Statement [APP-018]?
1.15.7	The Applicant	ES Chapter 13: Road Drainage and Water Environment [APP-051], paragraph 13.9.12, refers to the need for a piling risk assessment (primarily in respect of overbridges and a retaining wall). Where is this secured, what would it involve and should it be specified in the dDCO [APP-016]?
1.15.8	The Applicant	ES Chapter 13: Road Drainage and Water Environment [APP-051], paragraph 13.9.14, makes reference to measures to minimise risk of contamination pathways relating to the gas pipeline diversion. What measures are envisaged and where are these secured?
1.15.9	The Applicant	ES Chapter 13: Road Drainage and Water Environment [APP-051], makes reference to a temporary drainage strategy. Please clarify whether this is secured under Requirement 4 of the dDCO [APP-016] or Requirement 8, and how these two requirements, in respect of water management / drainage, differ?
1.15.10	The Applicant	RR [RR-053] raises a concern around potential for increased flood risk to Waterlow Cottage as a result of the Proposed Development. Please provide a response to this concern.
1.15.11	The Applicant	ES Chapter 13: Road Drainage and Water Environment [APP-051] refers to the 'Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010'. This should be the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016. Please amend as necessary.

**ExQ1: 27 April 2021****Responses due by Deadline 1: 6 July 2021****ANNEX A****A47 Blofield to North Burlingham project:****Compulsory Acquisition / Temporary Possession Objections Schedule****(ExQ1: Question 1.5.1)**

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.

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

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 the Applicant is seeking compulsory acquisition of land / rights.