

A47 Blofield to North Burlingham Dualling

Scheme Number: TR010040

Volume 9

9.22 Applicant's Response to the Examiner's Second Written Questions (ExQ2)

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010
Rule 8(1)(c)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

October 2021

Deadline 5

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009**

A47 Blofield to North Burlingham Dualling
Development Consent Order 202[x]

**APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO THE EXAMINER'S
SECOND WRITTEN QUESTIONS (EXQ2)**

Regulation Number:	Rule 8(1)(c)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010040
Application Document Reference	9.22
BIM Document Reference	HE551490-GTY-LSI-000-RP-TX-30071
Author:	A47 Blofield to North Burlingham Dualling Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	October 2021	Deadline 5

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S SECOND WRITTEN QUESTIONS (EXQ2)	2
	APPENDIX A – 2.1.1	11

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1.1 The Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the A47 Blofield to North Burlingham scheme was submitted on 30 December 2020 and accepted for examination on 27 January 2021.
- 1.1.2 The purpose of this document is to set out Highways England's (the Applicant) response to the Examiner's Second Written Questions (ExQ2), issued on 28 September 2021.

2 RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S SECOND WRITTEN QUESTIONS (EXQ2)

ExQ2	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
2.1.1	App	Please provide an updated summary table of the likely significant residual effects, noting the errors in the current version (at Appendix E of [REP1-061]) relating to ES Chapters 7, 13 and 15.	An updated table is provided in Appendix A.
2.1.2	App	The Applicant submitted a Change Request at Deadline 4 and provided a number of updated documents in respect of it. Some of these documents were updated for other reasons also (including the dDCO [REP4-007 / REP4-008]). Should the Change Request not be accepted, can the Applicant please advise how best to deal with these documents?	<p>The ExA indicated in his letter of 8 October 2021 that he would not accept the change request without the consent of all Category 1 and 2 parties. The Applicant is reviewing the effect of this decision and how the Applicant may satisfy the tests in Section 123 of the Planning Act 2008 in respect of this land and would expect to provide a detailed response at Deadline 6.</p> <p>In the event that the Applicant cannot meet the tests in Section 123 it would be likely that the Applicant would submit revised documents omitting the relevant changes to the Land Plans (REP4-002), Book of Reference (REP4-015), Statement of Reasons (REP4-013) and Schedules 5 and 7 of the dDCO (REP4-007), but retaining the other changes to the scheme required to carry out the works, including those made to the Works Plans (REP4-003), General Arrangement Plans (REP4-006) and Rights of Way and Access Plans (REP4-004).</p>
2.1.3	App	Please identify any matters of disagreement between the Applicant and relevant parties to the Statements of Common Ground.	The Applicant has updated The Statement of Commonality for Statements of Common Ground (TR010040/EXAM/8.1 Rev 4) to clearly identify matters of disagreement for each party.
2.3.1	NE	In its response to ExQ1.3.8 [REP1-071], NE stated that it would be helpful for the Applicant to provide a table with a reason for why each resource was scoped out / not carried forward in the assessment. The Applicant provided this at Deadline 4 [REP4-053]. Can NE please comment on this?	Response not required from the Applicant
2.3.2	NE	During Issue Specific Hearing 2, the ExA asked the Applicant about completing the surveys of Great Crested Newts, which had been curtailed due to COVID-19. The response [REP4-051] was that the survey window had now passed and that there were no further opportunities to survey this species within the remaining examination period. However, Requirement 7 of the dDCO requires	Response not required from the Applicant

ExQ2	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		pre-construction protected species surveys and the Applicant confirmed the surveys would be completed at this time and any necessary licences subsequently applied for. Is NE content with this approach given the circumstances?	
2.5.1	App	Please provide an updated: a) Compulsory Acquisition Schedule; and b) Statutory Undertakers Progress Schedule.	The Applicant has provided an updated Compulsory Acquisition Schedule (TR010040/EXAM/9.4 Rev 6) and Statutory Undertakers Progress Schedule (TR010040/EXAM/9.5 Rev 3) at Deadline 5.
2.5.2	App	Please provide an update in respect of Crown Land negotiations, indicate when agreement is likely to be reached and set out any potential obstacles to reaching an agreement before the close of the Examination.	The Applicant is not aware of any obstacles to reaching agreement before the end of the examination. The delay in reaching agreement is simply down to the time taken to go through the administrative process.
2.5.3	App	At section 2.10 (page 31) of the Applicant's Deadline 4 submission [REP4-051], the Applicant states that it is the physical factors that result from the new or altered road that form the basis of any potential claim under the Land Compensation Act 1973. On that basis, can the Applicant confirm that no valid claims could arise as a result of an increase in noise for those receptors along Yarmouth Road and the B1140 High Road from additional traffic using these roads (i.e. those receptors referred to in ES Chapter 11 [REP1-028] paragraph 11.12.10)?	<p>The Applicant assumes that the properties in question are those mentioned in Paragraph 11.12.9 of ES Chapter 11 (REP1-028).</p> <p>Landowners have the protection of Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973 where the value of their property has depreciated due to physical factors caused by the use of public works such as a new highway.</p> <p>Those "physical factors" include noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke and artificial lighting and the discharge on to the land in respect of which the claim is made of any solid or liquid substance.</p> <p>It may be that local landowners have a right to claim compensation in this regard, however under the statutory process that is a matter for those landowners to assess and to submit a claim (if they consider they have one) once the works are open for use. The Compensation Code does not provide for the acquiring authority to prospectively assess such claims, and nor is there any requirement for it to do so. No Applicant will ever be in a position to rule out whether any particular property will have a claim, and nor is it their role to do so.</p> <p>In putting forward its application the Applicant is not required to demonstrate which properties would or would not benefit from a</p>

ExQ2	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>right to claim compensation, and nor, in our submission, is the ExA required to consider this: it is a matter of compensation which is not for the examination.</p> <p>The answer to the ExA's original question 1.5.12 (as to whether "these receptors [could] be entitled to make a relevant claim under... the Land Compensation Act 1973" is yes that they could have a claim (as may any property) if the statutory tests can be met. However the Applicant's understanding is that it is unlikely that a claim could be sustained in the event that the "physical factors" giving rise to a claim use of a side road (such as Yarmouth Road) as opposed to the works themselves.</p>
2.6.1	BDC	Please comment on / confirm the Applicant's written response (in the last column of the table in [REP4-051] relating to Ref 5.5 on page 65) in respect of effects on the Church of St Andrew Grade I listed building?	Response not required from the Applicant
2.8.2	BDC	R3: In its Deadline 4 submission [REP4-054], BDC states that the General Arrangement Plans do not include details of structures and would thus be insufficient for the purposes of R3 relating to design. However, and notwithstanding that R3 does not specify the General Arrangement Plans (as discussed in the Issue Specific Hearings), the General Arrangement Plans did at the time, on the last two pages, show details of structures. These last two pages were subsequently moved to the last two pages of the Engineering Drawings and Sections plans at Deadline 4 [REP4-005]. Can BDC please review these plans and comment on them in terms of their adequacy for the purposes of R3?	Response not required from the Applicant
2.8.3	App	R4(1), R4(4), R8(1) and R8(2) – please insert commas and remove unnecessary 'and' where appropriate.	These amendments have been made in the dDCO (TR010040/APP/3.1 Rev 4) submitted at Deadline 5.
2.8.4	App	Sch 1: add a fullstop between 'Work No' and '26A' to show 'Work No. 26A' instead of 'Work No 26A' as previously requested.	These amendments have been made in the dDCO (TR010040/APP/3.1 Rev 4) submitted at Deadline 5.

ExQ2	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
2.8.5	App	Sch 9 Part 2: Please provide an update in respect of Protective Provisions, indicating a) when these are likely to be agreed; and b) where there are outstanding matters of disagreement between parties.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Cadent</u>. Protective Provisions are agreed and formal agreements are being put in place. It is anticipated that they will be completed before the end of the examination. 2. <u>Virgin Media Limited</u> has sent the Applicant some documents, but not in the form of Protective Provisions. This appears to be a works contract/agreement of the sort that may be issued if Virgin Media was approached by someone asking to carry out works. The Applicant has gone back to Virgin Media highlighting the draft Protective Provisions in Part 2 of Schedule 9 of the dDCO (REP3-004) to see if these can be agreed. To date the Applicant has had no reply from Virgin. 3. <u>Vodafone</u>. The Applicant is currently considering comments from Vodafone. It is currently anticipated that Agreement will be reached before the end of the Examination. 4. <u>Anglian Water</u>. The Applicant has asked Anglian Water to confirm whether the protective provisions as updated in the dDCO at Deadline 4 are agreed.
2.8.6	App	Sch 10: This provides a detailed list of documents to be certified. However, there are a number of errors and inconsistencies within it (for example, two entries for the Habitats Regulations Assessment with different revision numbers and incorrect revision numbers of other documents, including the Rights of Way and Access Plans). Can the Applicant please ensure that all version numbers are correct and that documents are not repeated in this list.	A corrected and updated Schedule 10 has been included in the dDCO (TR010040/APP/3.1 Rev 4) submitted at Deadline 5.
2.10.1	App	Please address NCC's comments in respect of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment as set out in its Deadline 4 submission [REP4-061].	This has been addressed in the Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (TR010040/EXAM/9.21 Rev 0) submitted at Deadline 5.
2.12.1	App	At section 4.2 (page 78) of the Applicant's Deadline 4 submission [REP4-051], it states that low road noise resurfacing at Noise Important Area 5206 is scheduled to take place between 13 September 2021 and 5 October 2021. Please confirm whether these works have been completed?	The Applicant can confirm these works have now been completed.
2.13.1	App	The ExA will need to consider, amongst other things, as to whether the Proposed Development would be acceptable or not without the provision of either a footbridge or underpass around its central	The Application does not include a footbridge or underpass ("Crossing") at the location of Footpath 3 and the Applicant's firm view is that a Crossing is unnecessary and unjustified.

ExQ2	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		point. Should the ExA consider the Proposed Development unacceptable in this regard, or should the ExA consider it acceptable, but the SoS takes a different view, how would the Applicant advise that such a situation might be addressed / overcome - for example, might there be a suitably worded requirement which could be inserted into the dDCO to secure a central crossing point in one form or another?	<p>The Applicant's view is that the inclusion of a new Crossing within the dDCO would constitute an additional "Work" in Schedule 1, it would require amendments to a number of application documents and would require the submission of additional structure drawings. Moreover is it not assessed in the Environmental Statement in relation to issues such as landscape, visual amenity, cultural heritage and flood risk. There is insufficient land to construct a Crossing with the necessary ramps within the land which the Applicant could acquire permanently, and this would require further land to turn pink on the land plans. A Crossing would also displace mitigation planting which would require further alterations to the application.</p> <p>Any amendment to the application to include a Crossing would therefore be likely to constitute a material change and may also invoke the Infrastructure Planning (Compulsory Acquisition) Regulations 2010.</p>
2.14.1	App NCC	Please provide an update on agreements relating to the transfer of assets.	The Applicant is continuing to discuss the transfer of assets with Norfolk County Council.
2.14.2	App NCC	The ExA notes differing advice within DMRB CD 143 'Designing for walking, cycling and horse-riding' and Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20 'Cycle infrastructure design', relating to recommended widths of shared cycle tracks (2 metres and 3 metres respectively). Can the parties please: a) explain the status of LTN 1/20 and DMRB CD 143; and b) provide a view as to whether the standards of LTN 1/20 can be applied flexibly, given the rural context and likely low usage levels of shared cycle tracks associated with the Proposed Development?	<p>LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design was published alongside "Gear Change: A bold vision for cycling and walking." The Applicant acknowledges that "Gear Change" applies to both urban and rural environments. However, the Applicant is mindful of the statement on page 33 reproduced below:</p> <p><i>"No "one size fits all" approach – This policy, and the standards, recognise that different levels of provision may be appropriate in different place, both within and between local authorities. For instance, in a shire county, the busy, densely-populated county town may be a higher priority for cycling intervention than a small village. We will require more from local authorities, urban or rural. But our main focus will be on medium-sized towns, larger towns and cities."</i></p> <p>LTN 1/20 applies to local highway schemes as indicated in</p>

ExQ2	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>paragraph 1.1.1, which states that:</p> <p><i>“Local authorities are responsible for setting design standards for their roads. This national guidance provides a recommended basis for those standards on the overarching design principles and 22 summary principles. There will be an expectation that local authorities will demonstrate that they have given due consideration to this guidance when designing new cycling schemes and in particular, when applying for Government funding that includes cycle infrastructure.”</i></p> <p>Guidance for strategic roads is provided by DMRB standards, namely, CD 143 Designing for walking, cycling and horse-riding (for shared use facilities) and CD 195 Designing for cycle traffic (for cycle only schemes). As the Scheme is providing either footways or shared unsegregated cycle tracks with a right of way on foot, CD 195 does not apply in this case.</p> <p>The Applicant has been cognisant of guidance provided in LTN 1/20 and DMRB standards when identifying the package of Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding improvements for the Scheme. However, Highways England does consider it appropriate to adopt the principles of LTN 1/20 for the Scheme on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways England is not required to adopt the principles of Local Transport Notes. These are advisory documents produced by the Department for Transport and recommended to local highway authorities for use on their roads • The existing A47 and the local roads to which it connects are not new roads, a status not changed by the de-trunking process. • The scheme is not being funded through a grant to Local Authorities.

ExQ2	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>With regard to applying LTN 1/20 guidance flexibly, paragraph 4.4.4, page 33, of LTN 1/20 states, with reference to separation of the facility from the carriageway of a road, that <i>"Although there may be fewer cyclists and pedestrians in rural areas, the same requirement for separation from fast moving motor vehicle applies. A well-constructed shared use facility designed to meet the needs of cycle traffic - including its width, alignment and treatments at side road and other junctions – may be adequate where pedestrian numbers are very low."</i> It goes on to state at paragraph 5.5.3, page 41, that <i>"..... away from the highway, and alongside busy interurban roads with few pedestrians or building frontages, shared use might be adequate..... Such facilities should be designed to meet the needs of cycle traffic....."</i> Paragraph 5.6.1, page 43 references the use of <i>"..... rural shared use facilities where there are few pedestrians ..."</i> in the context of selecting cycle design speed and paragraph 5.9.3, page 45 references the use of <i>".... Shared use facilities alongside rural highways where there are few pedestrians...." in the context of selecting horizontal curve radii.</i> Additionally, paragraph 6.5.6, page 65 states that <i>"Shared use may be appropriate in some situations, if well designed and implemented. Some are listed below..... Alongside interurban and arterial roads where there are few pedestrians....."</i> These extracts from LTN 1/20 highlight the fact that Gear Change is not a one size fits all approach and that use of shared use, cycle track, facilities for pedestrians and cyclists are appropriate alongside highways in rural areas where pedestrian flows are known to be low, as is the case in the vicinity of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has liaised with Norfolk County Council regarding the standard of the infrastructure to be provided and the Council has confirmed that it supports the provision of shared use cycle tracks.</p> <p>LTN 1/20 focusses primarily on the design of cycle only infrastructure whereas DMRB standard CD 143 provides guidance on the design of shared use routes. CD 143 states that the width of an unsegregated shared use route shall be a minimum of 2.0 metres where there are less than 200 users per hour (paragraph</p>

ExQ2	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>E/3.5 refers). Observed user activity in the vicinity of the Scheme is very low and the volume of users is unlikely to exceed 200 users an hour in the future. A minimum width of 2.0 metres is therefore appropriate for the proposed shared use facilities.</p> <p>The Scheme proposes 2.5 metres wide shared use facilities, although, the Applicant acknowledges that the width may need to reduce to 2.0 metres at pinch-points, e.g. where there are existing trees. The widths of the proposed facilities will be confirmed as part of detailed design.</p>
2.14.3	App	Please: a) explain how shared cycle tracks would be separated from carriageways; and b) clarify whether the separation on overbridges would be provided by the 1000mm width area identified as 'Hard Strip' between the carriageway and the cycleway on the section drawings within the Engineering Drawings and Sections [REP4-005]?	<p>a) The shared use cycle tracks adjacent to carriageway will be constructed with an appropriate bituminous macadam surface and will have a kerbed edge. A separation distance will also be provided between the kerbed edge and the running carriageway of the adjacent road. This separation distance will be provided in accordance with paragraph E/3.5.1, page 9 of CD 143 and will reflect the prevailing speed limit of the adjacent road. For example, the proposed speed limit on the B1140 overbridge will be 30mph so the separation from the carriageway should be a minimum of 0.5 metres.</p> <p>b) CD 143 notes that "<i>Where a hard strip is provided on the carriageway, it can be considered as part of the separation distance for shared use routes.</i>"</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that the separation on the overbridges will be provided by the 1000mm width area identified as 'Hard Strip'.</p>
2.15.1	App	In its Deadline 4 submission [REP4-061], NCC suggests including provisions within the dDCO relating to works in watercourses. Please comment on this.	The Applicant does not propose to carry out works to watercourses as there are none, and had deleted powers to carry out such works from Article 20 of the dDCO (REP4-007) submitted at Deadline 4.
2.15.2	App EA	Please further address the EA's concerns set out in its Deadline 4 submission [REP4-058] relating to: a) extraction licences; and b) R6 of the dDCO relating to contaminated land and groundwater –	(a) The Consent and Licences Position Statement (TR010040/APP/3.3 Rev 4) has been updated with the agreed wording and submitted at Deadline 5.

ExQ2	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		alternatively, provide a completed Statement of Common Ground with the EA to highlight where any disagreement cannot be resolved and the reasons for this.	<p>(b) Amendments have been made to Requirement 6 of the dDCO, which address the Environment Agency's concerns. The dDCO (TR010040/APP/3.1 Rev 4) has been updated and submitted at Deadline 5.</p> <p>The Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency (TR010040/EXAM/8.4 Rev 1) has also been updated and submitted at Deadline 5, with all points now agreed.</p>

APPENDIX A – 2.1.1

Summary of predicted residual effects

To provide a summary of the likely significant residual effects identified within each ES Chapter, the predicted residual effect tables have been pulled together and are detailed below for the following ES Chapters:

- ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage (**REP4-019**)
- ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity (**REP4-021**)
- ES Chapter 9: Geology and Soils (**APP-047**)
- ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration (**REP1-028**)
- ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health (**REP4-023**)

The scope of the EIA considers a wide range of impacts and receptors specific to each discipline in order to identify relevant potential likely significant effects. As a result, a single table presenting significant effects can be unhelpful to the reader as the editing required can undervalue or possibly invalidate the detailed results of the assessment. All conclusions presented in these tables should be read in conjunction with the correlating chapter(s).

ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage (REP4-019)

Extract from Table 6-2: Residual construction effects

NHLE / HER / BLO Ref Name	Designation	Value / Sensitivity	Description of impact and mitigation proposals	Magnitude of Impact before mitigation	Magnitude of impact after mitigation	Significance of Effect
MNF62994 Early 20th century milestone marking Norwich 7 miles and Yarmouth 15 miles	None	Medium	Asset is within the Proposed Scheme boundary. The asset will be appropriately conserved, restored and protected during works. It will then be proposed for listing to Grade II. The magnitude of impact is assessed being on the individual asset as well as on the setting and group value of all remaining milestones on the former turnpike and the turnpike itself. This could lead to an assessment of either moderate or major significance. In this case, moderate was chosen to not overstate the effect.	No change	Major beneficial	Moderate beneficial
MNF62995 20th century milestone marking Norwich 9 miles and Yarmouth 13 miles	None	Medium	Asset is within the Proposed Scheme boundary. The asset will be appropriately conserved, restored and protected during works. It will then be proposed for listing to Grade II. Layout of paths, fences and planting will re-instate the general visual context of the asset, enhancing its setting. The magnitude of impact is assessed being on the individual asset as well as on the setting and group value of all remaining milestones on the former turnpike and the turnpike itself. This could lead to an assessment of either moderate or major significance. In this case, moderate was chosen to not overstate the effect.	No change	Major beneficial	Moderate beneficial

Extract from Table 6-3: Residual operational effects

NHLE / HER / BLO Ref Name	Designation	Value / Sensitivity	Description of impact and mitigation	Magnitude of Impact before mitigation	Magnitude of impact after mitigation	Significance
1051522, MNF8523 Church of St Andrew	Listed Building Grade I	High	Traffic on the new road will be visible and audible, and this will change with season and weather. As the traffic on the new carriageway will be further away to the south than the current A47 alignment, and landscape planting will be designed to be in keeping with the current screening, this is considered a positive effect overall.	No change	Minor beneficial	Moderate beneficial

ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity (REP4-021)

Extract from Table 8-9: Predicted significance of residual effects on biodiversity resources following implementation of committed mitigation

Biodiversity resource and valuation	Description of impacts (construction)	Level of impact pre-mitigation	Description of impact (operation)	Level of impact pre-mitigation	Residual effects after mitigation	Level of impact after mitigation	Significance of residual effects
Bats (within Proposed Scheme boundary) (National)	<p>Loss of one tree roost and disturbance of 3 tree roosts during construction.</p> <p>Disturbance of known bat roosts in buildings in Poplar Farm, Oaklands, the Lindens, Hall Cottages and the White House from noise, vibration and light.</p> <p>Permanent loss of foraging habitat, severance of commuting routes and foraging areas, disturbance resulting in avoidance and abandonment of habitats and roosts.</p>	Major Adverse	<p>Direct mortality through traffic collisions due to wider road. Pollution of water courses could lead to reduction in prey availability.</p> <p>Disturbance from noise, vibration or light spill resulting in permanent avoidance and abandonment of foraging habitats, commuting routes and roosts.</p>	Major adverse	<p>After mitigation included in the precautionary method statement, residual effects to roosts will be neutral.</p> <p>Disturbance from loss of habitat during construction will not be remediated immediately as there will be a time lag between loss and the remediated habitats reaching maturity.</p> <p>Disturbance from noise, vibration and light spill is not predicted to cause residual effects.</p> <p>Mortality through traffic collisions is predicted to be less likely once remediated road side trees mature.</p> <p>Mitigation has been designed on a precautionary basis ie that bats may cross the road at a risk height and this is reflected in the residual effects stated for the bats.</p>	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse

ES Chapter 9: Geology and Soils (APP-047)

Extract from Table 9-6: Determination of residual effects significance

Receptor	Summary of effects	Mitigation measures	Significance category
Agricultural soils	Stripping of topsoil across the proposed scheme footprint required for the permanent works (road, structures, drainage network, environmental bunds etc)	<p>Inclusion of a Materials Management Plan (MMP) and Soil Management Plan (SMP).</p> <p>Minimising over-excavation of soils.</p> <p>Reuse of soils as much as possible on the Proposed Scheme</p> <p>Use of best practice measures for soil handling</p> <p>Logistical planning of site layout and access</p> <p>Identifying soils subject to earthworks and construction activities</p>	<p>Receptor sensitivity: Very high</p> <p>Magnitude: Major</p> <p>Significance: Very large</p> <p>Duration: Permanent</p>
Agricultural soils	Stripping of soil across the Proposed Scheme footprint required for the temporary works (construction compounds, haul roads, gas pipeline diversion)	<p>Inclusion of a Materials Management Plan (MMP) and Soil Management Plan (SMP).</p> <p>Minimising over-excavation of soils.</p> <p>Reuse of soils as much as possible on the Proposed Scheme</p> <p>Use of best practice measures for soil handling</p> <p>Protection of the agricultural soils within the temporary land take</p> <p>Logistical planning of site layout and access</p> <p>Identifying soils subject to earthworks and construction activities</p> <p>Specifying areas of soils to be stripped, stored and replaced to their baseline condition</p>	<p>Receptor sensitivity: Very high</p> <p>Magnitude: Minor</p> <p>Significance: Moderate</p> <p>Duration: Temporary</p>

ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration (REP1-028)

Extract from Table 11-14: Final operational noise significance summary table

Receptor Group	Magnitude of change	Significance of Environmental Effect	Justification of Significance Conclusion
Strumpshaw Road/Stone Road/Wood Lane	Major/moderate beneficial in the short term, moderate/minor beneficial in the long term	Significant beneficial	The long term impact is predicted to be of a lower magnitude than the short term. However, the major/moderate change at 17 dwellings in the short-term is considered a significant beneficial effect.
Yarmouth Road (Blofield)	Major/moderate adverse in the short term, minor/moderate adverse in the long term	Significant adverse	For 37 dwellings either side of Yarmouth Road an increase in road traffic noise level results from the predicted increase in traffic flows and speeds along this road. The impact magnitude remains moderate in the long-term and a significant adverse effect is predicted. Significant adverse effects are likely at dwellings within 80m of Yarmouth Road (between the A47 and the Danesbower Lane junction).
Receptors on the B1140 (High Road)	Moderate/major adverse in the short term, moderate/minor adverse? in the long term	Significant adverse	The long term impact is predicted to be of a lower magnitude than the short term. However, 18 receptors are predicted to have a moderate adverse impact in the long term. Therefore significant adverse effects are likely at a number of dwellings on the B1140 (Cock Tavern to Sandy Lane).

ES Chapter 12: Population and Human Health (REP4-023)

Extract from Table 12-9:Residual effects on private property and housing

Description of impact	Sensitivity	Magnitude of impact	Potential impacts (pre-mitigation)	Residual effect
<i>Private property and housing</i>				
Temporary land take would be required from residential gardens on Yarmouth Road, south of the A47 to construct the western retaining wall.	High	Moderate	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse
Change in access for residents along Lingwood Road	Medium	Moderate	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse
Change in access for residents along Lingwood Lane	Medium	Moderate	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse

Extract from Table 12-10: Residual effects on commercial land and assets during construction

Description of impact	Sensitivity	Magnitude of impact	Potential impacts (pre-mitigation)	Residual effect
Community land and assets				
Permanent land-take from the Blofield allotment	High ¹	Minor	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
Permanent and temporary land-take from Lingwood Community Woodland	Medium	Moderate	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
Access to Lingwood Community Woodland south of the existing A47	Medium	Minor	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse

Extract from Table 12-13: Assessment of permanent effects on agricultural holdings

Holding Name	Sensitivity to Change	Land removed from holding (ha) (and % of total size)	Permanent Severance	Magnitude of Impact	Residual Effect
Agricultural Land Holdings					
6	High	9.28 (23)	Moderate	Moderate	Large adverse
7	Very High	9.51 (20)	Moderate	Moderate	Large adverse

Extract from Table 12-14: Residual construction effects on human health

Description of impact	Sensitivity	Magnitude of impact	Potential impacts (pre-mitigation)	Residual effect
WCH				
Severance of Burlingham FP3 during construction	Medium	Major	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse

¹ The sensitivity of the allotment gardens has been increased to High value due to its importance to the local community, as raised during the 2017 non-statutory consultations.