



Norwich Western Link

Pre-application Consultation

Appendix 9: Frequency Tables

Author: WSP

Document Reference: 5.01.09

Version Number: 00

Date: March 2024



Contents

1	Frequency Tables	3
---	------------------------	---

Tables

Table 1-1	Question 5.....	3
Table 1-2	Question 7.....	9
Table 1-3	Question 10.....	14
Table 1-4	Question 12.....	17
Table 1-5	Question 15.....	20
Table 1-6	Question 17.....	25
Table 1-7	Question 19.....	28
Table 1-8	Question 21.....	31
Table 1-9	Question 23.....	37
Table 1-10	Question 25.....	41
Table 1-11	Question 26.....	44



1 Frequency Tables

1.1.1 This appendix outlines the frequency tables used as part of the coding process which is used to analyse responses to the pre-application consultation. This shows the total number of mentions against each code or theme within the code frame. The most common coded themes are listed in further detail within the main body of the Consultation Report.

1.1.2 We have included a summary of key information shown in this document in an accessible format. However, some users may not be able to access all technical details. If you require this document in a more accessible format please contact norwichwesternlink@norfolk.gov.uk

Table 1-1 Question 5

Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Scheme opposition/ is not needed	116	11
Oppose – negative impact on the environment	96	9
Oppose – Cost/ Money should be invested elsewhere	54	5
Oppose – negative impact on wildlife/ wildlife habitats	51	5
Suggestion – Ensure dedicated routes for active travel	47	4
Concern – Local access is insufficient	46	4
Oppose- More active travel/ local access required	40	4
Suggestion – More public transport/ modal shift needed	39	4



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Support – Local Access/ Active Travel	38	4
Support – Scheme needed	37	4
Concern – General traffic/ rat running increase due to scheme	33	3
Concern – loss of green space	26	3
Request for more information or questions	23	2
Suggestion – Scheme design changes	19	2
Support – Suggested mitigation will reduce traffic/ congestion/ rat- running	19	2
Suggestion – Faster Delivery	17	2
Comments about other schemes/ Comparison with other schemes	16	2
Oppose – Barnham Broom Road/ Low Road access only – Loss of most direct route	16	2
Suggestion – General alternative traffic mitigation/ restrictions to be enforced	14	1
Comments unrelated to the scheme	13	1
Concern – Impact on Air Quality	13	1
Concern – Noise Increase	13	1
Concern - Safety	13	1
Suggestion – Existing roads should be improved	13	1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
No comments	11	1
Oppose – Materials/ process/ events incomplete	11	1
Oppose – not enough mitigation measures/ does not address environmental issues	11	1
Comments about areas outside scheme limits	10	1
Concern – Scheme will not improve the traffic/ rat running/ current situation	10	1
Concern – NDR and other local roads cannot cope with traffic	9	1
Oppose – Barnham Broom Road/ Low Road access only – Traffic displacement/ increase in traffic	9	1
Oppose Barnham Broom Road/ Low Road access only – Impact on residents/ business	9	1
Concern – Road will lead to more development in area	8	1
Oppose – Honingham Lane closure – loss of route options	8	1
Oppose – Restricted right turn on Holt Road	8	1
Oppose – Specific road closures	8	1
Oppose – Honingham Lane closure – loss of most direct route	7	1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Suggestion – Barnham Broom Road/ Low Road access only – Alternative calming measures/ mitigations	7	1
Support – Scheme supports environment/ wildlife	7	1
Support – Scheme will improve safety	7	1
Concern – Traffic displacement/ mitigations not sufficient (Holt Road/ Horsford village)	6	1
Oppose – Green Bridge	6	1
Concern – Light pollution	5	1
Concern – Negative impact on rare chalk stream/ SSSI	5	1
Concern – Negative impact on resident’s health	5	1
Oppose – Barnham Broom Road – Low Road access only – Safety concerns	5	1
Oppose – Drainage system	5	1
Oppose – Honingham Lane closure – traffic displacement/ increase in traffic	5	1
Suggestion – Alternative route outside proposal	5	1
Concern – Visual Impacts	4	0.4
Oppose - Honingham Lane closure - negative impact on residents and businesses	4	0.4



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Support – Ringland Lane proposal	4	0.4
Support – Speed restrictions	4	0.4
Concern – Increase in fly tipping/ littering	3	0.3
Concern – traffic displacement/ mitigations not sufficient/ traffic increase (Taverham Road & The Street)	3	0.3
Oppose - General road closures will impact emergency services access	3	0.3
Support – Bell Road/ Mill Road/ Norwich Road/ Honingham Road speed limit	3	0.3
Support – Honingham Lane closure	3	0.3
Concern – Traffic increase due to the scheme (Holt Road)	2	0.2
Oppose – Consultation will not impact decision	2	0.2
Oppose – Dark Lane Closure	2	0.2
Oppose – Speed restrictions	2	0.2
Oppose – Viaduct proposal/ structure/ materials	2	0.2
Suggestion – Alternative calming measures/ mitigations (Taverham Road & The Street)	2	0.2



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Suggestion – Consider active travel on the viaduct	2	0.2
Suggestion – Green belt care	2	0.2
Support – Tuttle Lane speed limit	2	0.2
Concern – Impact on environment during construction	1	0.1
Oppose – Dark Lane closure will increase traffic	1	0.1
Oppose – General traffic mitigation measures	1	0.1
Oppose – Holt Road speed limit	1	0.1
Oppose – No turn right into Station Road	1	0.1
Oppose – Too much environmental mitigation	1	0.1
Suggestion - Alternative traffic mitigation/ restrictions to be enforced (Morton on Hill)	1	0.1
Suggestion – More or better Green crossings	1	0.1
Suggestion – More parking/ lay bys needed	1	0.1
Suggestion – More trees/ screening needed	1	0.1
Support – Bell Road/ Mill Road/ Norwich Road/ Honingham Road HGV ban	1	0.1
Support – Dark Lane closure	1	0.1
Support – HGV ban	1	0.1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Support – Holt Road speed limit	1	0.1
Support – Scheme will improve air quality/ reduce pollution	1	0.1
Support - Taverham Road speed limit	1	0.1
Support – The Street speed limit	1	0.1

(N: all responses – 1,065)

Table 1-2 Question 7

Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Negative impact on the environment	184	14
Oppose – Scheme opposition	148	11
Oppose - negative impact on wildlife/ wildlife habitats	111	8
Oppose – Cost/ Money should be invested elsewhere	93	7
Suggestion – Scheme design changes	59	4
Concern – Air Quality will decrease	51	4
Support – Scheme needed	47	4
Oppose – Not enough mitigation measures	46	3
Concern - Negative impact on rare chalk stream/SSSI	35	3



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Concern – Impact on the environment during construction	35	3
No comments	33	3
Concern – Light pollution	32	2
Suggestion – More public transport/ modal shift	31	2
Concern – Noise Increase	31	2
Concern – General traffic/ rat-running increase due to the scheme	31	2
Oppose- Active Travel/ local access needed	24	2
Oppose – Green Bridge	24	2
Concern – Risks to water environment	24	2
Suggestion – Green belt care	21	2
Concern – Visual impacts	21	2
Request for more information or questions	18	1
Comments about other schemes/ Comparison with other scheme	18	1
Oppose – Drainage system	17	1
Suggestion – Ensure dedicated routes for active travel	14	1
Oppose – Viaduct proposal/ structure/ materials	14	1
Concern – Loss of green space	14	1
Support – Local Access/ Active Travel	13	1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Concern – Local access is insufficient	13	1
Suggestion – Existing roads should be improved	12	1
Support – Scheme supports the environment/ wildlife	10	1
Concern – Scheme will not improve traffic/ rat running/ current situation	10	1
Comments unrelated to the scheme	10	1
Concern – Safety	9	1
Support – Suggested mitigation will reduce traffic/ congestion/ rat running	8	1
Suggestion – More or better green crossings	6	0.4
Suggestion – Faster delivery	6	0.4
Suggestion – Design changes to the environmental barrier	6	0.4
Concern – Road will lead to more development in the area	6	0.4
Concern – NDR and other local roads cannot cope	5	0.4
Suggestion – General alternative traffic mitigation/ restrictions to be enforced	4	0.3
Suggestion – Alternative routes outside the proposal	4	0.3



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose - Materials/ process/ events incomplete	4	0.3
Support – Viaduct proposal/ structure/ materials	3	0.2
Suggestion - More trees/screening needed	3	0.2
Suggestion – Include fences, nest boxes	3	0.2
Suggestion – Consider active travel on the viaduct	3	0.2
Concern – Negative impact on residents’ health	3	0.2
Support – Scheme will improve safety	2	0.1
Support – Green Bridge	2	0.1
Suggestion – more parking/ lay bys	2	0.1
Oppose – Too much environmental mitigation	2	0.1
Oppose – General traffic mitigation measures	2	0.1
Comments about areas outside scheme limits	2	0.1
Suggestion - Drainage system	1	0.1
Oppose- Lack of consultation	1	0.1
Oppose – Speed restrictions	1	0.1
Oppose – Consultation will not impact the decision	1	0.1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose - Barham Broom Road/ Low Road access only - Loss of most direct route	1	0.1

(N: all responses – 1,334)



Table 1-3 Question 10

Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Negative impact on the environment	148	13
Oppose – Viaduct proposal/ structure/ materials	120	11
Oppose – Negative impact on wildlife/ wildlife habitats	96	9
Oppose – Drainage system	87	8
Concern - Negative impact on rare chalk stream/ SSSI	71	6
Concern - Visual impacts	58	5
Oppose - Scheme opposition/is not needed	54	5
Support – Viaduct proposal/ structure/ materials	48	4
Oppose - Cost / Money should be invested somewhere else	46	4
Concern – Impact on environment during construction	38	3
Suggestion – Design changes to the environmental barrier	31	3
Concern – Negative impact on air quality	30	3
Concern - Noise increase	28	3
Oppose – Not enough mitigation measures	27	2
Oppose – Impact of viaduct on flooding and water management	26	2



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
No comments	21	2
Concern – Loss of green space	21	2
Concern – Negative impact of light pollution	19	2
Suggestion – Consider active travel on the viaduct	17	2
Request for more information/ questions	16	1
Support – Scheme supports the environment/ wildlife	11	1
Concern – Risks to water environment	11	1
Suggestion - Scheme design changes	8	1
Concern – Negative impact on residents' health	8	1
Suggestion – More public transport/ modal shift	7	1
Concern – General traffic/rat running increase due to scheme	7	1
Support – Drainage system	6	1
Suggestion - Faster delivery	6	1
Suggestion - Alternative routes outside the proposal	6	1
Comments about other schemes/ comparison with other schemes	6	1
Suggestion – Green belt care	4	0.4



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Suggestion - Existing roads should be improved	4	0.4
Oppose – Active travel and local access required	4	0.3
Comments unrelated to the scheme	4	0.4
Concern - Safety	3	0.3
Concern – Local access is insufficient	3	0.3
Comments about areas outside the scheme limits	3	0.3
Support – Scheme needed	2	0.2
Suggestion – General alternative traffic mitigation/ restrictions need to be enforced	2	0.2
Oppose – Too much environmental mitigation	2	0.2
Oppose – Lack of consultation	2	0.2
Oppose – Green bridge	2	0.2
Concern – Scheme will not improve the traffic/ rat running/ current situation	2	0.2
Concern - Road will lead to more development in area	2	0.2
Support – Scheme will improve air quality/ reduce pollution	1	0.1
Suggestion – More/better green crossings	1	0.1
Suggestion - More trees/ screening needed	1	0.1
Suggestion – Include fencing, nest boxes	1	0.1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Concern – Increase of fly tipping/ littering	1	0.1

(N: all responses – 1,122)

Table 1-4 Question 12

Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Negative impact on environment	97	14
Oppose – Scheme opposition	90	13
Oppose – Negative impact on wildlife/ wildlife habitats	77	11
No comments	45	6
Oppose – Cost/ Money should be invested elsewhere	44	6
Oppose – Not enough environmental measures	32	5
Suggestion – Scheme design change	23	3
Oppose – Active travel and local access is required	19	3
Suggestion – Green belt care	18	3
Concern – Light pollution/ impact	18	3
Concern – Decline in air quality	17	2
Concern – Negative impact on rare chalk stream/ SSSI	16	2
Comments about other schemes/ comparison with other scheme	16	2



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Request for more information/ question	15	2
Concern – General traffic/ rat-running increase due to scheme	14	2
Suggestion – More public transport/ modal shift	13	2
Support – Scheme needed	10	1
Suggestion – More trees/ screening needed	10	1
Oppose – Green Bridge	10	1
Oppose – Materials/ process/ events incomplete	9	1
Concern – Negative impact on resident's health	9	1
Oppose – Specific road closures	8	1
Suggestion – Existing roads should be improved	7	1
Concern – Noise increase	7	1
Concern – Increase of fly tipping/ littering	7	1
Concern – Impact on the environment during construction	7	1
Concern – Visual impacts	6	1
Support – Scheme supports environment/ wildlife	5	1
Support – Green Bridge	5	1
Concern – Loss of green space	5	1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Comments unrelated to the scheme	4	1
Support – Ringland Lane proposal	3	0.4
Suggestion – Include fencing or nest boxes	3	0.4
Suggestion – Faster delivery	3	0.4
Suggestion – Ensure dedicated routes for active travel	3	0.4
Oppose – Viaduct proposal/ structure/ materials	3	0.4
Suggestion – More/better green crossings	2	0.3
Oppose – General traffic mitigation measures	2	0.3
Oppose – General road closures will impact emergency service access	2	0.3
Oppose – Consultation will not impact the decision	2	0.3
Concern – Local access in insufficient	2	0.3
Support – Viaduct proposal/ structure/ materials	1	0.1
Support – Suggested mitigation will reduce traffic/ congestion/ rat-running	1	0.1
Support – Speed restrictions	1	0.1
Support - Local Access/ Active Travel	1	0.1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Suggestion – More parking/ lay bys needed	1	0.1
Suggestion – Design changes to environmental barrier	1	0.1
Suggestion – Alternative routes outside the proposal	1	0.1
Oppose – Too much environmental mitigation	1	0.1
Oppose – Drainage system	1	0.1
Oppose - Barham Broom Road/ Low Road access only - Loss of most direct route	1	0.1
Concern – Risks to water environment	1	0.1
Concern – NDR and other local roads cannot cope with traffic	1	0.1
Comments about other schemes/ comparisons with other schemes	1	0.1

(N: all responses – 701)

Table 1-5 Question 15

Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Negative impact on environment	112	13
Oppose – Scheme opposition	106	12
Oppose - Drainage system	81	10
Oppose - Negative impact on wildlife/ wildlife habitat	66	8



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Not enough mitigation measures	29	3
Suggestion – Scheme design changes	29	3
Oppose – Cost/ Money should be invested somewhere else	28	3
Request for more information/ questions	27	3
Concern – Negative impact on air quality	21	3
Concern – Negative impact on chalk stream/ SSSI	21	3
No comments	20	2
Comments about other schemes/ comparison with other schemes	18	2
Suggestion – Ensure dedicated routes for active travel	16	2
Comments unrelated to the scheme	15	2
Concern – General traffic increase due to scheme/ rat running	15	2
Concern – Loss of green space	15	2
Support – Scheme needed	15	2
Concern – Risks of drainage system to water environment	14	2
Oppose – Green bridge	14	2
Concern – Noise increase	12	1
Suggestion – More public transport/ modal shift	12	1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Concern – Local access is insufficient	11	1
Support - Drainage system	10	1
Concern – Impact on the environment during construction	9	1
Oppose – Lack of Active travel/access	9	1
Suggestion – Existing roads should be improved	9	1
Suggestion – Green belt care	9	1
Support – Scheme supports environment/ wildlife	9	1
Suggestion – Alternative routes outside the proposal	6	1
Suggestion – Faster delivery	6	1
Concern – NDR and other local roads cannot cope with traffic	5	1
Concern – Negative impact on residents' health	5	1
Concern – Road will lead to more development in area	5	1
Concern – Safety	5	1
Suggestion – more trees/ screening needed	5	1
Oppose - Barham Broom Road/ Low Road access only - Loss of most direct route	4	1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Suggestion – General alternative traffic mitigation/ restrictions to be enforced	4	1
Concern – Scheme will not improve traffic/ rat running/ current situation	3	0.4
Concern – Visual impacts	3	0.4
Oppose - Barham Broom Road/Low Road access only - Safety concerns	3	0.4
Oppose – Consultation will not impact decision	3	0.4
Oppose – Materials/ process/ events incomplete	3	0.4
Support – Local Access/ active travel	3	0.4
Support – Suggested mitigations will reduce traffic/ congestion/ rat running	3	0.4
Concern – Increase in fly tipping/ littering	2	0.2
Oppose - Barham Broom Road/Low Road access only - Impact on residents/ businesses	2	0.2
Oppose – Consultation materials/ events not inclusive	2	0.2
Oppose – Specific road closures	2	0.2
Suggestion - Drainage system	2	0.2
Support - Bell Road/Mill Road/Norwich Road/ Honingham Road speed limit	2	0.2



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Support -Green bridge	2	0.2
Concern – Increase in light pollution	1	0.1
Oppose - Barham Broom Road/Low Road access only - Traffic displacement/ increase in traffic	1	0.1
Oppose – General road closures will affect emergency service access	1	0.1
Oppose – General traffic mitigation measures	1	0.1
Oppose – Lack of consultation	1	0.1
Oppose - Viaduct proposal/ structure/ materials	1	0.1
Suggestion - Consider active travel on the viaduct	1	0.1
Suggestion – include fencing/ nest boxes	1	0.1
Suggestion – more parking/ lay bys needed	1	0.1
Suggestion – More/better green crossings	1	0.1
Support - Barham Broom Road/Low Road access only	1	0.1
Support - Bell Road/Mill Road/Norwich Road/ Honingham Road HGV Ban	1	0.1
Support – Safety will be improved	1	0.1

(N: all responses – 852)



Table 1-6 Question 17

Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Negative impact on environment	289	19
Oppose – Not enough mitigation measures	248	16
Oppose – Negative impact on wildlife/ wildlife habitats	160	11
Oppose – Scheme opposition/ is not needed	103	7
Suggestion – Green belt care	76	5
Oppose – Cost/ Money should be invested somewhere else	48	3
Concern – Negative impact on air quality	47	3
Support – Scheme supports environment/ wildlife	43	3
Concern – Negative impact on chalk stream/ SSSI	37	2
Comments about other schemes/Comparison with other scheme	36	2
Request for more information/Question	33	2
Concern – Loss of green space	32	2
Oppose – Green bridge	32	2
Oppose – Drainage system	30	2
Suggestion – More public transport/ modal shift	29	2
Concern – Noise increase	22	2



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Concern – General traffic increase due to scheme/ rat-running	21	1
Concern – Impact on environment during construction	21	1
No comments	19	1
Oppose - Materials/ process/ events incomplete	18	1
Support – Scheme needed	15	1
Oppose – Too much environmental mitigation	10	1
Comments unrelated to the scheme	9	1
Suggestion – Existing roads should be improved	9	1
Concern – Road will lead to more development in the area	8	1
Oppose – Viaduct proposal/ structure/ materials	8	1
Suggestion – Alternative routes outside the proposal	8	1
Suggestion – Scheme design changes	8	1
Comments about areas outside scheme limits	7	1
Concern – Impact of light pollution	7	1
Concern – Visual impact	7	1
Suggestion – Ensure dedicated routes for active travel	7	1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Suggestion – More trees/ screening needed	7	1
Support – Suggested mitigation will reduce traffic/ congestion/ rat-running	7	1
Concern – Negative impact on residents' health	6	0.4
Oppose – Active travel/ local access is insufficient	6	0.4
Oppose - Consultation materials/events not inclusive	6	0.4
Oppose - Lack of consultation	6	0.4
Concern – Risks from impact on water environment	5	0.3
Oppose - Consultation will not impact decision	5	0.3
Support – Green bridge	4	0.3
Suggestion – Design changes to environmental barrier	3	0.2
Suggestion – Faster delivery of scheme	3	0.2
Suggestion – General alternative traffic mitigation/ restriction to be enforced	3	0.2
Concern – Safety	2	0.1
Suggestion – More/ better green crossings	2	0.1
Support – Viaduct proposal/ structure/ materials	2	0.1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Concern – Local access is insufficient	1	0.1
Concern – NDR and other local roads cannot cope with traffic	1	0.1
Suggestion – Consider active travel on the viaduct	1	0.1
Support – Local access/ active travel	1	0.1
Support – Ringland Lane proposal	1	0.1
Support – Safety	1	0.1

(N: all responses – 1,520)

Table 1-7 Question 19

Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Not enough mitigation measures	224	19
Oppose – Negative impact on environment	198	17
Oppose – Negative impact on wildlife/ wildlife habitats	142	12
Oppose – Scheme opposition/ is not needed	93	8
Suggestion – Green belt care	71	6
Oppose – Green bridge	51	4
Concern – Negative impact on chalk stream/ SSSI	39	3
Comments about other schemes/Comparison with other scheme	38	3



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Cost/ Money should be invested elsewhere	36	3
Support – Scheme supports environment/ wildlife	34	3
Request for more information/ questions	27	2
Concern – Negative impact on air quality	23	2
Suggestion – More public transport/ modal shift	19	2
No comments	18	2
Oppose – Drainage system	17	1
Concern – Noise increase	13	1
Concern – Loss of green space	12	1
Concern – General traffic increase due to scheme/ rat running	11	1
Oppose – Consultation will not impact decision	11	1
Concern – Light pollution	10	1
Oppose – Materials/ process/ events incomplete	10	1
Oppose – Too much environmental mitigation	10	1
Suggestion – Alternative routes outside the proposal	8	1
Concern – Impact on environment during construction	7	1
Oppose – Lack of consultation	7	1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Support – Green bridge	7	1
Concern – Negative impact on residents' health	6	1
Suggestion – Faster delivery of scheme	6	1
Suggestion – More trees/ screening needed	6	1
Concern – Local access is insufficient	5	0.4
Oppose – Active travel/ local access is insufficient	5	0.4
Suggestion – Existing roads should be improved	5	0.4
Support – Scheme needed	5	0.4
Suggestion – More/ better green crossings	4	0.3
Comments unrelated to the scheme	3	0.2
Concern – Visual impacts	3	0.2
Suggestion – Ensure dedicated routes for active travel	3	0.2
Suggestion – Include fencing, nest boxes	3	0.2
Concern – Increase of fly tipping/ littering	2	0.2
Suggestion – Scheme design changes	2	0.2
Concern – Road will lead to more development in the area	1	0.1
Concern – Safety	1	0.1
Oppose – Consultation materials/ events not inclusive	1	0.1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Viaduct proposal/ structure/ materials	1	0.1
Suggestion – General alternative traffic mitigation/ restrictions to be enforced	1	0.1
Support – Scheme will improve air quality/ reduce pollution	1	0.1
Support – Speed restrictions	1	0.1
Support – Suggested mitigation will reduce traffic/ congestion/ rat-running	1	0.1

(N: all responses – 1,202)

Table 1-8 Question 21

Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Scheme opposition	107	9
Oppose - Barham Broom Road/ Low Road access only - Loss of most direct route	80	7
Concern – General traffic/ rat running increase due to scheme	64	6
Suggestion – More public transport/ modal shift	64	6
Oppose – Cost/ Money should be invested elsewhere	48	4
Support - Bell Road/Mill Road/Norwich Road/ Honingham Road speed limit	48	4



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose - Barham Broom Road/Low Road access only - Traffic displacement/ increase in traffic	47	4
Oppose - Negative impact on environment	47	4
Concern – Scheme will not improve the traffic/ rat running/ current situation	46	4
Oppose - Barham Broom Road/Low Road access only - Impact on residents/ businesses	34	3
Suggestion - Barham Broom Road/Low Road access only - Alternative calming measures/ mitigations	34	3
No comments	30	3
Oppose - Barham Broom Road/Low Road access only - Safety concerns	28	3
Comments about areas outside scheme limits	25	2
Oppose – Not enough mitigation measures or does not address the issues	25	2
Suggestion – Ensure dedicated routes for active travel	23	2
Oppose - Negative impact on wildlife/wildlife habitats	21	2
Request for more information/ questions	21	2
Concern – Negative impact on air quality	20	2



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Suggestion – General alternative traffic mitigation/ restrictions to be enforced	19	2
Support – Scheme needed	17	2
Support – Suggested mitigation will reduce traffic/ congestion/ rat running	17	2
Concern – NDR and other local roads cannot cope with traffic	16	1
Concern - Safety	16	1
Comments about other schemes/ comparison with other scheme	12	1
Support - Bell Road/Mill Road/Norwich Road/ Honingham Road HGV Ban	12	1
Comments unrelated to the scheme	11	1
Suggestion – Existing roads should be improved	10	1
Support - Barham Broom Road/Low Road access only	10	1
Support – Speed restriction	10	1
Suggestion – Scheme design changes	9	1
Support - Tuttle Lane speed limit	9	1
Concern – Negative impact on resident's health	8	1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Concern – Scheme will lead to more development in the area	8	1
Oppose - Dark Lane closure	8	1
Oppose - Materials/ process/ events incomplete	8	1
Support - Honingham Lane closure	8	1
Concern – Local access is insufficient	7	0.1
Oppose - Bell Road/Mill Road/Norwich Road/ Honingham Road speed limit	7	1
Concern – Noise increase	6	1
Oppose - Tuttle Lane speed limit	6	1
Support - Dark Lane closure	6	1
Oppose – Active travel/ local access required	5	0.4
Oppose – General traffic mitigation measures	5	0.4
Oppose – Specific road closures	5	0.4
Oppose – Speed restrictions	5	0.4
Support – HGV ban	5	0.4
Concern – Light pollution	4	0.4
Concern – Loss of green space	4	0.4
Oppose - Consultation will not impact decision	4	0.4
Support – Scheme will improve safety	4	0.4



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Concern – Negative impact on chalk stream/ SSSI	3	0.3
Concern - Tuttle Lane speed limit not being followed	3	0.3
Oppose – Barnham Broom Road prohibition of motor vehicles except access	3	0.3
Suggestion – Faster delivery	3	0.3
Concern – Risks to water environment	2	0.2
Oppose - Consultation materials/ events not inclusive	2	0.2
Oppose – General road closure will impact emergency service access	2	0.2
Oppose - Honingham Lane closure - loss of most direct route	2	0.2
Oppose - Honingham Lane closure - traffic displacement/ increase in traffic	2	0.2
Support – Local access/ active travel	2	0.2
Oppose - Bell Road/Mill Road/Norwich Road/ Honingham Road HGV Ban	1	0.1
Oppose - Dark Lane closure will increase traffic	1	0.1
Oppose – Green bridge	1	0.1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose - Lack of consultation	1	0.1
Oppose – Restricted right turn on Holt Road	1	0.1
Oppose – Taverham Road speed limit	1	0.1
Oppose – The Street Speed limit	1	0.1
Oppose - Viaduct proposal/ structure/ materials	1	0.1
Suggestion – Alternative calming measures on Taverham Road and The Street	1	0.1
Suggestion – Green belt care	1	0.1
Support - Chapel Lane speed limit	1	0.1
Support – Green bridge	1	0.1
Support - Holt Road speed limit	1	0.1
Support – Restricted right turn on Holt Road	1	0.1
Support - Scheme supports environment/wildlife	1	0.1

(N: all responses – 1,141)



Table 1-9 Question 23

Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Scheme opposition/ is not needed	78	13
No comments	60	10
Concern - General traffic increase due to scheme/ rat-running	48	8
Oppose - Negative impact on environment	31	5
Oppose - Restricted right turn on Holt Road	26	4
Suggestion – More public transport/ modal shift	25	4
Oppose – Cost/ Money should be invested elsewhere	21	4
Concern - Scheme will not improve the traffic/ rat-running/ current situation	20	3
Support – Scheme needed	18	3
Concern - NDR and other local roads cannot cope with traffic	17	3
Suggestion - General alternative traffic mitigation / restrictions to be enforced	17	3
Oppose - Negative impact on wildlife/wildlife habitats	14	2
Suggestion – Scheme design changes	14	2
Concern - Traffic increase due to scheme (Holt Road/ Horsford)	12	2



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Suggestion - Alternative calming measures/ restrictions to be enforced (HGV ban, speed restrictions) through Horsford Village	12	2
Comments about other schemes/Comparison with other scheme	11	2
Concern – Negative impact on air quality	10	2
Oppose - Holt Road speed limit	9	2
Request for more information/ questions	9	2
Support - Suggested mitigation will reduce traffic/ congestion/ rat-running	9	2
Concern – Local access is insufficient	8	1
Concern - traffic displacement/ mitigations not sufficient (Holt Road/ Horsford)	8	1
Support – Speed restriction	8	1
Comments unrelated to the scheme	7	1
Concern - Station Road traffic increase	7	1
Suggestion – Ensure dedicated routes for active travel	7	1
Support – Holt Road Speed limit	7	1
Concern – Safety	6	1
Concern – Noise increase	5	1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Active travel/ local access needed	5	1
Oppose - General traffic mitigation measures	5	1
Oppose - Speed restrictions	5	1
Concern - traffic displacement/ mitigations not sufficient/ traffic increase on Taverham Road and The Street	4	1
Oppose – Materials/ process/ events incomplete	4	1
Oppose - Not enough environmental mitigation measures	4	1
Oppose – Specific road closures	4	1
Suggestion - Alternative calming measures/ mitigations on Taverham Road and The Street	4	1
Support - HGV ban	4	1
Comments about areas outside scheme limits	3	1
Concern – Light pollution	2	0.3
Concern – Negative impact of chalk stream/ SSSI	2	0.3
Concern – Road will lead to more development in the area	2	0.3
Oppose - Traverham Road speed limit	2	0.3
Suggestion – Faster delivery	2	0.3



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Support - Restricted right turn on Holt Road	2	0.3
Support – Taverham Road speed limit	2	0.3
Concern - General traffic increase in Morton on the Hill	1	0.2
Concern – Risk to water environment	1	0.2
Oppose – Barnham Broom Road/ Low Road access only – Loss of most direct route	1	0.2
Oppose – General road closures due to emergency service access	1	0.2
Oppose - Honingham Lane closure - loss of most direct route	1	0.2
Oppose – The Street speed limit	1	0.2
Suggestion - Alternative traffic mitigation / restrictions to be enforced in Morton on the Hill	1	0.2
Suggestion – Existing roads should be improved	1	0.2
Suggestion - More trees/screening needed	1	0.2
Support – Bell Road/ Mill Road/ Norwich Road/ Honingham Road speed limit	1	0.2
Support - Honingham Lane closure	1	0.2
Support – No right turn into Station Road	1	0.2



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Support – The Street speed limit	1	0.2

(N: all responses – 593)

Table 1-10 Question 25

Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Scheme opposition	55	14
Oppose - Honingham Lane closure - loss of most direct route	33	8
Support - Honingham Lane closure	36	9
Oppose – Negative impact on environment	22	6
No comments	27	7
Oppose - Honingham Lane closure - negative impact on residents and businesses	16	4
Oppose – Cost/ Money should be invested elsewhere	16	4
Concern - General traffic/ rat running increase due to scheme	13	3
Oppose - Honingham Lane closure - traffic displacement/ increase in traffic	19	5
Oppose – Negative impact on wildlife/ wildlife habitats	11	3
Suggestion – Ensures dedicated routes for active travel	10	3



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Request for more information/ questions	10	3
Suggestion - General alternative traffic mitigation / restrictions to be enforced	6	2
Suggestion – More public transport/ modal shift	10	3
Support - Suggested mitigation will reduce traffic/ congestion/ rat-running	8	2
Concern – Local access is insufficient	7	2
Oppose - Honingham Lane closure - loss of route options	7	2
Suggestion – Scheme design change	8	2
Comments about other schemes/ comparison with other scheme	7	2
Concern – Negative impact on air quality	6	2
Concern - Scheme will not improve the traffic/ rat-running/ current situation	7	2
Comments unrelated to the scheme	6	2
Oppose – Not enough mitigation measures/ not sufficient	6	2
Suggestion – Existing roads should be improved	4	1
Concern - NDR and other local roads cannot cope with traffic	4	1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Concern – Increase of fly tipping/ littering	3	1
Concern – Road will lead to more development in the area	3	1
Oppose – Green bridge	3	1
Oppose – Lack of consultation	3	1
Oppose – Materials/ process/ events incomplete	2	1
Oppose – Specific road closures	3	1
Concern – Loss of green space	2	1
Concern – Negative impact on chalk stream/ SSSI	2	1
Concern – Safety	2	1
Oppose – Active travel/ local access needed	2	1
Support – Local Access/ active travel	2	1
Support – Barnham Broom – Low Road access only	2	1
Comments about areas outside scheme limits	6	2
Concern – Noise impacts	1	0.2
Oppose - Barham Broom Road/ Low Road access only - Loss of most direct route	1	0.2
Oppose – General road closures will impact emergency service access	1	0.2



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Suggestion – Alternative routes outside the proposal	1	0.2
Suggestion – Green belt care	1	0.2
Support – Scheme supports environment/ wildlife	1	0.2
Support – Scheme will improve safety	1	0.2
Support – Scheme needed	1	0.2
Suggestion – Faster delivery	1	0.2
Support – Speed restrictions	1	0.2
Support – HGV ban	1	0.2
Oppose – General traffic mitigation measures	1	0.2

(N: all responses – 401)

Table 1-11 Question 26

Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Scheme opposition	872	11
Oppose – Negative impact on environment	868	11
Oppose – Negative impact on wildlife/ wildlife habitats	711	9
Oppose – Not enough mitigation measures/ measures not sufficient	623	8
Advocacy messaging campaigners	604	8



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Lack of consultation	592	8
Concern – Air Quality decrease	341	4
Oppose – Cost/ Money should be spent elsewhere	313	4
Support – Scheme needed	251	3
Suggestion – Green belt care	219	3
Suggestion – More public transport/ modal shift	188	2
Concern – General traffic/ rat-running increase due to scheme	134	2
Suggestion – Faster delivery of scheme	116	2
Comments about other schemes/ comparison with other schemes	105	1
Concern – Negative impact on rare chalk stream/ SSSI	78	1
Concern – Loss of green space	75	1
Oppose – Green Bridge	75	1
Suggestion – Ensures dedicated routes for active travel	73	1
Support – Suggested traffic mitigations will reduce traffic/ congestion/ rat-running	72	1
Suggestion – General alternative mitigation/ restrictions to be enforced	68	1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Concern – Noise increase	67	1
Request for more information/ questions	63	1
Concern – Safety	62	1
Concern – Impact of environment during construction	56	1
Suggestion – Scheme design changes	56	1
Concern – Road will lead to more development	50	1
Suggestion – Existing roads should be improved	49	1
Comments unrelated to the scheme	46	1
Concern – NDR and other local roads cannot cope with traffic	46	1
Oppose – Consultation materials/ events not inclusive	42	0.5
Support – Scheme supports environment/ wildlife	40	0.5
Concern – Scheme will not improve traffic or rat running	39	0.5
Oppose – Barnham Broom/ Low Road access only – Loss of most direct route	39	0.5
Oppose – Viaduct proposal/ structure/ materials	39	0.5
Oppose – Restricted right turn on Holt Road	36	0.5



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Request for a hard copy of consultation materials	36	0.5
Concern – Traffic displacement or insufficient mitigations in Horsford	35	0.5
Concern – Light pollution or impact	34	0.4
Oppose – Drainage system	28	28
Suggestion – Alternative routes outside proposal	25	0.3
Support – Scheme will improve air quality/ reduce pollution	25	0.3
Concern – Local access is insufficient	22	0.3
No comments	22	0.3
Oppose – Barnham Broom/ Low Road access only – Impact on residents/ businesses	22	0.3
Oppose – Consultation will not impact decision	22	0.3
Oppose – Barnham Broom/ Low Road access only – Safety concerns	21	0.3
Oppose – Active travel/ local access required	20	0.3
Oppose – Materials/ process/ events incomplete	20	0.3
Oppose – Barnham Broom/ Low Road access only – Traffic displacement or increase in traffic	18	0.2



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Suggestion – Barnham Broom/ Low Road access only – Alternative calming measures/ mitigations	18	0.2
Concern – Visual impacts	16	0.2
Support – Bell Road/ Mill Road/ Norwich Road/ Honingham Lane speed limit	15	0.2
Comments about areas outside the scheme limits/ extensions	13	0.2
Concern – Increase in fly tipping/ littering	13	0.2
Support – Scheme will improve safety	11	0.1
Support – Bell Road/ Mill Road/ Norwich Road HGV ban	10	0.1
Support – HGV ban	10	0.1
Concern – Risks due to drainage system	9	0.1
Request for link for website/ consultation questionnaire	9	0.1
Support – Local access/ active travel supported	9	0.1
Oppose – Specific road closures	8	0.1
Concern – Negative impact on resident's health	7	0.1
Suggestion – Consider active travel on the viaduct	7	0.1
Suggestion – More trees/ screening needed	7	0.1



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Request for technical support to answer consultation/ meeting with team	6	0.1
Concern – Traffic increase in Horsford due to scheme	5	0.1
Suggestion – Design changes to environmental barrier	5	0.1
Support – Speed restrictions	5	0.1
Support – Tuttle Lane speed limit	5	0.1
Support – Dark Lane closure	4	0.1
Support – Green Bridge	4	0.1
Support – Viaduct proposal/ structure/ materials	4	0.1
Oppose – Barnham Broom Road – Prohibition of motor vehicle except access	3	0.04
Oppose – Dark Lane closure will increase traffic	3	0.04
Oppose – Speed restrictions	3	0.04
Support – Holt Road speed limit	3	0.04
Oppose – Bell Road/ Mill Road/ Norwich Road HGV ban	2	0.03
Oppose – General traffic mitigation measures	2	0.03



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Oppose – Honingham Lane closure – negative impact on residents and businesses	2	0.03
Suggestion – Alternative calming measures/ restrictions to be enforced in Horsford	2	0.03
Suggestion – Alternative traffic mitigation/ restriction enforced at Morton on the Hill	2	0.03
Support – Restricted right turn on Holt Road	2	0.03
Support – Taverham Road speed limit	2	0.3
Concern – General traffic increase on Morton on the Hill	1	0.01
Concern – Honingham Road safety	1	0.01
Oppose – Dark Lane closure	1	0.01
Oppose – Holt Road speed limit	1	0.01
Oppose – Honingham Lane closure – traffic displacement or increase	1	0.01
Oppose – Impact of viaduct on flooding and water management	1	0.01
Oppose – Too much environmental mitigation	1	0.01
Suggestion – Alternative calming measures/ mitigations on Taverham Road & The Street	1	0.01



Theme	No. of coded comments	% of coded comments
Suggestion – Include fencing, nest boxes for owls	1	0.01
Suggestion – More parking/ lay bys needed	1	0.01
Support – Barnham Broom/ Low Road access only	1	0.01
Support – Drainage system	1	0.01
Support – Honingham Lane closure	1	0.01
Support – No right turn into Station Road	1	0.01
Support – The Street speed limit	1	0.01

(N: all responses – 7,699)