

Response to ExA's Second Written Questions (ExQ2)

This document sets out the response to the Examining Authority (ExA)'s Second Written Questions and requests for information (ExQ2) by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC). The table below sets out the topic, question number and CCC's response.

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
2.0. Principle and the Nature of Development			
Q2.0.9.	SCC	Land parcels E12, E13, E05 If the ExA were to recommend that parcels E12, E13 and E05 should remain, please identify the extent of the PV solar panels in those parcels that would effectively mitigate impacts.	CCC refers to SCC's response to Q2.0.9, which has been prepared by SCC and CCC as a joint response because parcel E05 is within Cambridgeshire. CCC would add that the LHAs seek section 106 contributions for (amongst other additions) the creation of a definitive path linking the proposed E05 perimeter path with Isleham village. Both authorities are considering their position on Public Access mitigation strategies in readiness for discussions with the Applicant.
Q2.0.10.	SCC	Rights of way What rights of way improvements are proposed as an offsetting measure if avoidance or mitigation were not possible?	CCC refers to SCC's response to Q2.0.10, which has been prepared by SCC and CCC as a joint response because the matter similarly affects both authorities.
2.1. Air Quality and Human Health			
Q2.1.5.	The Applicant, SCC, CCC, ECDC, WSC	Discharge of Requirement 7: DCO Are you satisfied with the arrangements for discharge of DCO Requirement 7 in relation to the OBF SMP, as currently drafted (Rev 03, 18 December 2022 [REP4-006])? If not, please explain and supply your proposed form of amended wording.	The Council is satisfied with the arrangements for discharge of DCO Requirement 7. It is requested that the Environment Agency and the Health and Safety Executive confirm they are happy with this requirement and will provide detailed comments.

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
Q2.1.13.	East of England Ambulance Service Trust, Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service, Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service	<p>Major accidents and disasters</p> <p>The Applicant has stated in its response to our ExQ1.1.46 [REP2-037] that “the only pollutant of concern is hydrogen fluoride (HF) and ... concentrations of HF will be below the AEGL-1 value before reaching any sensitive receptors. As such there are not expected to be any adverse effects from HF. The expectation is that exposure will be avoided rather than mitigated.” and that it would be the responsibility of the host authorities and fire services as first responders “to decide if measures such as evacuation or advising people to stay indoors and keep windows closed were appropriate.”</p> <p>Are you content with these assumptions and that the issue of HF concentrations and how these will be dealt with is properly addressed in the OBFSMP?</p>	<p><i>Noting that a further revision of the OBFSMP is being submitted at deadline 5, the Fire and Rescue Services do not believe there is sufficient consideration to hazardous substances brought about by deflagration of the units and subsequent intervention by the services. This is due to not having a confirmed battery technology until detailed design stage. It is challenging to confirm that there will be no impact to receptors when we have noted issues in the LIR [REP1-024] (see para 15.2 and Appendix 26 [REP1-024a]) regarding the modelling and placement of the plume prediction in relation to the final plan layouts of the BESS locations.</i></p>
2.2. Biodiversity and Nature Conservation (including Habitats Regulations Assessment)			
Q2.2.6.	The local authorities	<p>Stone Curlew and archaeology</p> <p>Please explain what you consider to be the potential conflicts between management of the archaeological areas and the Stone Curlew plots, as referred to in your joint Local Impact Report [REP1-024].</p>	<p>Aspects of the Stone Curlew offsetting which have the potential to cause conflict with preservation and management of archaeological interest include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reduction of nutrient levels prior to the establishment of grassland; • establishment of grassland; • management of bare ground nesting plots; and • management/grazing of grassland.

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
			<p>CCC refers to Suffolk County Council's response to Q2.2.6, which has been prepared as a joint response.</p> <p>ECO1 – Stone Curlew nesting plots (2ha disturbed ground plots):</p> <p>This area is known to be of high archaeological value and is shown as archaeological mitigation on the Environmental Masterplan [REP3-022]. Stone Curlew nesting plots shown on the Environmental Masterplan conflict with areas of high archaeological importance and would impact on the archaeological interest of the site. All Stone Curlew nesting plots must be confined to the two areas identified during trial trenching where the 2ha disturbed ground plots can be delivered within impacting on archaeology interest [PDA-002].</p> <p>ECO1 – Establishment and management of grassland:</p> <p>The Council considers that cultivation of topsoil is limited to direct drilling to avoid impact to archaeological interest in ECO1. Ideally, management of a low sward for Stone Curlews would be achieved through intense grazing by rabbits and controlled livestock grazing, however, usage of rabbit grazing on ECO1 would be unacceptable for preservation of archaeology.</p>
2.9. Socio-Economics and Land Use			
Q2.9.10.	CCC	<p>PRoW closures Regarding CCC's D4 Submission - Comments on the Applicant's D3 and D3A submissions [REP4-137] relating to concerns about closure of parts of the PRoW network, please would the CCC specify wording for amendment to the CTMP and/or propose amendments</p>	<p>This matter equally affects PROW in the area for which SCC is responsible, and so a joint response between CCC and SCC has been agreed. CCC and SCC consider that Article 11(1) of the dDCO needs to be amended as highlighted in bold, in order to address our concerns.</p> <p>Article 11(1): "The undertaker, during and for the purposes of constructing or maintaining the authorised development, may temporarily stop up,</p>

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
		<p>to the DCO that will ensure closures are as a last resort after thorough discussion with the LHA and once it has been agreed that there is no other alternative, including location and timing of signage?</p>	<p>prohibit the use of, authorise the use of, alter or divert any public right of way and may for any reasonable time only as a last resort in accordance with the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan approved under Schedule 2 Requirement 16 ".</p> <p>The DCO should refer to the legal agreement that the Council has requested the Applicant to enter into with it. This legal agreement will provide the detail as to how the liaison process will be governed, as well as phasing and other matters critical to ensuring effective delivery and control.</p> <p>Schedule 2 Requirement 16 sets out the requirement for a Construction Traffic Management Plan. This is linked to Article 9, Power to alter layout, etc., of streets. Article 9(3) should be amended as follows:</p> <p>Article 11(3): "The undertaker must restore any street that has been temporarily altered under this Order to the reasonable satisfaction of the street authority through inspection and certification by the street authority in accordance with the procedure set out in the legal agreement between the relevant parties."</p> <p>Article 9(1)(b) should also be amended so that it refers to Part 1 of Schedule 6, which governs the temporary stopping up of PROW. If it does not refer to Part 1 of Schedule 6, then there is no provision within the DCO for control of reinstatement of PROW affected, as there is for the streets listed in Schedule 5. This is because Article 11 only deals with temporary stopping up and alterations to the surface etc. of PROW and not reinstatement provisions. Article 9(1)(b) should be amended as follows:</p>

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
			<p>Article 9(1)(b): “in the case of the streets specified in column 2 of the table in Part 2 (temporary alteration of layout) of Schedule 5 and Schedule 6 temporarily in the manner specified in relation to that street in column 3.”</p> <p>Schedule 2 Requirement 16: Construction Traffic Management Plan should be amended as follows:</p> <p>Requirement 16(3): “No part of the permitted preliminary works for each phase comprising above ground site preparation for temporary facilities for the use of contractors, site clearance (including vegetation removal, demolition of existing buildings and structures) and the diversion and laying of apparatus so far it relates to works in the highway (including public rights of way) and the crossing of highways (including public rights of way) for construction purposes may start until a permitted preliminary works traffic management plan for that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant county authority for that phase or, where the phase falls within the administrative areas of both the county of Suffolk and the county of Cambridgeshire, both relevant county authorities.”</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [REP3A-004] should be amended as follows:</p> <p>“6.3.4 It is likely that oOver the course of the construction period a number of PRow willmay need to be temporarily closed for a maximum of three weeks. This is a worst-case scenario: PRow will only be closed as a last resort. The local highway authority will be consulted on any proposed closures in accordance with Article 11 of the DCO.”</p>

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
			<p>“6.3.10 The contractor will provide its proposed programme of all proposed temporary diversions and/or closures of PRoW to the relevant LHA and will agree the appropriate diversionary routes. Through discussions with the Local Highway Authorities, it is understood that their preference is to avoid PRoW closures where they are required for vehicles to cross the PRoW, with the preferred method to be the use of marshals (banksman/banks person) to enable usesusage of the PRoW to cross the point at which the closuremanagement is required. Solutions may include diversion within the redline boundary, where space allows. This is supported by the Applicant, however, the contractor will make the final decision, following consultation and agreement with the Local Highway Authority, as to whether marshals (banksman/banks person) can be used, and this will be decided on case-by-case basis based on health and safety of workers and the nature of users of the public rights of way.”</p> <p>“6.3.11 Appropriate signage for any diversions or closures will be agreed with the Local Highway Authority, including the locations at which signage is to be placed in order to provide users with adequate notice to make appropriate decisions for their journeys. The signage will comprise the appropriate Notice of the closure/diversion, a map of the closure and diversion and directional signs. These will be displayed on site at the agreed locations. Copies of closures maps and notices will be provided to local community and user groups prior to commencement of diversions or closures in accordance with the Communication Plan.”</p>
Q2.9.11.	CCC	<p>PRoW disruption CCC is requested to provide its proposed wording to include within the DCO to ensure disruption to PRoW users is mitigated through agreement</p>	<p>In order to address this problem CCC suggests amendments to the LEMP [REP3-011], CEMP [REP3-015] and CTMP provisions in the DCO, as shown in bold below.</p> <p>Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP3-011]:</p>

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
		<p>as to reinstatement works and inspection and certification by the LHA, and restoration of boundary features agreed with CCC, as discussed in CCC D4 Submission -Comments on the Applicant's D3 and D3A submissions [REP4-137].</p>	<p>“1.6.35 Species poor hedgerows will be crossed by the Scheme and may need to be wholly or partially removed to facilitate construction works.</p> <p>1.6.36 On completion of construction, the affected hedgerow sections will be reinstated in full (respecting the legal extent of any public rights of way) and a diversity of native woody species of local provenance will be used to improve their biodiversity value. Species will include Hawthorn (<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>), Blackthorn (<i>Prunus spinosa</i>), Hazel (<i>Corylus avellana</i>), Holly (<i>Ilex aquifolium</i>) and Field Maple (<i>Acer campestre</i>).”</p> <p>This will link the requirement in with the PROW reinstatement provision in the CEMP and the CTMP (as proposed to be amended below).</p> <p>Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP3-015], Habitat Restoration (page 16C-21):</p> <p>“Habitats to be temporarily lost or damaged during construction will be fully reinstated on a like-for-like basis at the same location, respecting the legal extent of any PROW (through approval and certification by the local highway authority), on completion of construction works, where practical. Some habitats will be restored and managed with the aim of increasing their biodiversity value in the long-term as set out within Appendix 10I: OLEMP of this Environmental Statement [APP-108].”</p> <p>At page 43 of the CEMP, the provision around disruption to users of PROW needs to be changed to reflect the fact that PROW may not need to be closed but will still be affected by haul road crossing/cable works, as shown in bold below:</p>

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
			<p>“Where possible, temporary closures of Public Rights of Way will be planned and programmed to minimise disruption to users. Prior to such closures, a condition survey will be undertaken of the PRow and the PRow will be restored to their previous condition following any closure.</p> <p>The principal contractor will liaise with the local highway authority to advise of the programme and agree how PRow will be managed during the course of works.</p> <p>A condition survey will be undertaken of all the PRow affected by the scheme and the PRow will be restored to their previous condition by the developer. Such reinstatement is to be inspected and certified by the local highway authority that it is to their reasonable satisfaction.”</p> <p>Furthermore, in relation to the Construction Traffic Management Plan, CCC suggests that an additional provision (j) to be added to Schedule 2 Requirement 6(1). Please see our response to Q2.9.12 below for our proposed amendment.</p>
Q2.9.12.	CCC	<p>PRow and haul roads Please provide a proposed wording to amend the DCO [REP4-005] Schedule 2: Detailed design approval, to include approval of design for hedgerows of PRow to be removed and restored together with the requirement for reinstatement of the surface and width of PRow affected by haul road/cable route crossings, including provision for inspection and certification by the LHA.</p>	<p>To address this matter CCC asks for an additional provision (j) to be added to Schedule 2 Requirement 6, Detailed design approval:</p> <p>“6.—(1) No phase of the authorised development may commence until details of—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the layout; (b) scale; (c) proposed finished ground levels; (d) external appearance; (e) hard surfacing materials; (f) vehicular and pedestrian access, parking and circulation areas; (g) refuse or other storage units, signs and lighting;

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
			<p>(h) drainage, water, power and communications cables and pipelines; and (i) programme for landscaping works, (j) the pre-commencement condition survey of all PROW affected by haul road/cable route crossings has been completed in accordance with 5.2.11 of the Construction and Traffic Management Plan, and a reinstatement plan of the PROW surfaces and widths agreed, relating to that phase have been submitted and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority for that phase or, where the phase falls within the administrative areas of both the District of West Suffolk and the District of East Cambridgeshire, both relevant planning authorities.”</p> <p>CCC is content that the design for hedgerows of PROW removal and restoration will be dealt with through the amended LEMP [REP3-011] and CEMP [REP3-015].</p> <p>This wording has been jointly agreed with SCC as it will equally affect that authority in the management of PROW within their administrative area.</p>
Q2.9.15	The Applicant	<p>Public access strategy How would the Applicant’s proposals contribute to a more extensive public access strategy said to be integral to the Stone Curlew mitigation, given its potential to help manage the recreational pressure by diverting people away from Beck Road and providing an alternative to the existing PRow that goes along EC02?</p>	<p>The Council appreciates that this question is for the Applicant. In order to assist the ExA, CCC refers to SCC's response to Q2.0.9, which has been prepared by SCC and CCC as a joint response because parcel E05 is within Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>CCC would add that the LHAs seek section 106 contributions for (amongst other additions) the creation of a definitive path linking the proposed E05 perimeter path with Isleham village. Both authorities are considering their position on Public Access mitigation strategies in readiness of discussions with the Applicant.</p>
Q2.9.16	The Applicant	<p>Permissive Access</p>	<p>The Council appreciates that this question is for the Applicant. In order to assist the ExA in understanding the Council’s position</p>

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
		<p>The permissive access offered in Cambridgeshire at the E05 site does not appear to connect to any existing PRow. Therefore. What proposals does the Applicant have that would increase and/or enhance walking opportunities from Isleham?</p>	<p>please refer our response to Q2.9.15. This is an agreed joint response with SCC.</p>
Q2.9.17.	The Applicant	<p>Permissive path within E05</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If E05 is retained, does the Applicant agree that the proposed open space and car park facilities (referred to by CCC in its comments on D3 and D3A submissions [REP4-137]) would improve amenity access and please explain your reasoning? • How would this proposal and the suggested pushing back of the permissive path in the southern section of E05 be incorporated as part of the proposed development? 	<p>The Council appreciates that this question is for the Applicant. In order to assist the ExA in understanding the Council's position please refer our response to Q2.9.15. This is an agreed joint response with SCC.</p>
Q2.9.18.	The Applicant, CCC	<p>Fordham walking group concerns</p> <p>Fordham Cambs Walking Group (FCWG) has over 200 active members, including members from neighbouring villages. They have expressed strong concerns regarding the inadequacy of mitigation relating to permissive routes (see FPC submission at D4). Please confirm that the discussions between the Applicant and CCC relating to permissive routes will</p>	<p>CCC is of the view that Fordham (Cambs) Walking Group (FCWG) should be consulted by the local highway authorities and the Applicant in order to help inform a representative view of local needs. Not only is FCWG an interested party but they are effectively <i>the</i> pedestrian representation, in lieu of the Ramblers' Association (RA) who do not have a representative in this area. The RA would normally be the statutory consultee and the LHA is content that the FCWG are a reasonable alternative. CCC would not expect FCWG to be a party to the s106 discussions, but we would expect them to be consulted in order to help inform those negotiations.</p>

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
		<p>include the FCWG as requested in that organisation's D4 post hearing submission [REP4-097].</p>	<p>CCC also considers that the local parish councils should be consulted, as it is critical that any public access mitigation strategy takes account of local knowledge and needs, and parish councils are usually well placed to provide this. The purpose of the public access mitigation strategy is fundamentally to address the adverse impact of the scheme on the local communities through seeking improvements to the existing limited network and the associated landscape and cultural heritage experience. Should s106 monies be agreed to create additional paths outside of the redline boundary of the scheme during the life of the scheme, and paths within the redline boundary once the plant is decommissioned, the parish councils would, under the terms of a section 26 creation order, be a statutory consultee. Therefore, it is sensible that their views are canvassed in the creation of any proposed mitigation strategy.</p> <p>The Councils welcomed the Applicant's verbal statement at ISH3 that they were willing to engage with the Councils to agree an appropriate s106 agreement and compensation for PROW mitigation.</p> <p>CCC is of the view that permissive paths other than those currently proposed are feasible, not only around parcel E05 but also around E19-E22 near Worlington, as was discussed at a meeting between SCC, CCC and other authorities on 1 December 2022 with AECOM (representing the Applicant). The actions agreed at this meeting, for AECOM to provide revised plans for the permissive paths discussed, are still awaited. The Councils are of the view that there is also merit in FCWG's suggestions for providing access along at least some of the cable corridors.</p> <p>This is a jointly agreed position between CCC and SCC, because, as with other PROW matters, the same issues exist for both administrative areas and thus need to be considered holistically.</p>

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
			Rights of Way users are not concerned with county boundaries; they use the network according to their needs. Therefore, it is vital that the stakeholders work together to agree solutions to the concerns raised.
2.10. Traffic, Transport and Highway Safety			
Q2.10.5.	The relevant highway authorities	<p>Site access and crane routes In your joint response to our ExQ1.10.45 and 1.10.46 [REP2-078], you express reservations about various issues relating to site access and crane routes, including road widths, the use of Manual for Streets on high speed rural roads and a post consent crane access route review. Are you satisfied with the Applicant's response [REP3A-036] to the concerns you raise? If not, what issues are outstanding, and are they capable of satisfactory resolution?</p>	<p>It has not yet been established that the provision of passing places on La Hogue Road is sufficient to mitigate the risk of conflict on a road that many road users may anticipate being sufficiently wide to accommodate two-way traffic – risking collision or overrun of road edge. Where the road is not to be fully widened along the route to the main site, it will not be possible to consider safety implications without provision of a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.</p> <p>While the DCO boundary has been amended to accommodate the swept path, assumptions remain regarding the highway extent. The Applicant has not yet demonstrated that the site access layouts for uncontrolled use during operational phase are safe.</p> <p>While amendment to the final crane route is accepted in principle, the Applicant must still demonstrate feasibility of providing a safe access route.</p> <p>It is not possible to determine whether these issues can be resolved without provision of appropriate information, including highway extent.</p>
Q2.10.6.	The relevant planning and highway authorities	<p>Baseline conditions We note the Applicant's response to our ExQ1.10.81 [REP2-037] relating to baseline traffic conditions</p>	CCC refers to and supports Suffolk County Council's response to this question in their submission.

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
		<p>[REP2-037], where it is stated that “The LHAs concern was whether there was a scenario where construction flows and baseline flows combined were likely to be higher than in the weekday assessment, and not whether there would be a higher proportionate impact”. Surely a Saturday assessment should be undertaken as the additional weekend construction traffic will be proportionally higher and impact more on peaceful enjoyment?</p>	
Q2.10.7.	The relevant highway authorities	<p>Baseline conditions We note your response to our ExQ1.1.85 [REP2-078] regarding the Applicant’s assertion in its Transport Assessment [APP-117] that there is no “particular safety concern that needs to be considered as part of the Scheme proposals.” and to the Applicant’s response [REP3A-036] in which it refers to further review at various locations and the need for and timing of safety audits. Are you satisfied with the Applicant’s response? If not, what issues are outstanding, and are they capable of satisfactory resolution?</p>	CCC refers to and supports Suffolk County Council’s response to this question in their submission.
Q2.10.8.	The relevant planning and highway authorities	<p>Assessment methodology We note your response to our ExQ1.10.98 [REP2-078], particularly in respect of the assessment of links,</p>	CCC refers to and supports Suffolk County Council’s response to this question in their submission.

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
		and to the Applicant's response [REP3A-036] [REP2-041]. Are you satisfied with this response?	
Q2.10.11.	The relevant planning and highway authorities	<p>Joint LIR</p> <p>We refer to the joint LIR [REP1-024] and to the Applicant's Response [REP3A-034].</p> <p>Other than topics raised elsewhere in this section of questions ExQ2, are there any other outstanding transport and access issues?</p> <p>If so, please give details and indicate whether or not these issues are capable of satisfactory resolution.</p>	<p>It has not yet been established to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority that it is feasible to construct safe access or route improvements fully within the DCO or highway boundary, with the general principles of achieving suitable visibility, and access geometry for uncontrolled two-way use has not been adequately discussed or resolved. Until the impact of the use of the access/route and proposed works is fully understood, it would not (at this stage) be appropriate to discount the need for further Stage 1 Road Safety Audit as may be required by the Highway Authorities in determining the feasibility of providing appropriate highway measures at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Visibility splays have not been clearly described on all accesses and shown to be achieved fully within land within the DCO or highway boundary. While the need to provide appropriate visibility has been mitigated at many sites during the construction phase, by the proposed installation of speed limits and traffic signals, this does not extend into the operational phase when the accesses are to be retained for an unquantified use for future maintenance – which may require access for deliveries of materials or construction plant. It is not considered appropriate to assume that any intensification of use, however minor, would be appropriate where the existing access is deficient in terms of geometry or visibility for its existing use, such that road safety would be further compromised.</p> <p>Vehicle swept paths have been provided to demonstrate that vehicles may enter and leave the site within the DCO boundary, but this does not establish whether there is a need to accommodate vehicles both entering and leaving at the same time, or whether any</p>

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
			<p>further widening that may be required to achieve this could be accommodated within land in the Applicant's control. Failure to establish this prior to determination of the application may result in appropriate widening being unachievable at the detailed design stage, compromising highway safety.</p> <p>Few of the accesses on the amended plans are proposed to have improvements, including to junction radii as appropriate to the (speed) use of the road from which it enters. This may result in unnecessary deceleration within the highway, resulting in shunt type accidents. It is unclear whether suitable radii can be constructed with land in the Applicant's control, especially where the access may also be required to be widened to accommodate the passing of two vehicles.</p> <p>Comments below refer to the IR Summary Reference (Para) listed in the Applicant's Response to the LIR [REP3A-034].</p> <p>E1: The point only recognises the need to provide visibility splays at the main staff access during the construction phase. This is not considered acceptable; instead, splays should be provided at any access where there is to be any intensification of use, however minor. While this may be mitigated during the construction phase by traffic management, it should still be provided at any site with ongoing use during the operational phase. The highway extent has not been provided as requested during direct contact with the Applicant, and it remains unclear whether appropriate visibility can be achieved within the DCO boundary. It is not therefore possible to resolve this matter until appropriate information is provided.</p> <p>E.2-E.5:</p>

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
			<p>While introduction of temporary traffic management may mitigate for insufficient visibility, the Applicant requires access to be retained to most sites and cable route junctions throughout the operational phase for the purpose of maintenance. While it is suggested that such use will be minor, this has not been quantified. Any access that does not have appropriate levels of visibility would not be suitable for any intensification of use, irrespective of how minor. It is unclear how safe access can be considered and agreed while the Applicant holds a contrary view.</p> <p>E.6-E.7: Subsequent plans provided by the Applicant suggest passing places on La Hogue Road, rather than full widening. It has yet to be established that this is a safe approach on a road that many drivers may perceive to be sufficiently wide for two vehicles to pass, and it is therefore recommended that a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit is undertaken to confirm suitability. Until appropriate information is provided, including highway extent, it is not possible to determine whether proposals can be fully achieved within the highway or DCO boundary.</p> <p>E.8-E.9: While single vehicle access width may be acceptable under management by traffic signals during the construction phase, the Applicant requires access to be retained to most sites and cable route junctions throughout the operational phase for the purpose of maintenance. While it is suggested that such use will be minor, this has not been quantified. Failure to provide sufficient access width may result in vehicles dwelling in the highway, risking turning out and shunt type collisions on the highway. It is unclear how safe access can be considered or agreed while the Applicant holds a contrary view.</p>

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
			<p>E.10-E.11: It is unclear whether approval through the CTMP is appropriate for those elements of the works that will be permanent and will be required to be maintained throughout the operational phase.</p> <p>E.12-E.13: While drainage may be resolved as part of the detailed design, the Applicant should establish how they propose to manage this and ensure that their proposals are feasible. It should be recognised that permission to discharge water into adjacent watercourses may require separate permissions to be obtained.</p> <p>E.14-E.126: It has not yet been established that visibility can be achieved fully within the DCO or highway boundary. While absence of appropriate visibility may be mitigated by traffic management during the operational phase, where there is a continuing use, appropriate visibility splays should be provided. While the environmental concerns are noted, this should not come at the detriment of highway safety, and the Applicant should perhaps consider relocating accesses to positions where less foliage is required to be removed to achieve appropriate safe visibility distances.</p> <p>The responses generally relate to access under temporary traffic management measures, but fails to recognise the needs to maintain appropriate safe access at uncontrolled site, including use during the operational phase.</p> <p>It should not be presumed that safety of an existing field access has been established by an absence of recorded accidents for its existing agricultural use. Where any access is found to be substandard with respect to visibility or geometry for existing use, then it should not be considered appropriate for any intensification</p>

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) response
			<p>of use, irrespective of however minor. While the Applicant indicates that use during the operational will be limited, this has not been quantified; this will clearly be difficult to establish, given the nature of any unplanned maintenance. While it is accepted that the operational phase may not require access by HGVs, the class of vehicles that can be anticipated should be established, and appropriate measures put in place to ensure that safe access can be achieved. The observations raised previously in the LIR [REP1-024] with respect to these points largely remain applicable and until such time that appropriate details have been provided, it is not possible to determine whether the measures that may be necessary can be achieve fully within the DCO or highway boundary.</p>
Q2.10.14.	The relevant highway authority	<p>Updated Framework CTMP and TP [REP3A-004]: crane and AIL routes In paragraph 5.4.11, the Applicant states that “the routes included within the review do not necessarily mean they will be the final routes of the AILs. It will be the hauliers’ responsibility to finalise the AIL route in coordination with the relevant highway authorities and any other relevant authority ...” If the actual route chosen to each site access is different from the route identified here, are you satisfied that the powers available to you in the DCO are sufficient to ensure that the actual route agreed for each site access is no worse in terms of impact and effects than the case which has been assessed and reported in the ES?</p>	<p>CCC refers to and supports Suffolk County Council’s response to this question in their submission.</p>

