

Hearing/Date	Issue	SCC Comment
Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 24/02/2020	Abbey Rangers Football Club. Applicant said there have been meetings held. Close to finding solutions. Minor change proposed – to be discussed later in Agenda	No further comments to make. Agree with Applicant that things are progressing with the Football Club
	Protective Provisions with the Lead Local Flood Authorities	Confirmed that SCC are not instructed to negotiate for both LLFAs. Negotiations between the Applicant and SCC on Protective Provisions are continuing.
Issue Specific Hearing 4 25/02/2020	Permit Schemes	There are ongoing discussions with the Applicant. Pleased with the insertion of reference to the permit schemes. Want to ensure that they are correctly referred to and that all parties are in agreement. Keen to avoid ambiguity.
		Agree with Applicant solicitor's summary of relationship between DCO itself and permit schemes .The DCO gives powers and rights to place apparatus. The permit scheme enables us to fulfil our Network Management Duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004. The DCO detail makes drafting harder to weave in the permit content. No carte blanche working – permit scheme for best working practice.
Article 12	Temporary Stopping Up	Remove reference within the Article to stopping up. Remaining concern – temporary or permanent? Terminology not clear. Need clarification.
Requirement 14	Construction Hours	Appreciate Applicant inserting 14 (4) (c). Relates to potential permit scheme conditions. No intent to overuse this power. Exceptional circumstances only where impacts might dictate. SCC always considers residents' environmental health concerns when making decisions. Not taken in isolation as simply just traffic management considerations.
	Ex A – Large sections through highway – tend to be urban – that's our concern	Requirement 14 (4) C only applied in 'Traffic Sensitive Streets' (i.e. busiest roads) so not all urban areas the project passes through. List of Traffic Sensitive Streets to be supplied for reference to show limited extent of any potential use.
Issue Specific Hearing 5 26/02/2020	CTMP – why are the County Councils taking the lead and not the reverse?	Both Counties and the Districts/Boroughs have residents to consider. Permits consider impacts on residents too. Paragraph 1.4 of the CTMP specifically highlights the overlap and alignment between the two. SCC consider it odd for one Authority to determine permit applications and another to sign off the CTMP. We are content with the current wording in the dDCO – Highway Authority sign off with LPA consultation. Single document for the whole geography of the scheme promotes better adherence. Consider it easier for SCC and HCC to agree final content with applicant than multiple LPAs involved.

		Some minor content to agree with the Applicant. 4.2.4 – Woodthorpe Road alternative access – reference to SCC needing to grant a permit. We cannot see any issue granting said permit subject to some traffic management considerations.
	LEMP	Rewording required to take account of SCC's preference on approach to highway trees specifically. There is a CAVAT process. For example utility companies removing a tree would pay 20% of the CAVAT value to SCC. (Court precedent). SCC will plant appropriate tree volumes elsewhere to balance the loss. With highway trees there is a need to consider other apparatus in the highway including where and what can be planted and the likelihood of the survival of a single newly planted replacement highway tree.