

## **Application by Highways England for A63 Castle Street Improvement, Hull**

### **The Examining Authority's further written questions and requests for information (ExQ2)**

**Issued on 11 July 2019**

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) further written questions and requests for information – ExQ2.

Questions are set out using the same issues-based framework use in the first round of written questions (ExQ1).

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all parties named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a party to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 2 (indicating that it is from ExQ2) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on the historic environment is identified as Q2.5.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please contact [A63CastleStreet@PlanningInspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:A63CastleStreet@PlanningInspectorate.gov.uk) and include 'A63 Castle Street Improvement, Hull' in the subject line of your email.

Responses are due by **Deadline 5: Monday 5 August 2019**.

## Abbreviations used

<b>PA2008</b>	<i>The Planning Act 2008</i>	<b>LIR</b>	<i>Local Impact Report</i>
<b>Art</b>	<i>Article</i>	<b>LPA</b>	<i>Local planning authority</i>
<b>ALA 1981</b>	<i>Acquisition of Land Act 1981</i>	<b>MP</b>	<i>Model Provision (in the MP Order)</i>
<b>BoR</b>	<i>Book of Reference</i>	<b>MP Order</b>	<i>The Infrastructure Planning (Model Provisions) Order 2009</i>
<b>CA</b>	<i>Compulsory Acquisition</i>	<b>NPS</b>	<i>National Policy Statement</i>
<b>CPO</b>	<i>Compulsory purchase order</i>	<b>NSIP</b>	<i>Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project</i>
<b>dDCO</b>	<i>Draft DCO</i>	<b>R</b>	<i>Requirement</i>
<b>EM</b>	<i>Explanatory Memorandum</i>	<b>SI</b>	<i>Statutory Instrument</i>
<b>ES</b>	<i>Environmental Statement</i>	<b>SoS</b>	<i>Secretary of State</i>
<b>ExA</b>	<i>Examining authority</i>	<b>TP</b>	<i>Temporary Possession</i>
<b>HCC</b>	<i>Hull City Council</i>		

## The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR010016/TR010016-000261-Examination%20Library%20A63%20Castle%20Street.pdf>

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

<b>ExQ2 Question to:</b>		<b>Question:</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>General and Cross-topic Questions</b>	
2.0.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Plans</b></p> <p>Please clarify the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the Works Plans need to be amended to reflect the addition of Work No 18A and 18B in dDCO Schedule 1?</li> <li>• Non-Motorised user route plan sheet 3: Are the existing routes shown by the solid blue line to be removed? If so, should that be made clear in the key (as has been done for footways)?</li> <li>• Drainage engineering drawings: What do the asterisks on Sheet 3 denote?</li> </ul>
	<p>The Works plans have been updated and submitted for Deadline 5.</p> <p>The existing route shown by the solid blue line is to be removed. This has been made clear in the plans submitted for Deadline 5.</p> <p>These have been clarified on the plans submitted for Deadline 5. The asterisks denote Combined Kerb Drains (CKD).</p>	
2.0.2	HCC	<p><b>Documents</b></p> <p>Please provide the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Network Management Plan 2009</li> <li>• Humber LEP Strategic Economic Plan 2014-2020</li> <li>• Air Quality Management Plan</li> </ul>
<b>2.1.</b>	<b>Air Quality and Related Emissions</b>	
2.1.1.	N/A	No written questions on this topic at this stage.

<b>ExQ2 Question to:</b>		<b>Question:</b>
<b>2.2.</b>	<b>Biodiversity</b> (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))	
2.2.1.	Natural England	<p><b>Likely significant effects</b>            The Applicant's Screening Report <a href="#">[APP-069]</a> advises that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• without mitigation, the proposed development will cause no significant effects to European Sites located within 2km of the Scheme, either alone or in-combination with other projects and plans;</li> <li>• there are no European Sites for which bats are one of the qualifying interests within 30km of the site; and that</li> <li>• in view of the above, no further stages of HRA are necessary.</li> </ul> <p>Please confirm whether or not you accept that assessment.</p>
2.2.2.	Applicant	<p><b>HRA and 'mitigation measures'</b>            It is noted that the Applicant's responses to ExQ1 [REP2-003] and Hull City LIR [REP2-016] mention "mitigation measures" to prevent effects upon the Estuary designated sites (see in particular the Applicant's response to 1.2.3 where the Applicant states "The mitigation measures to prevent effects upon the Estuary designated sites have been accepted by Natural England.").            Can the Applicant please consider whether there is any contradiction between this and response 1.0.11 [REP2-003], which says, 'As a consequence, the Screening Report does not take into account mitigation measures, including aspects such as timing restrictions'. Are mitigation measures required to prevent likely significant effects to the European sites?</p>
		In the Applicant's response to ExA Written Questions 1 (REP2-003) submitted at Deadline 2, mitigation measures are mentioned at 1.2.3 in respect of preventing impacts to birds during clearance and at the Neptune Street compound.

ExQ2		Question to:	Question:
		<p>This mitigation was discussed and approved by Natural England during the preparation for the DCO submission. However, the HRA Screening Report does not take into account these mitigation measures including aspects such as timing restrictions and concludes that there are no significant effects on the Humber Estuary designated sites. Therefore to clarify, mitigation measures are not required to prevent likely significant effects to the European sites.</p> <p>The Applicant would like to make the following clarification in REP2-003 WQ1.2.3 as follows:</p> <p><u>First bullet</u>                      Replace "<i>The mitigation measures to prevent effects upon the Estuary designated sites have been accepted by Natural England</i>"                      with "<i>The mitigation measures have been accepted by Natural England.</i>"</p> <p><u>Second bullet</u>                      Replace "<i>The mitigation measures to prevent effects upon the Estuary designated sites have been accepted by Natural England, and along with the measures to prevent impacts to birds during clearance in the OEMP and REAC at reference E5, it has been assessed with probable certainty that there will be no significant effects on breeding birds at Neptune Street compound.</i>"                      with "<i>The mitigation measures have been accepted by Natural England, and along with the measures to prevent impacts to birds during clearance in the OEMP and REAC at reference E5, it has been assessed with probable certainty that there will be no significant effects on breeding birds at Neptune Street compound.</i>"</p>	
<b>2.3.</b>	<b>Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession</b>		
2.3.1.	The Applicant	<p><b>Annex B of the Statement of Reasons</b></p> <p>The final column of the Statement of Reasons - Status of objection and negotiations with land interest – is often filled in with the words, 'Not applicable'. It is not clear from this answer whether there is an objection or not, or whether any negotiations have taken place. Could a more informative answer please be given.</p> <p><b>Please note that this matter was raised at ExQ1 but has yet to be addressed. It is imperative that the status of objections and</b></p>	

<b>ExQ2 Question to:</b>		<b>Question:</b>
		<b>discussions relating to compulsory acquisition and temporary possession is clear before the close of the Examination.</b>
	The Statement of Reasons has been updated and submitted for Deadline 5. Annex B has now been updated and reflects the progress of negotiations with affect persons. The Applicant is only intending to enter into agreement where they are seeking permanent acquisition of land. Therefore, in the final column – Status of objection and negotiations with land interest – now states ‘Agreement not sought’ where the Applicant is not planning on entering an agreement.	
2.3.2.	The Applicant	<b>Crown Land</b> Please provide an update in accordance with question number ExQ1.3.3.
	A notice has been received in relation to plots 3/5a, 3/5b, 3/5c. 3/5d, 3/5e, 3/5f, 3/5g, 3/5h, 3/5i and 3/5j disclaiming the Crown’s interest in the land.  In relation to plot 5/10a, in which Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government holds a leasehold interest, the Applicant is still attempting to find the correct party to engage with on this plot.	
2.3.3.	The Applicant	<b>Special category land</b> Please provide an update of proposals relating to the open space to be compulsorily acquired for the scheme and how s131 of the Act is to be addressed.
	The Applicant is currently in discussions with the Church to acquire the Public Open Space by agreement and to remove the open space plot from the draft DCO. The Church has verbally agreed to this proposal and the relevant agreement is being drawn up. This would then avoid the Special Parliamentary Procedure being triggered under s.131 of the Planning Act 2008. The Applicant will update the examination in respect of its progress with this agreement as soon as it is able to.	
<b>2.4.</b>	<b>Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)</b>	
2.4.1.	All IPs	Please review the Examining Authority’s Schedule of Proposed Changes to the draft Development Consent Order, published 11 July, and provide any

<b>ExQ2 Question to:</b>		<b>Question:</b>
		comments by Deadline 5 (Monday 5 August).
	Please see Schedule 1 which sets out the Applicant's responses to the Examining Authority's Schedule of Proposed Changes published on 11 July.	
<b>2.5.</b>	<b>Historic Environment</b>	
2.5.1.	The Applicant, HCC, Historic England	<p><b>Earl de Grey public house</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please provide an update on any further progress and discussions in respect of proposals for the partial rebuilding/relocation of this listed building.</li> <li>• What bearing should the recent grant of planning permission and listed building consent for a development which includes the partial reconstruction/relocation of the Earl de Grey public house (reference nos. 19/00333/FULL and 19/00334/LBC) have on the ExA's assessment of the Applicant's current proposal for this listed building? Is there any reason why that permitted scheme should not be implemented instead of the proposal within Work No 30 of the DCO if circumstances permit?</li> <li>• Paragraph 5.131 of the National Networks NPS advises that, 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Secretary of State should give great weight to the asset's conservation.' Additionally, both Historic England [REP1-017] and HCC [REP3-215] have expressed concern about the limited information provided regarding the Applicant's proposals for the Earl de Grey. With that in mind, what further information does the Applicant intend to provide regarding its proposals for this listed building and when will that be provided?</li> </ul>
	The applicant is in discussions with Castle Building LLP with regards to an agreement to facilitate the relocation of the Earl de Grey to Waterhouse Lane in relation to the now approved planning permission (reference nos. 19/00333/FULL and 19/00334/LBC). Heads of terms are currently being agreed and it is anticipated that an agreement will be in	

ExQ2		Question to:	Question:
		place prior to the completion of the examination.	<p>The applicant supports the proposals to relocate the building to Waterhouse Lane but is unable to include this work as part of the Development Consent Order due to constraints with the scheme's redline boundary. The scheme also cannot be reliant on a third party to deliver a private development over which it would have no control.</p> <p>In the event an agreement is reached with the building's owners then the proposed redevelopment to the Earl de Grey would replace Work No 30 of the DCO. The work to relocate the building would be completed by Castle Building LLP.</p> <p>In the event that agreement is not reached with the building's owners the applicant will relocate the building the 3m required for the scheme, a full methodology for this work would be produced and both Hull City Council and Historic England would be consulted. The applicant has agreed to a requirement relating to production of this methodology.</p>
2.5.2.	The Applicant, Historic England, HCC	<p><b>Beverly Gate Scheduled Monument</b></p> <p>In response to ExQ 1.5.8, The Applicant advised that:              'Utility diversions for the Scheme could impact the significant element of the scheduled monument. The detailed design stage will provide clarification on the requirement for utilities diversions prior to construction' [document ref REP2-003]. It also states that, 'the DCO would require the equivalent level of documentation to scheduled monument consent'.</p> <p>In view of this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please provide your views regarding the degree of detail and certainty regarding the effect on the Scheduled Monument that is necessary in order for development consent to be granted.</li> <li>• If the impact on the Scheduled Monument is not clear by the close of</li> </ul>	



<b>ExQ2 Question to:</b>		<b>Question:</b>
		the Examination, how should the matter be addressed in the DCO?
	<p>1. It remains that the most desirable proposal for the KCOM diversion is that we utilise their existing duct network for this diversionary work in what is the feasibility stage for the diversion. Any installation of additional ducting that may become apparent in the next stage of the diversionary work will ensure that the ducting is installed no deeper than 500mm. This has been confirmed by KCOM in writing.</p> <p>It is noted that for the area outside the sunken amphitheatre constructed to display the remains after the 1986-89 excavations, the top 0.5m of deposits immediately below the modern ground surface is excluded from the scheduling. Services such as gas and water pipes, electricity and telecommunication cabling and ducting are also excluded from the scheduling, however any service trenches deeper than 0.5m are included for the support and protection of the archaeological deposits through which they may be cut. Therefore any ducting required by KCOM will be outside of the scheduling of the monument.</p> <p>2. If the impact is not clear for the planned diversion works along Whitefriar Gate and into Humber Dock Street to install the KCOM diversion by close of the Examination then consent will be required. This consent would not impact the area of the sunken amphitheatre but would have to encompass the listing of Beverley Gate and adjacent archaeological remains forming part of Hull's medieval and post-medieval defences. The works on the SU diversion have been assessed for worst possible case in the Environmental Statement for impact on archaeology.</p>	
<b>2.6.</b>	<b>Social, Economic and Land-Use Effects</b>	
2.6.1.	The Applicant	<p><b>Low carbon economy</b>                      What is the evidence that the scheme will help move towards a low carbon economy (whether as the result of reducing congestion or otherwise), as stated in Table 5.1 of the Planning Statement [APP-070]?</p>
	The vision and strategic objectives are set out within the NPS which states:	

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
	<p><i>"The Government will deliver national networks that meet the country's long term needs; supporting a prosperous and competitive economy and improving overall quality of life, as part of a wider transport system. This means:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Networks with the capacity and connectivity and resilience to support national and local economic activity and facilitate growth and create jobs.</i></li> <li><i>• Networks which support and improve journey quality, reliability and safety.</i></li> <li><i>• Networks which support the delivery of environmental goals and the move to a low carbon economy.</i></li> <li><i>• Networks which join up our communities and link effectively to each other."</i></li> </ul> <p>Emissions of greenhouse gas are assessed and compared on a national scale as it is at the national scale where overall carbon reduction carbon targets are set. Therefore, it is not appropriate to assess an individual scheme's effects on a low carbon economy based on calculated greenhouse emissions from road traffic associated with one scheme. The predicted total, and change in greenhouse gas emissions from the A63 Scheme, are negligible in the context of national emissions. Nevertheless, the aims of the Scheme are to contribute to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improved access to the Port of Hull</li> <li>• congestion relief</li> <li>• improved safety</li> <li>• improved connections between the city centre to the north and developments, and tourist and recreational facilities to the south</li> </ul> <p>Once completed the Scheme will improve the existing national road network and by meeting its aims, it will help contribute to a national move to a low carbon economy, and thereby meet the vision and strategic objectives set out within the NPS.</p>	
2.7.	<b>Townscape and Visual Impact</b>	
2.7.1.	The Applicant and HCC	<p><b>Central reservation barrier</b></p> <p>The Council's suggested amendment to R12, which would require details of the design of the barrier, is noted (HCC's Post-Issue specific Hearings submission [REP3-215]). What progress has there been in seeking to address the design of the barrier and what evidence is there that a mutually satisfactory design can</p>

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		be achieved?
		<p>The Applicant hosted a workshop on 27 June 2019, which was attended by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The Applicant's project team</li><li>- The Applicant's designers (Arup)</li><li>- The Applicant's contractor (Balfour Beatty)</li><li>- The Applicant's Environmental and DCO team</li><li>- The Applicant's Safety Engineering and Standards Team</li><li>- The Applicant's Project Sponsor</li><li>- Hull City Council's project team</li></ul> <p>The objective of the workshop was to present the proposed design to Hull City Council (HCC), explain why Concrete Central Reserve Barrier (CCRB) is the preferred solution for the entire scheme and to consider HCC's concerns. As HCC had indicated at the first set of hearings that their area of concern was around the Old Town Conservation Area, this was the focus of the workshop. There was a session to assess alternatives to the CCRB using a scoring system.</p> <p>The Applicant has made it clear to HCC that there is no intention to amend the proposal to install CCRB from the western extents of the scheme and throughout the entirety of the underpass. CCRB is the safest solution during operation, requires almost no long-term maintenance, has been agreed by all internal Highways England specialists and the Area 12 maintainer and has been through the road safety audit process. Amending this proposal would increase the future safety risk to road users and the operatives undertaking maintenance.</p> <p>HCC has made it clear to the Applicant that their main areas of concern are visual impact and a barrier that is in fitting with the look and feel of the Conservation area and pedestrian safety.</p> <p>In the interest of attempting to find a solution in the proximity of the Conservation area that is safe, maintainable and meets the expectations of HCC, the Applicant's designers and contractor are assessing the current solution against the two alternative options that scored highest at the workshop, which are:</p>

ExQ2 Question to:		Question:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A parapet style fence (similar to that presented by Hull CC at the last hearings)</li> <li>- A combination of trief kerbing and pedestrian guardrail</li> </ul> <p>This assessment will be completed and presented to Hull CC and the ExA in the form of a technical note along with a recommendation. The assessment results will need to be reviewed and approved through Highways England’s own governance process and any alternative solution will need to pass numerous tests, including a road safety audit and Operations Technical Leadership Group compliance. The current proposal has passed those tests as it meets design standards, is the most robust solution and preferred for the long-term maintenance and safe operation of the scheme.</p> <p>Any change to the proposed solution in the Conservation area may require an amendment to the Environmental Statement.</p>		
2.7.2.	The Applicant, HCC, HAIG, East Yorkshire and Derwent Area Ramblers	<p><b>Myton underpass design</b></p> <p>The Council’s suggested additional requirement, which would require details of the design of the Myton Bridge underpass, is noted (HCC’s Post-Issue specific Hearings submission [REP3-215]). Have any design principles or details yet been agreed? If not, what evidence is there that a mutually satisfactory design can be achieved?</p>
<p>Several meetings have been held between the Applicant, Hull CC and HAIG since the previous hearings in June 2019, culminating in a combined site visit on 2 July 2019.</p> <p>The visit focussed on presenting the Applicant’s current proposals for the High Street area to the attendees, taking back any comments that could add benefit to the scheme and also presenting the draft visuals for the area. This was a useful session.</p> <p>The Applicant’s designers are currently reflecting on this meeting, however to aid the ExA The Applicant has provided the latest plans and visuals tabled for Deadline 5.</p> <p>The Applicant is hopeful that a mutually satisfactory design can be achieved.</p>		

<b>ExQ2 Question to:</b>		<b>Question:</b>
2.7.3.	The Applicant, HCC	<p><b>Article 35 – Trees</b>                      Should Article 35 and/or Requirement 5 include additional protection for trees which are the subject of a preservation order?</p>
	<p>As stated at ES Section 2.6.81, "<i>none of the trees to be removed or which require arboricultural works on the Scheme are subject to a Tree Preservation Order</i>". Trees within the conservation area are protected by the provisions of section 211 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.</p> <p>Therefore the Applicant does not propose to amend article 5 or requirement 5 of the draft DCO in this respect.</p>	
<b>2.8.</b>	<b>Transportation and Traffic</b>	
2.8.1.	The Applicant	<p><b>Cycle routes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please provide details of how the proposed cycle routes will link in with the cycle network in the immediate area surrounding the NSIP site. Please ensure that all illustrative material is consistent with the project plans.</li> <li>• At Deadline 3 the Applicant advised that it wishes to review the shared cycleway/footpath provision along the A63 [see document REP3-007]. Has that review now taken place and, if so, when will any revised details be submitted?</li> </ul>
<p>A review has been undertaken and the Applicant wishes to clarify that a combined footway and cycleway would be provided to the north of the A63 and along Blackfriargate, whilst the footway to the south of the A63 would be improved.</p> <p>These clarifications have been made to the ES (APP-023), Planning Statement (APP-070), Transport Assessment Report (APP-073), ES Volume 2 Figures 2.5.4 and 2.5.6 The Scheme Proposals and ES Volume 2 Figure 15.2 Proposed NMU facilities and closures for the scheme (APP-025) via the DCO Documents Errata version 3 to be submitted for DCO Deadline 5 on 5 August 2019. In addition, NMU Route Plans (TR010016/APP/2.8 (DB) Sheet 3 of 6 and TR010016/APP/2.8 (F) Sheet 5 of 6) will be</p>		

ExQ2 Question to:		Question:
<p>re-issued on this date.</p> <p>The proposed cycle routes will link into the existing cycle network as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To the north of the A63, the proposed combined footpath / cycleway will link into the existing shared footpath / cycleway to the west of the Scheme and continue all the way along the A63 eastwards until joining the ramp down to High Street to go under the A63.</li> </ul> <p>On the south side of the A63, pedestrians and cyclists would be routed along Blackfriargate. Pedestrian users would re-join the A63 either via the retained Queen Street signalised crossing. Cyclists would travel along the existing Blanket Row and Humber Dock Street or could travel further west by taking a route along the existing High Street, Queen Street, Wellington Street (existing cycle route) and Manor House Street.</p>		
2.8.2.	The Applicant, HCC, HAIG, East Yorkshire and Derwent Area Ramblers	<p><b>Pedestrian crossings at Market Place and Queen Street</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there any reason not to amend the scheme to introduce/retain signalised crossings at these slip roads as the Council suggests?</li> <li>What are the safety implications of providing or not providing signalised crossings at these points and what information is that view based on?</li> </ul>
<p>The Applicant is aware of the request from Hull CC to provide the east to west controlled crossings across Market Place and Queen Street. Currently, these crossings exist and the submitted DCO application seeks to remove them and replace them with uncontrolled crossings. This was highlighted as a potential issue in the road safety audit, and it was agreed that the Applicant's designers will assess the implication of reintroducing the crossings.</p> <p>There are several assessments required in order to assess the impact on such a change. This focusses on assessing the traffic flow and economics (as queues would effectively be re-introduced) and then if that test is passed assessing the engineering and design challenges as departures from standard may be required. Controlled crossings require extra forward visibility and placement of them needs to be considered in relation to the surrounding network and geometry.</p>		

<b>ExQ2 Question to:</b>		<b>Question:</b>
<p>In terms of the points raised in the question, the only reason not to re-introduce the crossings would be if there be an adverse road safety issue created by the crossings. For example, excessive queueing which would lead back to the eastbound weaving area. If this was to be a risk, it is unlikely the crossings could be re-introduced as it may result in vehicles travelling eastbound being in conflict with waiting vehicles.</p> <p>In terms of the second point, the implications of removing the current controlled crossing is that it would be worse for pedestrians in this locality compared to what is already there. This may create additional road safety issues and risk of conflicts between crossing pedestrians and left turning vehicles on this area specifically as there would be no physical control. By re-introducing the controlled crossings into the final scheme, the risk is noted in the previous paragraph as an example. This view is based on the experience of road safety engineers within the Applicants team and the completed Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.</p> <p>The impact of the crossings being introduced is being assessed in detail. The Applicant will report back the finding to the ExA as soon as the information is returned and quantified.</p>		<p><b>Speed limits on the Market Place and Queen Street slip roads</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please provide a timescale for when any decision regarding the potential extension of the 30mph zone on the slip roads will be made.</li> <li>• Please advise how any such change will be reflected in revisions to the application documents.</li> </ul>
<p>2.8.3.</p>	<p>The Applicant, HCC, HAIG, East Yorkshire and Derwent Area Ramblers</p>	<p>An assessment of changes to the proposed speed limits at Market Place and Queen Street slip roads is being undertaken. Initial indications are that due to limited space on the traffic island, the directional signage, the crossing signals and the geometry of the junction to the A63 mainline it is not possible to provide a speed limit sign on both the near and far sides of the carriage way as per Chapter 3 of the Traffic Signs Manual (Regulatory Signs). This would cause additional confusion for drivers on the mainline and therefore has been discounted as an option.</p> <p>Currently, there are two options for these signs under consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option A – Bend ahead sign (Diagram 512) with maximum speed advised (Max speed 30) supplementary sign;</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ2 Question to:</b>		<b>Question:</b>
		<p>or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option B – Traffic signals ahead sign (Diagram 543)</li> </ul> <p>Both these options will require consultation with Highways England’s specialist.</p> <p>The Applicant is also reviewing adding the necessary road markings at the crossings such as the terminal lines, stop lines (Diagram 1001) and road studs.</p> <p>The Applicant will provide an additional update on progress at deadline 6 including which submission documents will need revising.</p>
2.8.4.	The Applicant, HCC and EPIC (No2) Ltd	<p><b>Temporary Traffic Management</b>            HCC’s comments concerning mitigating traffic impacts during the construction period at section 1.6 of its Post-Issue specific Hearings submission [REP3-215] are noted. If the ExA comes to the view that such measures are necessary, how should that be reflected in the DCO and related documents?</p>
	The temporary traffic management concerns raised by Hull City Council will be addressed by the Traffic and Transport Management Plan which is secured by requirement 4 of the draft DCO.	
2.8.5.	The Applicant and HCC	<p><b>Weight restrictions</b>            Why are weight restrictions shown on the Traffic Regulation Plans (eg Princess Dock Street) now that there is no longer any schedule within the DCO specifying a weight restriction?</p>
	The Traffic Regulation Plans have been updated and submitted for Deadline 5 to align with the draft DCO.	
2.8.6.	The Applicant, HCC, HAIG, East Yorkshire and Derwent Area Ramblers	<p><b>Princes Quay Bridge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can HCC please provide further information, with illustrative material if necessary, explaining its concerns in respect of the design of the Princes Quay Bridge and the way it relates to the pedestrian/cycle route on the north side of the A63.</li> </ul>



<b>ExQ2 Question to:</b>		<b>Question:</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please provide an update of progress towards agreeing a solution to the above concerns.</li> <li>• If a revised design is necessary, how should that be addressed in the NSIP documentation?</li> </ul>
<p>This issue relates to the location of the steps on the northern side of the A63 and towards the western end of the bridge and ramp access. The Applicant has been extremely supportive of this request and the Applicant's designers are continuing to progress this design which is due to be completed imminently. Hull City Council are currently in the process of acquiring the land required for this design change.</p> <p>The required change to the DCO submission would be to amend the NMU plans and preliminary design to note the revised orientation of the stepped access to the ramp.</p>		
2.8.7.	The Applicant, HCC, HAIG, East Yorkshire and Derwent Area Ramblers	<p><b>NMU Connectivity</b>          Are any changes to the dDCO and other application documents needed to address HCC's desire for greater detail about pedestrian and cyclist routing and access during the construction period, as set out in section 1.3 of its Post-issue specific hearings submission [REP3-215]? If so, please specify the changes required.</p>
<p>The concerns raised by Hull City Council will be addressed through the Traffic and Transport Management Plan which will set out the proposed NMU routes during construction. This plan is secured by requirement 4 of the draft DCO and as per that requirement, Hull City Council will be consulted on the proposals in the plan.</p>		
2.8.8.	Applicant, EPIC (No 2) Ltd, HCC	<p><b>Traffic management during construction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further to the unsigned Statement of Common Ground with EPIC, has any further progress been made in respect of proposals for traffic modelling and specific mitigation measures relating to Daltry roundabout</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ2 Question to:</b>		<b>Question:</b>
		and the routes for customers using the Kingston Retail Park during the construction phase? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent will this matter have been addressed by the close of the Examination, and how should it be reflected in the DCO and associated documents?</li> </ul>
<p>Traffic modelling of the Daltry Street roundabout is currently being undertaken collaboratively between Hull City Council, Highways England and Jacobs to determine what the impact on the diversion route would be for customers of the retail park and identify any adverse impacts. A study is also being undertaken to assess potential improvements to routes that may become congested during the main works phase. The aim of this study and any subsequent measures provided is to make the local network more resilient. The study includes the route from Daltry Street via English Street to the retail park. Additional traffic modelling may be required once the results of the study have been evaluated. Highways England have also agreed to use reasonable endeavours to carry out mitigation measures, where practicable, to ameliorate the negative effects of the construction phase which are shown by the modelling/studies, including implementing local area improvements from the Daltry Street roundabout, via English Street to the Kingston Retail Park.</p> <p>Highways England have agreed Heads of Terms with EPIC (No.2) Limited, which have also been mirrored in an updated SoCG. We anticipate that both the Agreement and SoCG can be finalised and signed off before the end of the Examination.</p>		
<b>2.9.</b>	<b>Utility Infrastructure</b>	
2.9.1.	N/A	No written questions on this topic at this stage.
<b>2.10.</b>	<b>Water Environment</b>	
2.10.1.	The Applicant, HCC	<b>Early warning flood signage</b> Should the project include early warning flood signage as described by HCC in section 2.3 of its Post-Issue specific Hearings submission [REP3-215]? If so, how should this be addressed in the DCO and/or related documents?

**ExQ2 Question to:**

**Question:**

The request by Hull CC to assess this sign location has been discussed with the Environment Agency, Highways England's Regional Control Centre officers and Traffic Officer service. Based on those discussions all parties agreed that a sign so far outside the red line boundary would not be commensurate with the flood risk and proposals already in place to deal with such events including signage and technology near the underpass.

Based on these discussions, The Applicant has no intention of including such a sign in the Scheme.