

The Examining Authority's (ExA's) first written questions and requests

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) initial written questions and requests in relation to the proposed A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme. Responses are required by noon on **Monday 15 June 2015**.

Each question has a unique number in Column 1. The numbering sequence follows the schedule of Principal Issues discussed at the Preliminary Meeting and attached to the ExA's letter of 17 April (Annex C). Column 2 identifies the organisation(s) or interested party(s) from which answers are sought. Column 3 sets out the question, sometimes with a contextual introduction.

Please use the number reference system in responding. Responses to all questions marked with a * should be based on the traffic modelling update report where this supersedes the transport assessment.

Named bodies please answer questions directed at them, providing either a substantive response or explaining why the question is not relevant to them. The expectation is that each organisation will provide an answer to each question asked of it, but joint answers are acceptable if appropriate and the relevant issue is addressed. If the answer to a question is set out in, for example, a statement of common ground (SOCG) then a cross reference to where the issue is addressed is acceptable.

The list of organisations to which an individual question is addressed is not exclusive. Any interested party may answer any question asked.

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
1	Air Quality and Emissions	
Q1.1.1	Applicant Local authorities	Has agreement over the establishment of the baseline for the air quality assessment been reached with CCC, HDC and SCDC? If so, please give the relevant reference. If not, why not?
Q1.1.2	Applicant Local authorities	The assessment of air quality is based on DMRB, Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance and Interim Advice Notes (IAN). Since the submission of the application IAN185/15 has been published. What are the implications for the application of IAN 185/15 and if it had been in place before the application was accepted for examination, in what ways would this have influenced the outputs from the air quality assessment?
Q1.1.3	Applicant Local authorities	The methodology for the assessment of air quality effects is set out in the ES at 8.2.21ff. Para. 8.2.68 states that the overall approach and methodology to assess air quality effects was agreed with the local authorities. What was agreed and with which local authorities? Please provide details.
Q1.1.4	Applicant	ES para. 8.6.4 indicates that mitigation would be secured by way of requirements in the DCO. Precise cross referencing to the draft DCO is not provided. Can the applicant provide in tabular form how the proposed mitigation will be secured in the application draft DCO with the relevant reference.
Q1.1.5	Applicant Local authorities Parish Councils	Please explain when, how and where air quality would be monitored or why no monitoring is proposed with particular reference to NO _x , NO ₂ , CO, PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} .
Q1.1.6	Applicant	Please explain what mitigation is proposed to limit the effect on designated ecological sites which are sensitive to nitrogen oxide, within 200m of the proposed scheme? If no mitigation is proposed, why not?
Q1.1.7	Applicant	What sensitivity testing has been undertaken, if any, to consider the effects on air quality should traffic growth be greater than forecast? If no such testing has been undertaken, why not?
Q1.1.8	Applicant Local authorities Parish Councils	Please explain how the assessment of air quality has taken into account the proximity of the proposed road scheme to sensitive receptors including housing and schools and the mitigation measures proposed during the operational phase in such locations? Where and how would these measures be secured?
Q1.1.9	Applicant	Appendix 18.1 of the ES is an assessment of human health impacts of the proposed road. Has this assessment taken into account the Gauderman Report (2007) on the effect of exposure to traffic on

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		lung development in young people and if so what did the assessment conclude? If not, why not?
Q1.1.10	Applicant Local authorities Parish Councils	Table 8.12 of the ES concludes that during the operational phase the overall scheme would have no significant impacts on air quality. Can the applicant explain further how it has reached its conclusion of no significant air quality impacts??
Q1.1.11	Applicant Local authorities Parish Councils	Table 8.9 of the ES states that the modelled results indicate that the scheme would benefit air quality within the Brampton AQMA. Can the applicant explain how it reached this conclusion in further detail?
Q1.1.12	Applicant	Paragraph 8.2.24 states that with regard to air quality the opening year of the scheme (2020) is predicted to be the worst case scenario as vehicle emission factors and background pollutant concentrations are anticipated to decrease over time due to improvements in fuel technologies. If anticipated improvements in fuel technologies do not emerge, how would the forecast increases in traffic between 2020 and 2035 affect this conclusion?
Q1.1.13	Applicant	Para 8.6.5 of the ES indicates that there is no air quality mitigation in the operational phase as no significant impacts have been identified. The scheme is also predicted to improve air quality in some areas including AQMAs. Please provide details of where the improvements in air quality concentrations would be greatest and conversely where the situation would worsen?
Q1.1.14	Applicant Local authorities Parish Councils	Have the results of the air quality assessment been agreed with Interested Parties and if so, by whom and if not, why not?
Q1.1.15	Applicant Local authorities	What effect, if any, does the Supreme Court judgment on the Air Quality Directive (R (on the application of ClientEarth) (Appellant) v Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Respondent) Judgment Given on 29 April 2015) have on the proposed scheme? In responding, please make reference to the National Networks NPS.
Q1.1.16	Applicant Local authorities	With the existing NO ₂ annual mean objective in Cambridge already being exceeded (ES8.8.3) how would the proposed scheme improve this position?
Q1.1.17	Applicant Local authorities	Dust from construction is identified as a significant effect which could be mitigated through best practice measures implemented via the Code of Construction Practice. If best practice measures are not followed by contractors or prove to be ineffective, what further action can be taken by local authorities to control these effects?

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
2	Biodiversity and Ecological Conservation	
Q1.2.1	Applicant Natural England	The common toad is a BAP protected species. ES para 11.2.35 states that dedicated surveys were not carried out for common toad, on the basis that the species is known to be present within the region in significant numbers. How does this approach accord with the biodiversity duty on all public bodies to show a general regard for biodiversity conservation in all their actions and Highways England's own Biodiversity Action Plan?
Q1.2.2	Applicant Environment Agency Natural England	The Environment Agency has noted (RR page 28) that populations of white-clawed crayfish have been found in Cambridgeshire since the species was scoped out of further survey work in 2013 (ES para 11.2.34). Has the applicant considered (in consultation with the Environment Agency) the possible renewed need for a survey and if not, why not?
Q1.2.3	Applicant Environment Agency Natural England	The Environment Agency has advised (RR page 28) that the construction phase should seek to avoid the fish spawning season and that appropriate fish rescue measures should be put in place. Has agreement been reached between the applicant and the EA about the protective measures for freshwater fish and eels and if so, how would these measures be secured and enforced?
Q1.2.4	Applicant Natural England Environment Agency	Natural England (RR para 3.2.5.2) refer to further surveys being undertaken in relation to badger and water vole. a) Can the applicant confirm whether this work has been completed and if so, what are the findings and how do these findings inform the proposed scheme? b) Can the Environment Agency and Natural England confirm whether they have been consulted on the findings of these updated surveys? If so, please provide a copy of the comments. c) What progress has been made in providing a water vole receptor site (EA RR Issue 5.3) and how would this be secured?
Q1.2.5	Applicant Natural England	Natural England's Relevant Representation (RR para 3.2.4.12) refers to further surveys of areas of high potential for (and known) bat roosts. Can the applicant confirm the following: a) Whether this survey work has now been undertaken; b) If so, what are the findings and how do these findings inform the proposed scheme? c) If the surveys have not yet taken place, why not and when is it anticipated that they will be undertaken?
Q1.2.6	Applicant	The Environment Agency requests (RR page 25) that pre-construction ecological surveys be undertaken

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
	Environment Agency Natural England	as a basis for detailed design and construction decisions. Can the applicant confirm that these surveys would be undertaken and if so, when? How this would be secured?
Q1.2.7	Applicant Natural England Environment Agency	The ES indicates at para 11.5.38 that no direct land take would occur at Brampton Meadows SSSI but that the scheme would leave the SSSI surrounded by roads. An ecological mitigation area is proposed to enhance the resilience and value of the existing SSSI habitat. Please provide precise details of this proposal including its long term management and how would this be secured.
Q.1.2.8	Applicant	ES Figure 11.13 refers to the long term management of the restored borrow pits, but it is not clear how this would be secured. Can the applicant provide comment on this matter, including how the proposed approach accords with para 5.23 of the National Networks NPS, which seeks a commitment to the enhancement of biodiversity?
Q1.2.9	Applicant Natural England	Natural England has indicated that otter, breeding birds and barn owl mitigation is adequate subject to the agreement of details. What is the process for agreeing these details and how would this be secured?
Q1.2.10	Applicant Natural England Environment Agency	Natural England has indicated that there are a number of unresolved issues relating to the impact of the proposed development on European Protected Species (EPS) including Great Crested Newts (GCN) and bats. In relation to GCN, the impacts of the scheme on the newt populations and mitigation and monitoring details would need to be provided in a draft licence submission. In relation to bats, further detail of the culvert/tunnel design and lighting strategy, set out in mitigation and monitoring plan is sought by NE. What progress has been made towards resolving the issues raised by NE in their RR and how would these measures be secured?
Q.1.2.11	Applicant Natural England Environment Agency	Ecological mitigation plans show culverts for wildlife that would need to be maintained to aid connectivity between the habitats and meta-populations of badgers, water voles, otters, eels, fish, GCN and bats. What progress has been made in relation to the detailed design of these culverts? How would the maintenance of these culverts be secured?
Q1.2.12	Applicant Natural England Environment Agency	Has the revised design of the Great Ouse Viaduct included an assessment of the potential impacts on Buckden Gravel Pits County Wildlife Site? If not, why not?
Q1.2.13	Applicant Natural England	Can the applicant set out the progress that has been made in submitting the draft licence documentation required for EPSs (including detailed maintenance and monitoring plans)?

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
Q1.2.14	Applicant Natural England	Can the applicant please provide a visual aid which sets out the relationship between the various plans and how these would be secured in the DCO. This to include amongst others: the CoCP, CEMP, Action Plans, Mitigation and Management Plans. Please also set out their relationship to the work plans and management contracts for non-statutory sites and Priority and UK BAP Habitats.
Q1.2.15	Applicant Natural England Environment Agency Wildlife Trusts Forestry Commission	Monitoring prior to and during construction is described within section 12.3 of the CoCP. Can the applicant confirm: a) How would the post-construction monitoring of ecological and arboricultural conditions be undertaken and secured? b) Who would be responsible for this?
Q1.2.16	Applicant Natural England Environment Agency	The Construction Method Statement refers to the need for bio-security measures to be in place to ensure that invasive and non-native species are not allowed or caused to spread. What measures are proposed and how would these be secured and monitored?
Q1.2.17	Applicant	The Assessment of Implications on European Sites (AIES) – No Significant Effects Report (NSER) concludes that the proposed scheme is unlikely to have significant effects on the conservation objectives of the Ouse Washes SAC/SPA/Ramsar site. Please provide in tabular form separate assessments for each of these three designations applicable to the Ouse Washes site, which list the qualifying features and consider these features individually.
Q1.2.18	Applicant	The applicant has indicated that the potential for in-combination effects is limited, on the basis that all other major projects would have to demonstrate that they would not have an adverse effect on European sites to secure consent. How would the predicted impacts of this project be appropriately controlled given the uncertainty which exists around other projects?
Q1.2.19	Natural England	Can Natural England confirm that there would be no significant effect on the integrity of the Ouse Washes SAC/SPA/Ramsar site, having confirmed in RR para 3.2.1 that there would be no significant effect on the integrity of Portholme SAC and Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC?
Q1.2.20	Applicant Natural England	How would the mitigation measures proposed for non-statutory sites and priority and UK BAP Habitats be detailed in mitigation and monitoring plans and how would these be secured?
3	Carbon Emissions	
Q1.3.1	Applicant	In the context of section 5 of the NN NPS, how does the proposed scheme limit the carbon footprint of

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		the proposal in terms of design and construction and any associated mitigation measures?
4 Compulsory Acquisition		
Q1.4.1	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons (S of R) sets out at Appendix A details of the purpose for which compulsory acquisition and temporary possession powers are sought. Please indicate (and provide a schedule of such plots) if there are any plots in respect of which both compulsory acquisition and temporary possession powers are sought. This can occur, for instance, where an applicant can make a case for compulsory acquisition of a plot or plots, but subsequently finds that he can achieve what needs to be done on the land by the use of temporary powers only and does not need to actually acquire the land in question.
Q1.4.2	Applicant	Paragraphs 3.8 and 3.9 of the S of R refer respectively to Articles 27 and 29 of the Development Consent Order which enable acquisition of subsoil or airspace only, and rights under or over streets respectively. Please indicate by means of a schedule, which plots are affected by the two articles (if any). Alternatively, if this information is collated in any of the application documents, please give the relevant references.
Q1.4.3	Applicant	Paragraph 6.13 of the S of R states that the pre-designation NN NPS has not yet been formally designated by the Secretary of State but that formal designation is expected to occur early in 2015. The NN NPS was designated in December 2014. Please update the S of R providing the relevant information relating to the designation.
Q1.4.4	Applicant	With regard to paragraph 8.6 of the S of R relating to s127 procedures we look forward to receiving an update in due course.
Q1.4.5	Applicant	At paragraph 11.17 Of the S of R we note that the applicant is engaged with the relevant local authority regarding the assessment of need and that the intention is that the matter is dealt with in Statements of Common Ground. Please confirm that the issue is being been addressed through the Statements of Common Ground for submission at Deadline 2, 15 June.
Q1.4.6	Applicant	Turning to paragraph 12.5 of the S of R can the applicant confirm that the necessary written consent of the Highways Agency or its successor body will be forwarded to the Examining Authority before the date of the Compulsory Acquisition hearings

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
Q1.4.7	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 12.6 of the S of R refers to a plot which is bona vacantia land. The Examining Authority has received letters from the Treasury Solicitor which we understand are also copied to the applicant, dealing with all the bona vacantia land within the scheme and which by way of escheat is now vested in the Crown Estate. We understand these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Banwell- Land Plan 18 plot 13; Land Plan 20 plot 10 · Appletree Homecare Ltd-The Willow Bar Hill. Land Plan 22 plots 8a,8b,14 and 20 · Anjou 32 Ltd-Land between junction 29 and 30 Huntingdon Road Land Plan 22 plot 31 and Land Plan 23 plots 2a,2b and 7) <p>In addition, we understand that Riverside Restaurants Ltd Land Plan 22 plots 4a and 4b remains with the liquidator.</p> <p>Can you please confirm that the above information is correct and provide a comprehensive statement regarding all these plots, and where they are now owned by the Crown Estate, the current position with regard to obtaining written consent of the Crown Estate for the relevant plots to be compulsorily acquired?</p>
Q1.4.8	Applicant	<p>Articles 31 and 32 of the draft DCO seek to authorise the temporary use of land for carrying out and maintaining the authorised development. Please set out by section and / or subsection the relevant clause or clauses of the Planning Act 2008 which give statutory authority for the grant of these powers. (Please do not simply respond by referring to the relevant DCO Model Provisions clause or other DCOs where the power may have been granted.)</p>
Q1.4.9	Applicant	<p>Article 21 of the draft DCO incorporates, with modifications, Parts 2 and 3 of Schedule 2 to the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 (in effect the incorporation of the Mining Code). The effect of the incorporation of the Mining Code is to exclude minerals from the powers of compulsory acquisition under the draft DCO. That being so what is the legal authority for the proposed use of sand clay/gravel-minerals within existing Borrow pits and what provisions are included within the draft DCO to deal with</p>

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		compensation obligations which will arise.
5 Design and Engineering Standards		
Q1.5.1	MRH (GB) Limited	How would the revised junction layout and access arrangement have a significant impact on the operational aspects of the existing service station facilities?
Q1.5.2	MRH (GB) Limited	How would the revised access arrangements for the service station be unsatisfactory on highway safety grounds and likely to create confusion and safety hazards both for traffic visiting the service station and those on the A14?
Q1.5.3	South Cambridgeshire District Council	What are the missing movements at the Girton interchange, between the A428 and the A14 and M11? (Relevant Representation 471)
Q1.5.4	Applicant	Why can't The Avenue, north east of Madingley, be closed to traffic at its junction with the new local access road to reduce the risk of Madingley being used as a route between the A14 southbound and the A428 westbound? If this junction is not to be closed, what would prevent eastbound A428 traffic from using Madingley to access the A14 westbound?
Q1.5.5	Applicant	Briefly, what is the structural condition of the viaduct carrying the A14 over the East Coast Mainline Railway and the B1514 Brampton Road, including reference to any previous structural remedial work?
Q1.5.6	Applicant	Has the structural condition of the viaduct carrying the A14 over the East Coast Mainline Railway and the B1514 Brampton Road influenced the decision to remove the viaduct? If so, how, in terms of future costs including the cost of removing the viaduct and providing the link roads, has the condition influenced the decision?
Q1.5.7	Applicant	What signage would be provided for Lolworth Service Station from the A14 in the scheme? How would this compare with existing signage from the A14?
Q1.5.8	Applicant	To what extent have the non-motorised user provisions suggested by the Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum in its relevant representation (130) been incorporated in the scheme and how has the extent of those incorporated been determined?
Q1.5.9	Applicant	How would the future provision of connections to cater for the missing movements at Girton interchange, between the A428 and the A14 and M11, be accommodated within the scheme?
Q1.5.10	Applicant	Why were connections to cater for the missing movements at Girton interchange, between the A428

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		and the A14 and M11, not accommodated within the scheme? In particular, why was a link between the A428 eastbound and the A14 westbound not accommodated? Would such a link reduce future traffic through Dry Drayton? If so, by how much, or if not, why not? In particular, why was a link in both directions between the A428 to the west and the M11 to the south westbound not accommodated? Would such a link reduce future traffic on the A1303? If so, by how much, or if not, why not?
Q1.5.11	Applicant	How does the local regeneration and economic development basis for the removal of the Huntingdon viaduct compare with the future remedial work and maintenance basis reported elsewhere? (Document 6.1.04 Para 4.3.19)
Q1.5.12	Applicant	Did the Autumn 2013 public consultation include Options 7A and 7B? (Document 6.1.04 Para 4.5.1)
Q1.5.13	Applicant	Did the ground investigation and additional soil and groundwater quality testing, to inform the detailed design, take place in late 2014? If so, did the results identify any previously unknown issues? (Document 6.1.17 Para 17.5.27)
Q1.5.14	Applicant	Has the limiting of the depth of the borrow pit working in certain locations to avoid significant adverse effects on the River Terrace Deposits aquifer been accommodated within the proposed borrow pit areas? If so, how? If not, why not? (Document 6.1.17 Para 17.5.31)
Q1.5.15	Applicant	Does the suggested ending of the scheme at Histon accord with the works plans? If not, why not. (Document 6.3 Appendix 7.01 Para 1.5.3)
Q1.5.16	Applicant	The Applicants letter (12 May 2015) suggests that amended layouts at some junctions would be required as a result of the Traffic Modelling Update Report. Will revised highway layout drawings be submitted to the examination? If so, when? If not, why not?
Q1.5.17	Applicant	Are any agricultural underpasses or over bridges proposed? If so, where, why and to what standard?
6	Development Consent Order	
Q1.6.1	Applicant	<u>Art 2</u> - definitions : 'authorised development' - What is the ' <i>other development</i> ' authorised by this order and where is it identified in the draft DCO? 'commence' – is it the case that the exclusion of certain works from constituting a commencement has consequences for the effectiveness of certain requirements (see below relating to requirement 1)?

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		'compulsory acquisition notice' – is this necessary. There does not appear to be another reference to it in the DCO 'cycle tracks' – these are limited to cycle tracks which include a right of way on foot. Is this correct? 'Secretary of state' – the regulation of aspects of the proposal are by the same person as the consenting authority. Are there any changes to the structure, function or status of the applicant which would change this set-up?
Q1.6.2	Applicant IDBs EA	<u>Art 3</u> – Given the disapplication of powers particularly those in relation to watercourses, flood defence, land drainage and waterways what agreements, if any, has been reached as to the inclusion of these provisions with the relevant authorities as per s150 of the 2008 Act?
Q1.6.3	Applicant	<u>Art 8(2)</u> – Should the statutory undertakers having the express benefit of the DCO be identified?
Q1.6.4	Applicant	<u>Art 9</u> – Should this article be amended to gain consent from the secretary of state? Is it appropriate to transfer “all or any” of the benefit of the powers given the need for a co-ordinated approach to the project?
Q1.6.5	Applicant Cambridgeshire County Council	<u>Art 11(1) (2) and (4)</u> - 'unless otherwise' agreed' is considered informal without the qualifying words 'in writing' should these words therefore be included and with regard to transfer of powers to the relevant highway authority have discussions already been had with the relevant authorities?
Q1.6.6	Applicant Cambridgeshire County Council	<u>Art 14</u> – Have discussions been had with the relevant street authority on deemed consent for applications after 28 days, given that this would be outside the normal statutory process?
Q1.6.7	Applicant	<u>Art 16</u> – Are there any differences between the proposed restrictions and those that would apply under RTRA 1984. If so, how do they compare?
Q1.6.8	Applicant	<u>Art 17(7) (b)</u> – Is 'watercourse' an excluded term because already defined in article 2. If so, why is there a difference?
Q1.6.9	Applicant	<u>Part 5</u> – should this Part additionally be headed 'Imposition of Restrictive Covenants'?
Q1.6.10	Applicant	<u>Article 23(1) (2) and (3)</u> refer to restrictive covenants. Which specific areas of land do they refer to and what kinds of restrictive covenants are anticipated?
Q1.6.11	Applicant	<u>Art 25</u> What is the justification for the list of private rights. Should it additionally include 'restrictive covenants'?
Q1.6.12	Applicant	<u>Art 30</u> – In relation to the taking of temporary possession of land, does this article anticipate temporary possession of land which is additionally being permanently acquired? Alternatively do the provisions of

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		temporary and permanent possession relate to separate areas of land? Is it intended that there will be protection for vehicular access and other rights over private property during periods where temporary possession may be needed?
Q1.6.13	Applicant	<u>30(3)</u> – What will be the measure for the ‘completion’ of works in order for owners to know when they can re- occupy land which is temporarily possessed.
Q1.6.14	Applicant	<u>30(9)</u> – Why is there a general power for the undertaker to occupy land without having to acquire it first?
Q1.6.15	Applicant	<u>Art 34</u> –There may be an anomaly between paragraphs (1) and (2) since the term ‘public utility undertaker’ as defined in the 1980 Act does not in any event include an undertaker for public sewers. Additionally that term is limited to suppliers of gas or hydraulic power and no other utility undertakers. Should this article be altered in the light of this point?
Q1.6.16	Applicant	<u>Art 36</u> – Is it known that there are trees (other than TPO trees) and hedgerows (including ‘important’ hedgerows) which may need to be removed to facilitate development. If so, can they be identified by reference to a plan and schedule?
Q1.6.17	Applicant Local authorities	<u>Art 43</u> – Who are the persons referred to as ‘the parties’ that are anticipated in this article to be able to refer any matters (of disagreement) to arbitration. Is it considered they are to include ‘relevant planning authorities’, ‘relevant highway authorities’ and ‘relevant traffic authorities’? If not, why?
Q1.6.18	Applicant Local authorities	<u>Art 44</u> – A bespoke appeal process is anticipated which is outside the normal statutory process and public general legislation. Has discussion been had with the relevant authorities about the appeal process? If so, what was the outcome?
Q1.6.19	Applicant	<u>General (1)</u> : In each requirement (below) where a relevant party is consulted on a submission for approval should the requirement further recite that the views of the consultee would be reflected in the submission which is subsequently made for approval?
Q1.6.20	Applicant	<u>General (2)</u> : An earlier version of the draft DCO contained a reference to implementation of construction in accordance with a construction environmental plan (CEMP). Has this requirement been deleted? If so, why?
Q1.6.21	Applicant	<u>Req 1</u> – What is the justification for the exclusions from the definition of ‘commence’? How is it considered that will this impact on the need to provide mitigation measures from the outset, for example those in the code of construction practice (Req 3), protected species (Req 4) and archaeology (Req7)?

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
Q1.6.22	Applicant	<u>Reg 2</u> – How is it considered that changes to the ‘scheme design’ as shown on the works plans, engineering drawings and sections are such that they are changes which can be ‘agreed in writing’ subsequent to the authorised development being approved?
Q1.6.23	Applicant	<u>Reg 3</u> – What information is available for local residents in relation to the measures to be put in place for good construction practice? In the event that there was a breach of the requirement to comply with the code of construction in the carrying out of works, who would be the enforcing authority? Would the nature and scale of the development be such as to necessitate community liaison measures, for those living in the vicinity of construction works?
Q1.6.24	Applicant	<u>Reg 4</u> – 4(1) Should both ‘ <i>European protected species</i> ’ and ‘ <i>protected species</i> ’ be defined in the DCO? Should the words ‘ <i>reflecting that contained in ..</i> ’ be replaced with the words ‘ <i>in accordance with the steps contained in...</i> ’ for more precision?
Q1.6.25	Applicant Natural England	At <u>4(3)</u> for consistency should the words ‘ <i>in writing</i> ’ be inserted after ‘ <i>unless otherwise agreed..</i> ’ If not, how is it considered that there will be any record of such approvals having been granted? Where protected species are found during the course of the construction process should construction cease until the relevant licences have been obtained?
Q1.6.26	Applicant Environment Agency	<u>Reg 5</u> – 5(3) should the issue of remediation be determined by the Environment Agency rather than the ‘undertaker’? If not, why not?
Q1.6.27	Applicant Local authorities	<u>Reg 6</u> – 6(1) How is it considered the timing of the submission of the landscaping scheme be regulated and should the scheme be submitted before development commences? If not, why not/
Q1.6.28	Applicant	At <u>6(3)</u> Does the reference to ‘ <i>a reasonable standard</i> ’ and ‘ <i>appropriate BS..</i> ’ accord with the need for precision and enforceability in the drafting of conditions as set out in the NPPF paragraph 206?
Q1.6.29	Applicant Cambridgeshire County Council	<u>Reg 8</u> – How would the timing of the submission of the traffic management plan (for each part) be regulated and at what stage? Should ‘ <i>relevant planning authority</i> ’ in 8(1) instead read ‘ <i>relevant highway authority</i> ’?
Q1.6.30	Applicant	<u>Reg 9</u> – How would the timing of the submission of the surface water drainage be regulated?
Q1.6.31	Applicant	<u>Reg 10</u> – How would the timing of the restoration and aftercare of the borrow pits be regulated?
Q1.6.32	Applicant	<u>Reg 11</u> – See the question for requirement 2 (above) as to the nature of the approved details which may be ‘amended’ by subsequent approval in writing
Q1.6.33	Applicant	<u>Reg 12</u> – Given the timescales in this requirement and also requirement 13 (request for further information) is it considered that the Secretary of State has sufficient capacity and expertise to perform

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		the planning function set out in the requirements. Is the effect of 12(3) (c) that the absence of an (updated) environmental report (because it is not written into the requirement to provide such a report) might allow an applicant to gain approval by default even where such a report was required under the EIA Regs?
Q1.6.34	Applicant	<u>Req 13</u> – Should there be reference to submission of an environmental report (in conjunction with requirement 12) in order to overcome the potential defect that might arise from the lack of an updated environmental report?
Q1.6.35	Applicant	<u>Schedule 7</u> – At the end of the temporary possession period how would the DCO provide for any stored material to be removed and how would this be achieved?
Q1.6.36	Applicant	<u>Explanatory Note</u> – There would seem to be a few inconsistencies for example between <i>This Order</i> or <i>The Order</i> , <i>Secretary of State</i> or <i>undertaker</i> ; duplication in paragraph 3. Can the applicant comment?
Q1.6.37	Applicant	Under what mechanism would the A14 be de-trunked to county road status outside the DCO boundary?
7	Economic and Social Effects	
Q1.7.1	Applicant Natural England	The proposed development would result in the permanent loss of 987.7ha of agricultural land and the temporary loss of 219.9ha of agricultural land (ES Table 16.9). Natural England has advised that a detailed field survey should be carried out to identify the grades of affected land where this data does not already exist to confirm the loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification system). Can the applicant provide details of the breakdown of land take in grades 3a and 3b?
Q1.7.2	Applicant Natural England	NPPF para. 112 states that local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the BMV agricultural land while para 5.68 of NPS states that applicants should identify any effects and seek to minimise impacts on soil quality, taking into account any mitigation measures proposed. Can the applicant demonstrate how proposals have sought to minimise the use of BMV land and what mitigation measures have been proposed.
Q1.7.3	Applicant Natural England	Natural England has requested that a detailed Soil Resources Plan informed by a Soil Resources Survey would be needed to demonstrate how soil resources would be protected during development and how temporarily affected land would be restored to agriculture. What progress has been made to address this?

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
Q1.7.4	Applicant Interested Parties	ES Table 16.12 provides a summary of effects on community facilities and private property after mitigation. The applicant is requested to provide details of the effects without mitigation.
Q1.7.5	Applicant	ES Table 16.17 states that 30 farm units would be significantly adversely affected by the scheme with the overall effect likely to be moderately adverse, with details provided in Table 16.11. The applicant is requested to provide details of mitigation proposed for each farm unit and demonstrate how these would be secured.
Q1.7.6	Local authorities	In Table 16.17 of the ES it states that the regional economy would benefit from the creation of 800 – 1600 additional jobs to the local region during construction of the proposed scheme. Please set out the extent to which this assessment is agreed by your local authority, identifying areas where you disagree with the analysis and providing reasons.
Q1.7.7	Local authorities	In the Case for the Scheme it is stated that the proposed scheme is forecast to deliver significant economic benefits associated with reduced travel times together with greater journey time reliability and wider impacts associated with economic activity and business growth. Please comment on the construction and post construction effect of the proposal on the local economy in Cambridgeshire and linkages with neighbouring counties / regions.
Q1.7.8	Local authorities Parish Councils	Table 16.14 of the ES summarises the effect of the proposed scheme on community severance. To what extent have local authorities and Parish Councils been involved in such an assessment and are they in agreement with the applicant over the effects of the proposal? If not, why not?
Q1.7.9	Applicant	A number of Interested Parties have suggested that the A14 Huntingdon Viaduct should be retained. Please set out in more detail why it is proposed to remove the Huntingdon viaduct.
8	Environmental Impact Assessment	
Q1.8.1	Applicant Local Authorities	Discussions have taken place with CCC, HDC and SCDC about the developments to be included in the cumulative impact assessment. Was agreement reached on what is a reasonably foreseeable development and what are the developments that have been taken into account in the cumulative assessment? If agreement has not been reached, what are those areas of disagreement?
Q1.8.2	Applicant	How have the implications of the limits of deviation been taken into account in assessing the impact on heritage assets?
Q1.8.3	Applicant	The ES indicates that the urbanisation of the landscape character through the interaction of noise,

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
	Local authorities Parish Councils	lighting and visual intrusion from new infrastructure would be a major cumulative effect. Para 18.72 indicates that mitigation to reduce the cumulative effect on landscape character could not be identified and the mitigation for each effect would not fully mitigate the overall impacts. Has the mitigation of cumulative impacts been discussed with local authorities and Parish councils and if so what was the outcome. If this has not been discussed, why not?
Q1.8.4	Applicant Environment Agency	The EA is concerned to ensure that new pathways of contamination or new contaminants linkages to controlled waters should not be introduced as a result of the proposed scheme. Please explain how risks will be assessed and provide an explanation as to why sites have not been taken forward for detailed assessment following initial assessments.
Q1.8.5	Applicant Environment Agency	The EA has requested a role in assessing any remediation activity associated with land affected by contamination. Can the applicant comment?
Q1.8.6	Applicant English Heritage Cambridgeshire County Council	According to Chapter 9 of the ES, construction of the scheme would result in a number of adverse impacts on known archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes. What agreement, if any has been reached between the applicant, English Heritage and Cambridgeshire County Council regarding mitigation during construction and how is it proposed to secure this through the draft DCO with particular reference to Requirements 3 and 7? If agreement has not been reached, what are the outstanding matters?
9 Landscape and Visual Effects		
Q1.9.1	Applicant	Details of proposed mitigation through aquatic or terrestrial planting has not been cross referenced to the application draft DCO. Can details be provided in tabular form to demonstrate what mitigation is proposed and how it would be secured?
Q1.9.2	Applicant Environment Agency Local authorities	The vertical and horizontal limits of deviation provide a degree of flexibility for construction but also have the potential for differences in landscape and visual impacts. IPs have raised their concerns about this potential for differing impacts. How is the applicant addressing this issue?
Q1.9.3	Applicant HDC	In crossing the North Flowing Ouse Valley Floodplain (ES para 10.5.18) the proposed scheme would have a large adverse effect in year 1, while in year 15 there would still be a moderate adverse effect. How has this effect been balanced against other environmental effects and is there potential for further mitigation?

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
Q1.9.4	Applicant HDC CCC	The eastern part of Mill Common which is a landscape of high sensitivity (ES para 10.5.32) would be subject to major adverse impacts in both year 1 and year 15. Please explain the justification for the proposed new link road given such landscape sensitivity. How could the urbanising effect of the new link road be limited?
Q1.9.5	Local authorities	The methodology for the assessment of landscape and visual effects is set out in the ES para 10.2 while para 10.2.9 states that the methodology for the LVIA was not questioned by local planning authority officers. Can the local authorities confirm they are in agreement with the LVIA methodology including the locations of viewpoints and photomontages?
Q1.9.6	Applicant	Paragraphs 4.28-4.35 of the National Networks NPS establish the criteria for good design. Can the applicant demonstrate how good design has been incorporated into the proposals with particular reference to aesthetics, and the design of structures including the River Great Ouse viaduct and viaduct over the East Midlands Railway line?
Q1.9.7	Applicant Hilton Parish Council	Concerns have been raised by IPs about the visual impact of the proposed road as it passes Hilton and in particular the height of the structure over the proposed A14 to Potton Road. Can the applicant provide a photomontage of the view from Hilton before and after construction of the proposed scheme?
Q1.9.8	Applicant	ES section 3.5 and paras 10.5.110-113 set out the approach to lighting and its effect during construction and operation. Interested parties have suggested that light pollution and the resultant urbanisation of the countryside is a major concern for them. Please explain the strategy for lighting the proposed scheme during construction and operation and how the effects would be mitigated with particular reference to sensitive receptors.
Q1.9.9	Applicant	Concerns have been raised by IPs about the visual effect of bridges, the elevation of the proposed road and the introduction of new highway infrastructure. Can the applicant please provide an explanation of the design approach to features which potentially would have significant visual impacts.
Q1.9.10	Applicant	How has the design of the proposed scheme between Brampton Hut and Brampton Junction sought to address the landscape and visual effects in a comprehensive manner?
Q1.9.11	Applicant	Have views from Offord Hill been taken into account in terms of landscape assessment and design of the scheme? If so, how? If not, why not?
Q1.9.12	Applicant	What is the purpose of the 1m and 2m high mitigation bunds to the south of the new A14 to the north of Hilton? Why is there a change in bund height at Mere Way Bridge?
Q1.9.13	Applicant	Figure 10.5 and 10.6 contain photos and photomontages at various points along the route of the

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		proposed scheme. Appendix 10.7 sets out the methodology for the production of photomontages. Please provide a key plan which sets out the location of all viewpoints from which photos have been taken. This to show the direction of view and whether a photomontage has been prepared.
Q1.9.14	Applicant	What consultation was undertaken with stakeholders about the locations of viewpoints and was agreement reached? If agreement was not reached please provide details of the differences between parties.
Q1.9.15	Applicant	Para 4.33 NN NPS provides criteria for 'good design' for national network infrastructure. Please set out the approach taken for scheme design in response to this criteria. Has an independent design review of the scheme been undertaken and if not, why not?
10 Noise and Vibration		
Q1.10.1	Applicant Local authorities	Does the assessment of noise effects in ES chapter 14 consider all appropriate residential receptors along the route, taking account of individual dwellings and communities?
Q1.10.2	Applicant Local authorities	Was the baseline data for the noise assessment agreed with local authorities? Please identify any matters where agreement was not reached and explain why.
Q1.10.3	Applicant Local authorities	Significant impacts from noise and vibration during construction are predicted to impact on both residential and non-residential receptors. How would site specific noise controls be agreed with the local authorities before construction starts and how would the necessary mitigation measures be secured?
Q1.10.4	Applicant Local authorities	IAN185/15 has been published since the submission of the DCO application. Could different outputs have occurred had the assessments been made on the basis of the new advice?
Q1.10.5	Applicant Local authorities	The magnitude and duration of significant vibration effects is proposed to be included in the final Local Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) following engagement with owners and operators. Without this assessment, how have the likely significant effects from vibration been assessed?
Q1.10.6	Applicant Local authorities	Paragraph 14.2.91 of the ES notes that given the infrequent, irregular and short duration of maintenance work, this phase of the proposed development is unlikely to give rise to significant noise or vibration effects. What is the basis of this conclusion? How would any short term significant effects be mitigated?
Q1.10.7	Applicant Local authorities	Paragraph 13.2.1 in Appendix 20.2 of the ES states that a noise and vibration management plan would be prepared as part of the main contractor's Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		Can the applicant provide a draft of the CEMP, its relationship to the LEMP and confirm how these documents would be secured.
Q1.10.8	Applicant Local authorities	Noise mitigation during the operational phase of the scheme is proposed through various means, as described in Table 14.21 of the ES. How would the installation of noise barriers be secured through the draft DCO?
Q1.10.9	Applicant Local authorities	Paragraph 18.1.4 of the ES indicates that the traffic model which underpins the noise assessment has been agreed with the local planning authorities. Can the local authorities confirm that this is correct?
Q1.10.10	Applicant Local authorities	Paragraph 14.1.31 of the ES describes the consultation with local authorities regarding the approach to noise and vibration assessment, including the need to measure night time noise and suggested baseline noise measurement locations. Are these suggestions being taken on board?
Q1.10.11	Applicant Local authorities Interested parties	What mitigation is proposed to address the construction and operational noise effects of the proposed scheme on the University of Cambridge, Sub Department of Animal Behaviour at Madingley? What agreement, if any has been reached?
Q1.10.12	Applicant	ES section 14.15 makes reference to noise mitigation measures such as noise barriers and bunds. Please explain the design approach for both of these measures, with particular reference to their height.
Q1.10.13	Applicant	The construction and operational effects of noise on commercial and residential properties in the vicinity of the Cambridge Northern Bypass has been assessed as significantly adverse without mitigation. Have the proposed mitigation measures and their effectiveness been discussed with IPs and if so, what was the outcome? If no discussions have taken place, why not?
Q1.10.14	Applicant	In terms of noise, what effect would the construction of and future traffic on the A14 trunk road westbound link embankment have on residential properties in and around Madingley?
Q1.10.15	Applicant	What noise mitigation measures are proposed and where at the re-configured Girton interchange? Would these include acoustic fencing? If not, why not?
11	Planning Policy Context	
Q1.11.1	Applicant	How have the impacts of climate change been taken into account in the location, design, build and future operation of the proposed scheme? Where in the ES are the projected impacts of climate change discussed and taken account of? (Para 4.40 NN NPS)

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
Q1.11.2	Applicant	Please identify the adaptation measures in place in response to the potential impacts of climate change. How can the ExA be assured that there are no critical features of the design of the proposed scheme which may be seriously affected by more radical changes to the climate beyond current predictions? (Para 4.37 NN NPS)
Q1.11.3	Applicant Cambridgeshire County Council	What are the arrangements for undertaking road safety audits and how are these secured in the draft DCO? (Para 4.62 NN NPS)
12 Transportation and Traffic		
Q1.12.1	Applicant	How does the Traffic Modelling Update Report reflect the 2015 Road Traffic Forecast Scenarios 1 to 5 that predict traffic growth from 2010 to 2040 to lie between 29 to 60% on the Strategic Road Network, 12 to 51% on other principal roads and 10 to 54% on minor roads?
Q1.12.2	Offord Cluny & Offord Darcy Parish Council	How is it thought that the scheme would increase traffic through Offord Cluny, Offord Darcy and on the B104 to the south of the existing A14?
Q1.12.3	Hilton Parish Council	How is it thought that the scheme would increase traffic through Hilton in relation to the proposed access to or from the proposed A14?
Q1.12.4	Applicant	*Are traffic flows expected to increase in future years through Madingley? If so, by how much, and what element would be envisaged to be through traffic between the A428/A1303 and the new Dry Drayton to Girton Local Access Road? If not, why not?
Q1.12.5	Applicant	Are any traffic restrictions or calming measures proposed through Madingley? If not, why not? If so, what is proposed and how would it be implemented?
Q1.12.6	Applicant	How would the routes to be taken by construction traffic be regulated, in particular in relation to Madingley, Dry Drayton, Coton, Brampton and Boxworth? If no regulations for construction traffic are proposed, why not?
Q1.12.7	Applicant	*What proportion of journeys from Godmanchester and Hemingford Grey to the A1 northbound are anticipated to use a route through Huntingdon and how has this been calculated?
Q1.12.8	Applicant	Are any measures proposed to restrict traffic using the proposed Views Common Link, Brampton Road and its connection with the de-trunked A14 to the south of Huntingdon as a local through route? If so,

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		what? If not, why not?
Q1.12.9	Applicant	*Would the scheme have any effect on future traffic flows through Oakington and Westwick? If so, why and by how much? If not, why not?
Q1.12.10	Applicant	*From the traffic modelling work undertaken, in diagrammatic form and in terms of traffic flows, what are the levels of journeys, now and in future years, between the A14 eastbound at Ellington and Junction 15 of the A1(M) southbound to the A14 eastbound at Milton and Junction 12 of the M11 southbound and similarly in the west and northbound direction? In other words, this is the general routing of A14 scheme traffic in terms of the wider A14, A1(M) and M11.
Q1.12.11	Applicant	What road movement routes would be required from a borrow pit north of Boxworth to construction areas? Has the traffic impact of the use of such routes been considered? If so, what was the outcome, if not, why not? (Document 6.1.0 Para 3.8.1)
Q1.12.12	Applicant	How would the use of Brampton Road bridge by lightweight traffic only be regulated? (Document 6.1.03 Para 3.2.14)
Q1.12.13	Applicant	Would any arrangements for diversion alternatives to the proposed A14 route, in emergencies and for maintenance, differ from those already in place for the existing A14? If so, how, or if not, why not? (Document 6.1.07)
Q1.12.14	Applicant	*Have the traffic flows in Fig 7.1 been subject to any sensitivity analysis? If so, what was the outcome? If not, why not? (Document 6.1.07 Para 7.4.1)
Q1.12.15	Applicant	*If, on opening in 2020, the scheme results in an increase of 22,900 vehicles (61,900 – 39,000) in the annual average daily traffic flow between the existing A1/A14 junction at Brampton Hut (Junction 21 Brampton Hut interchange) and Alconbury and an increase of 33,700 vehicles (72,400 – 38,700) between the existing A1/A14 junction at Brampton Hut and the proposed new interchange with the A14 at Brampton, how can the modelling show a flow of 68,400 vehicles on the new A14 Huntingdon Southern Bypass? (Document 6.1.07 Para 7.4.3)
Q1.12.16	Brampton A14 Campaign Group	To what level of detail has the proposal for an alternative route, reached? Please provide evidence of appropriate detail.
Q1.12.17	Applicant	If the A14 Junction 31 to 32 eastbound and westbound improvements, Histon pinch point scheme are anticipated to be completed early in 2015, are they included in the DCO within Work No 33? If so why? If not, how would Work No 33 achieve compatibility with the completed improvements and what is the detailed scope of the application between the Girton and Milton A14 junctions?

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
Q1.12.18	Applicant Local Authorities	Some IPs have asked what effect the guided busway between Cambridge and Huntingdon would have on reducing demand for travel by car between these locations. What are the current and forecast patronage forecasts for the busway and what effect has this had on current and future forecasts of demand for travel between Huntingdon and Cambridge?
Q1.12.19	Applicant	Please provide in tabular format and by reference to relevant plans, the proposed measures which seek to address the needs of non-motorised users including equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians as part of the proposed scheme. Please identify clearly which measures are aimed at reducing community severance, correcting historic problems; enabling cyclists to use junctions easily and safely and improving accessibility for disabled people.
Q1.12.20	Applicant	Should the second '(east)' read '(west)'? If not, why not? (Document 7.2 Para 1.3.7 Bullet Point 2)
Q1.12.21	Applicant	Please clarify the sentence 'As this merge is located...'. (Document 7.2 Para 1.3.7 Bullet Point 5)
Q1.12.22	Applicant	Should 'Bar Hill junction bridge' read '...bridges..' to reflect the two roundabout bridges? If not, where is the Bar Hill junction bridge? (Document 7.2 Para 1.4.10)
Q1.12.23	Applicant	On what basis did the Cambridge Sub-Regional Model (CSRM), following the 2011 re-validation, fail to meet the WebTAG validation criteria? (Document 7.2 Para 3.5.5)
Q1.12.24	Applicant	On what basis did the Cambridge to Huntingdon A14 Road Model (version 1) (CHARM(1)) fail to meet the WebTAG validation criteria? (Document 7.2 Para 3.5.6)
Q1.12.25	Applicant	Did the Cambridge to Huntingdon A14 Road Model (version 2) (CHARM(2)) model meet the WebTAG validation criteria? What were the primary differences in traffic flows between the outputs from the CSRM following the 2011 re-validation, the CHARM(1) and the CHARM(2)? (Document 7.2 Para 3.5.10)
Q1.12.26	Applicant	What are the quality and consistency issues referred to? (Document 7.2 Para 3.5.11)
Q1.12.27	Applicant	From where do the significant accident benefits on all other roads derive? (Document 7.2 Para 4.4.5)
Q1.12.28	Applicant	What is the Pathfinder Link? (Document 7.2 Para 5.7.3)
Q1.12.29	Applicant	Please clarify the sentence 'Under the scheme proposals...'. (Document 7.2 Para 5.7.3)
Q1.12.30	Applicant	How does the forecast level of demand on the widened A1 between Brampton Hut Junction and Alconbury relate to the design capacity of the road? (Document 7.2 Para 7.4.8)
Q1.12.31	Applicant	*Why would the 40% and 49% increases in the volume of daily traffic on the A14 between Swavesey

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		and Bar Hill and Bar Hill and Girton with the scheme in 2035 be greater than the 16% and 21% increases without the scheme? (Document 7.2 Para 7.4.19)
Q1.12.32	Applicant	*Why are the with scheme daily traffic volumes on the A14 between Histon and Milton greater with the scheme than without? (Document 7.2 Para 7.4.23)
Q1.12.33	Applicant	*Whilst the relationship between the A14 and local roads is said to be complex and therefore much harder to predict with certainty on individual routes, what briefly are the reasons thought to be for the indicated % changes in the context of revised trip routes for each of the road sections identified as a result of the scheme? (Document 7.2 Table 7.6)
Q1.12.34	Applicant	*What is the difference in the % change in the 2-way AADT forecasts between those in the Transport Assessment and those in the Traffic Modelling Update Report? What briefly are the reasons thought to be for the differences in the context of revised trip routes for each of the road sections identified as a result of the scheme? (Document 7.2 Table 7.6)
Q1.12.35	Applicant	*Briefly, how would the reduction in traffic flows on key radial routes into Huntingdon occur in the context of revised traffic flows and trip routes as a result of the scheme? How does this identified reduction compare with the limited change identified in Paragraph 7.5.10? (Document 7.2 Para 7.5.9)
Q1.12.36	Applicant	*In terms of changes to trip routes, between the with and without the scheme in 2035 scenarios, how would daily traffic flows through The Avenue in Madingley be increased as a result of the scheme? Why are the increased traffic flows said to be well within the capacity of a road of this standard, in the context of its carriageway and junctions along its length? (Document 7.2 Para 7.5.17)
Q1.12.37	Applicant	Where is the Town Bridge? (Document 7.2 Para 7.5.29)
Q1.12.38	Applicant	*In Tables 7.13, 7.14, 7.15, 7.19, 7.22, 7.25, 7.33, 7.35, 7.39, 7.41, 7.42, 7.44, 7.45, 7.46, 7.47, 7.48, 7.52 and 7.70, various ratios of flow to capacity (RFCs) reduce between 2020 and 2035 against a background of overall increases in traffic flows during this period. Why is this the case in each of the tables? (Document 7.2 Table 7.13)
Q1.12.39	Applicant	*If the 2035 AM peak hour flow entering the roundabout from the local access road is greater than that forecast, how could the performance of this junction arm be improved, in view of the forecast RFC of 79%? (Document 7.2 Table 7.18)
Q1.12.40	Applicant	*Are the column headings for this table correct? If not, what should they be? Should this correction be repeated on any other tables? (Document 7.2 Table 7.19)
Q1.12.41	Applicant	*If the 2035 peak hour flow entering the roundabout from the A14 off-slip is greater than that forecast,

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		how could the performance of this junction arm be improved, in view of the forecast RFC of 73%? (Document 7.2 Table 7.19)
Q1.12.42	Applicant	*If the 2035 PM peak hour flow entering the roundabout from the B1050 (south) is greater than that forecast, how could the performance of this junction arm be improved, in view of the forecast RFC of 78%? (Document 7.2 Table 7.23)
Q1.12.43	Applicant	*If the 2035 PM peak hour flow entering the roundabout from Saxon Way is greater than that forecast, how could the performance of this junction arm be improved, in view of the forecast RFC of 77%? (Document 7.2 Table 7.25)
Q1.12.44	Applicant	*If the 2035 AM and PM peak hour flows entering the junction are greater than those forecast, how could the performance of this junction be improved, in view of the forecast RFCs? (Document 7.2 Table 7.26)
Q1.12.45	Applicant	*If the 2035 AM and PM peak hour flows entering the junction are greater than those forecast, how could the performance of this junction be improved, in view of the forecast RFCs? (Document 7.2 Table 7.27)
Q1.12.46	Applicant	*If the 2035 PM peak hour flows from the A14 off-slip and the local access road (east) are greater than those forecast, how could the performance of this junction be improved, in view of the forecast RFCs? (Document 7.2 Table 7.31)
Q1.12.47	Applicant	*In the general absence of conflicting manoeuvres at the roundabout, what is the reason for the queues in the model operational assessment? (Document 7.2 Table 7.36)
Q1.12.48	Applicant	*If the 2035 AM and PM peak hour flows entering the junction from Hinchingsbrooke Road (west), Views Common Link Road and the underpass are greater than those forecast, how could the performance of this junction be improved, in view of the forecast RFCs? (Document 7.2 Table 7.38)
Q1.12.49	Applicant	*If the 2035 PM peak hour flow entering the junction from the underpass is greater than that forecast, how could the performance of this junction arm be improved, in view of the forecast RFC of 77%? (Document 7.2 Table 7.39)
Q1.12.50	Applicant	*From observations made on 11 May 2015, the PM queue on Hinchingsbrooke Road approaching the junction was far greater than any in the 2020 'Do-Minimum Scenario'. How can such observations be related to the model operational assessment? (Document 7.2 Table 7.43)
Q1.12.51	Applicant	*Why does this table, and Table 7.44, identify two Hinchingsbrooke Road junction arms and not Brampton Road (west)? (Document 7.2 Table 7.43)

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
Q1.12.52	Applicant	*From observations made on 13 May 2015, the AM queue on Brampton Road (west) approaching the junction was far greater than any in the 2020 'Do-Something Scenario', notwithstanding the forecast queues on Brampton Road (west) at its junction with Edison Bell Way. How can such observations be related to the model operational assessment? (Document 7.2 Table 7.45)
Q1.12.53	Applicant	*How do the current traffic signal arrangements at the Brampton Road/Edison Bell Way junction compare to the non-motorised user (NMU) and traffic optimised 'Do-Something' scenarios for NMUs? (Document 7.2 Table 7.48)
Q1.12.54	Applicant	*If the 2035 AM and PM peak hour flows entering the junction are greater than those forecast, how could the performance of this junction be improved, in view of the forecast RFCs? (Document 7.2 Table 7.48)
Q1.12.55	Applicant	*If the 2035 AM and PM peak hour flows entering the junction from Ermine Street are greater than those forecast, how could the performance of this junction arm be improved, in view of the forecast RFCs? (Document 7.2 Table 7.50)
Q1.12.56	Applicant	*How do the current traffic signal arrangements at the Ermine Street/ Edison Bell Way junction compare to the non-motorised user (NMU) and traffic optimised 'Do-Something' scenarios for NMUs? (Document 7.2 Table 7.51)
Q1.12.57	Applicant	Is the heading for this table, and Table 7.55, correct? If not, what should it be? (Document 7.2 Table 7.54)
Q1.12.58	Applicant	*If the 2035 PM peak hour flow entering the junction from Middle Watch (south) is greater than that forecast, how could the performance of this junction arm be improved, in view of the forecast RFC of 72%? How could the powers to undertake any such improvement be sought? (Document 7.2 Table 7.60)
Q1.12.59	Applicant	*If the 2035 AM and PM peak hour flows entering the junction from Scotland Road and Park Street are greater than those forecast, how could the performance of this junction arm be improved, in view of the forecast RFCs? How could the powers to undertake any such improvement be sought? (Document 7.2 Table 7.64)
Q1.12.60	Applicant	*To which particular junction and arms do this table and its rows refer? (Document 7.2 Table 7.66)
Q1.12.61	Applicant	*In view of the forecast impact of the scheme on this junction, why are no improvements proposed? (Document 7.2 Table 7.66)

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
Q1.12.62	Applicant	*What is the minor blocking impact and to what extent would it occur? (Document 7.2 Table 7.66)
Q1.12.63	Applicant	Is the location of Mill Common Link compatible with the general arrangement drawings? If not, what should it be? (Document 7.2 Appendix E)
13	Water Issues	
Q1.13.1	Applicant Environment Agency	Does Hilton have any history of flooding? If so, has this been taken into account in the design of the scheme and how? If not, why not?
Q1.13.2	Applicant Environment Agency	Has the historic flooding in Girton, particularly from Washpit and Beck Brooks, been taken into account in the design of the scheme through the suggested floodplain compensation in the Environmental Statement and how? If not, why not?
Q1.13.3	Applicant Environment Agency	Although there are 'few properties within the scheme's zone of influence' on Washpit and Beck Brooks, why are these watercourses given a low importance of attributes in terms of flood risk based on the guidance given in HD45/09.
Q1.13.4	Applicant Environment Agency	Whilst it is said that there would not be any significantly increased risk to property from flooding at the River Great Ouse upstream of the scheme, would there be any increased risk to property from flooding. If so, to what extent? (Document 6.1.0 Para 4.11.2)
Q1.13.5	Applicant Environment Agency	What is the limited property in the vicinity of the Brampton Brook upstream of the scheme that has led to the low classification of the importance of flood risk? How does the identification of this limited property relate to the finding of the hydraulic modelling that the large water level rise upstream of the scheme, including the effect of floodplain compensation, would not affect property? (Document 6.1.17 Para17.6.5)
Q1.13.6	Applicant Environment Agency	What is the further consultation that is being undertaken with the Environment Agency on Ellington Brook, Brampton Brook and the River Great Ouse? Would this be likely to result in any design or DCO changes? (Document 6.1.19 Table 19.1 Page 19)
Q1.13.7	Applicant	Please explain how the 0.5m vertical deviation in the route has been included in the road drainage and water environment assessment.
Q1.13.8	Applicant	Was the methodology utilised in the assessment of road drainage and the water environment agreed by stakeholders? If not, why not?

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
Q1.13.9	Applicant Environment Agency	The EA state that a 30% allowance for climate change should be used for a scheme with a 100 year life span. A climate change allowance of 20% has been used for rainfall intensity and peak river flow in the ES. Please comment?
Q1.13.10	Applicant Environment Agency	What, in the context of the Flood Risk Assessment, is the strategy for the identification, use of and catchment areas for individual drainage balancing ponds?
Q1.13.11	Applicant Environment Agency	What are the further mitigation measures identified where the proposed mitigation might not fully compensate for the increase in peak water levels at Ellington Brook, Brampton Brook and on the river Great Ouse? (Document 6.3 Appendix 17.01 Executive Summary)
Q1.13.12	Applicant Environment Agency	How is the element of the level for level floodplain compensation storage, within FpC18 for example, physically provided within Flood Zone 3? (Document 6.3 Appendix 17.01 Para 4.3.1)
Q1.13.13	Applicant Environment Agency	How would highway attenuation ponds discharge during a flood event that inundated Flood Zone 3? (Document 6.3 Appendix 17.01 Para 5.3.1)
Q1.13.14	Applicant Environment Agency	The EA has identified the potential for the construction of the proposed scheme to impact on the ability of the operators of the Milton landfill site to meet the requirements in respect of their Environmental Permit. Please explain what measures are proposed to prevent an increased risk of pollution to the water environment both during the construction and operational phases of the scheme and how these can be secured through the DCO.
14 Other Matters		
Q1.14.1	Applicant	Given the number of relevant representations received, please provide in tabular format a summary of the main matters arising and how these matters are being addressed. This should be in addition to a more detailed comment on the specific points raised.
Q1.14.2	Applicant	Please provide in tabular format, all proposed mitigation measures, identifying where this mitigation is secured within the DCO.
Q1.14.3	Applicant	Please provide in tabular format, an assessment of the significance of predicted impacts of the proposed scheme, both pre and post mitigation, covering all topic chapters of the ES.
Q1.14.4	Applicant	Please describe the approach taken to the use of borrow pits in relation to the proposed scheme. What, in the context of the cut and fill balance for the scheme, is the strategy for the identification and use of

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		individual borrow pits? Please provide a plan to a relevant scale indicating the location of all borrow pits proposed for use and whether existing or newly created.
Q1.14.5	Applicant	Please provide an update in respect of other consents being applied for.
Q1.14.6	Applicant	Please provide a GANTT chart setting out the approach to the construction of the proposed project.
Q1.14.7	Applicant	Please provide a visual aid to illustrate where air quality, noise and vibration will alter as a result of the proposed scheme in relationship to the location of existing settlements. What are the mitigation measures proposed in those locations where these effects are worsening.