

A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme – TR010015

Examining Authority's Second Written Questions – 29 July 2015

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
1	Air Quality and Emissions	
Q2.1.1	Applicant Local Authorities	How would mitigation to manage air quality impacts during construction be secured through the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (APP-752) section 6 and Requirement 3 (now 4). (Ref Q1.1.4 and Q1.1.17 REP2-002)
Q2.1.2	Applicant	How would mitigation within the design of the scheme to ensure the impacts from operation are not significant, be secured? (Ref Q1.1.4 REP2-002)
Q2.1.3	Applicant	CoCP 6.10 (APP7.52) provides details of the monitoring that would be implemented by main contractors if monitoring is deemed to be 'appropriate'. A decision would be taken at detailed design stage and in consultation with interested parties (Ref Q1.1.5 REP2-002.) Can the applicant provide a detailed explanation of how consultation with interested parties would take place and with which interested parties?
Q2.1.4	Applicant Local Authorities	SCDC are seeking an appropriate baseline for post construction monitoring of PM ₁₀ and NO ₂ to be agreed and secured by Requirement. Can the applicant comment? (Ref Q1.1.5 REP2-002)
Q1.2.5	Applicant Local Authorities	The applicant has indicated that post completion air quality monitoring is not necessary (Comments on response to SCDC re Q1.1.1 REP2-002 (REP4-018). What is the reasoning for this? Local Authorities may wish to comment?
Q2.1.6	Applicant Local Authorities	What are the sanctions if best practice measures to control dust during construction prove ineffective and impacts become unacceptable? Local authorities may wish to comment. (Ref Q1.1.17 REP2-002)
Q2.1.7	Applicant Local Authorities	How would agreement be reached with the local authorities regarding their request for post implementation air quality monitoring in locations where air quality is predicted to decline?
Q2.1.8	Applicant	The applicant's response to Q1.1.7 (REP2-002) suggests that even if higher traffic growth rates or higher than expected emission rates are applied to the assessment the overall conclusions remain the same. Please provide further explanation setting out why this conclusion has been reached.
Q2.1.9	Applicant	What progress has been made in discussions between the applicant and SCDC about the PM ₁₀ data from the

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
	SCDC	Impington monitoring station. (Ref Q1.1.1 REP2-002).
Q2.1.10	Applicant	How would the mitigation of air quality emissions during construction be secured through the DCO?
Q2.1.11	Applicant Local Authorities	SCDC has raised concerns about air quality monitoring during construction. Would an air quality monitoring strategy address this concern?
Q2.1.12	Applicant	The applicant's response to Q1.1.13 (Fig 1-2) (REP2002) indicates that properties in Hemingford Grey would suffer a worsening of air quality post the implementation of the scheme. What are the detailed reasons for this to be the case and are there other locations where air quality is predicted to worsen?
Q1.2.13	Applicant	What mitigation has been proposed given the predicted increase in NO _x concentrations at Great Stukeley Railway Site SSSI?
Q1.2.14	Applicant Cambridge City Council	Cambridge City Council has suggested that the applicant undertakes a review of the scheme proposals based on the approach set out in IAN185/15 further to its high level analysis set out in response to Q1.1.2 (REP2-002). The applicant has indicated that significantly different results would be unlikely and therefore does not propose to undertake a further review. Does either party wish to comment further?
2 Biodiversity and Ecological Conservation		
Q2.2.1	Applicant	CoCP 12.1.5 (APP-752) requires main contractors to consult NE/EA amongst others about implementation, management and monitoring of mitigation. What is the process by which main contractors would address consultation responses? (Ref Q1.2.3 REP2-003)
Q2.2.2	Applicant	Protective provisions within the DCO would provide EA with a general plan approval role. Can the applicant provide draft heads of terms if the draft protective provisions are not available at Deadline 7? (Ref Q1.2.3 REP2-003)
Q2.2.3	Applicant Natural England	What is the status of discussions between HE and NE regarding an additional Requirement for securing the detailed design of ecological mitigation, such as the badger and water vole receptor sites to be included in the DCO? (Ref Q1.2.4 REP2-003)
Q2.2.4	Applicant Natural England	An ecological mitigation area adjacent to the Brampton Meadows SSSI is proposed to be secured through a new Requirement, for which NE approval would be sought. An update to the CoCP sets out a responsibility for the contractor to prepare a Handover Environmental Management Plan to secure management responsibilities for the habitat into the operational lifetime of the scheme. What engagement with NE beyond the design stage is required and what progress has been made in discussions? (Ref Q1.2.7 REP2-003).

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
Q2.2.5	Applicant	With reference to the proposed ecological mitigation area adjacent to the Brampton Meadows SSSI, the applicant states in their response to Q1.2.7 that this area would be '...acquired permanently by Highways England and managed in perpetuity either through the Highways England Estate or through sale to, or management agreement with, another suitable body'. How would this be secured, particularly if the area is sold on?
Q2.2.6	Applicant Natural England	The need for an agreement (in the form of a draft method statement) between NE and HE regarding the protection of breeding birds has been identified in HE's answer to Q1.2.9 (REP2-003) and in the SoCG. What progress has been made towards preparing, agreeing and securing this draft method statement?
Q2.2.7	Applicant Natural England	The detailed specification for the provision of bird nesting boxes and towers is proposed to be subject to consultation with NE, the Wildlife Trust and the Barn Owl Trust (Ref Q1.2.9 REP2-003) and approval should be sought from these bodies. How would this be secured in the DCO? What discussions have taken place with NE, the Wildlife Trust and the Barn Owl Trust?
Q2.2.8	Applicant Natural England	How would pre-construction surveys for barn owl, bats, water vole, otters, GCN, badger, breeding birds and WCC be secured through the DCO? (Ref Q1.2.6 and Q1.2.9 REP2-003)?
Q2.2.9	Applicant	CoCP 12.1.5 (APP-752) indicates that the main contractors will consult with the LAs, NE, EA and the local wildlife trusts regarding the preparation of the ecological aspects of the relevant LEMPs and approval should be sought from these bodies. How would this be secured in the DCO?
Q2.2.10	Applicant Natural England	<p>HE confirm in their SoCG with NE that they are proposing a new DCO requirement to secure 'the detailed design of ecological mitigation'.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What progress has been made towards drafting a suitably worded DCO Requirement, in consultation with NE? Can the applicant confirm that this Requirement will specifically secure (among other matters) the detailed design of the badger, water vole and GCN receptor sites, lighting, the Brampton Meadow SSSI mitigation area and the wildlife tunnels / culverts? Would the Requirement include a mechanism for the relevant planning authority to approve the design details, in consultation with NE? When would detailed design information be available? (SoCG NE/HE)?
Q2.2.11	Applicant	HE has indicated that it will continue to consult with NE throughout the pre-construction, construction and

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
	Natural England	post-construction period to ensure that all EPS issues are fully resolved (Q1.2.10 REP2-003). Approval from NE would be sought on these issues. How would this be secured in the DCO?
Q2.2.12	Applicant	Fig 2.2 (REP2-003) shows Species and Habitat Management Plans as separate from LEMPs and CEMPs. What is the relationship between these different plans?
Q2.2.13	Applicant	Bio-security measures to prevent the spread of invasive and non-invasive species are proposed to be included within the CEMP (ES App 11.12 para 6.6.6 APP-700). Why is this not included in the CoCP, LEMP or addressed as a separate DCO Requirement?
Q2.2.14	Applicant Natural England HDC	How would the detailed design of the restoration and enhancement of the Buckden Gravel Pits CWS be developed in consultation with the owner and NE and how would this be secured in the DCO?
Q2.2.15	Applicant	Please provide a detailed lighting plan which demonstrates that lighting would be used only where essential and demonstrating how light spill onto bat commuting and foraging areas would be minimised.
Q2.2.16	Applicant Natural England	Please provide an update regarding progress towards issuing Letters of No Impediment (LONI) with regard to bats, great crested newts, badgers and water voles. What assurance can be given to the ExA that these matters will be in place before the close of the examination.
Q2.2.17	Natural England	Please confirm whether information requested with regard to outstanding issues relating to great crested newts and water voles has been received and if so whether there are still outstanding issues.
Q2.2.18	Applicant Local Authorities	The local authorities are concerned about a lack of assessment work undertaken on the County Wildlife Sites particularly the Buckden Gravel Pits CWS and the Fenstanton CWS. Please provide a detailed response setting out how this matter is to be addressed.
Q2.2.20	Cambridgeshire County Council	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) suggested a new DCO Requirement (WR14.4.1) to ensure the protection of species of County or District importance. The applicant has responded by indicating that the issue is adequately covered within the CoCP by way of the CEMP and LEMP. Would CCC like to comment on the applicant's response, as set out in paragraphs 4.7.16-4.7.20 of the applicant's comments on CCC's Written Representation (REP4-011)?
Q2.2.21	Applicant	The applicant's response to Q1.2.18 does not consider the possibility that several insignificant effects occurring together could become significant. Could the applicant comment?
Q2.2.22	Applicant NE	Please confirm the outcome of discussions with Dr. James Patrick Doody, Ecologist – Brampton Biodiversity Project re Brampton Meadows SSSI.
Q2.2.23	Applicant	Advice Note AN10 provides a template for matrices to accompany the applicant's AIES. Please provide three

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		<p>separate matrices for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ouse Washes SAC, • The Ouse Washes SPA and • The Ouse Washes Ramsar site. <p>The applicant should refer to the advice and templates in the PINS Advice Note 10 when preparing these matrices. Each matrix should list all the qualifying features for each designated site and consider these features individually (i.e. follow the approach taken in Table 2.7).</p> <p>When producing these matrices, the applicant should be mindful of the request made by the ExA in their Rule 6 letter (PD-003), regarding accurate identification of evidence. The matrices need to be provided in both PDF and Word format.</p>
Q2.2.24	Applicant Natural England	<p>The applicant has provided two documents relating to the Ouse Washes SPA which are based on two different data sets for the qualifying features (the AIES is based on the qualifying features included on the Natura 2000 standard data form and Table 2.7 is based on the 2001 UK SPA review qualifying features). Please confirm, in consultation with NE, the correct qualifying features for the Ouse Washes SPA and provide a screening matrix for this European site. The applicant should refer to the advice and templates in the PINS Advice Note 10 when preparing this matrix; and ensure that the matrix includes a row for each qualifying feature, together with appropriate footnotes to specify where the evidence supporting the conclusions of the screening assessment on these features can be found.</p> <p>Five species identified on the Natura 2000 data form were not included in the AIES. Please explain this discrepancy and confirm in consultation with NE whether these species should be considered as qualifying features of the Ouse Washes SPA.</p>
Q2.2.25	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 5.1.6 of the AIES indicates that the applicant is relying on best practice design and construction practices to mitigate any likely significant effects on European sites. Please provide a breakdown of the relevant best practice measures which have been relied upon to reach the conclusion of no likely significant effects and demonstrate how such measures will be secured through the DCO and incorporated into the CoCP.</p>
Q2.2.26	Applicant	<p>Requirement 5 of the DCO would provide for pre-construction survey work to be undertaken to establish whether European or nationally protected species are present. Cambridgeshire County Council has requested</p>

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		a new Requirement in respect of locally important species. Further to the comments provided in response to this request at the DCO Hearing that the applicant is giving further consideration to this matter please provide an update.
3 Carbon Emissions		
4 Compulsory Acquisition		
Q2.4.1	Applicant	At Annex A is a document headed "A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme: list of all objections to the granting of compulsory acquisition powers". The document records the ExA's understanding of the objections which have been received to the applicant's request for the grant of compulsory acquisition and temporary use powers. The applicant is asked to please check the contents of Annex A and confirm whether or not they agree with its contents and, if not, to identify by way of track changes any amendments, additions or deletions with explanations where necessary.
Q2.4.2	Applicant	Land plans 28 (plot 28/7) and 29 (plots 29/4,29/7) show Land to be acquired for landscaping. The scale of the Land Plans make it difficult to ascertain the extent of the land taken. Both Napp Pharmaceuticals and Bard Pharmaceuticals are concerned that the proposed land take interferes with fibre optic cables laid in the ground, appears unacceptably close to the corner of one of their buildings and could remove up to 90 car parking spaces adjacent to their building Unit 196. The ExA accompanied site visit could not clarify the matter. Could the applicant look at the detailed design proposals for this area if necessary in collaboration with the parties concerned and advise the ExA whether the fears of the parties are warranted and the land take will have the effects outlined above or otherwise.
Q2.4.3	Applicant Cambridge City Council	On our accompanied site visit to Cambridge crematorium on the 17th July 2015 the ExA noted that the proposed new entrance to the crematorium close to the north west corner is located between the Muslim burial area and an area of woodland or garden used for the scattering of ashes and the planting of trees. It appeared to the ExA that the proposal would substantially interfere with the area where ashes are scattered and trees are planted.

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		Are there any legal impediments or requirements to be complied with relating to the removal of such an area and if there are, how does the applicant propose to deal with them. Further, what consultation and discussion has taken place with the Crematorium authority, Cambridge City Council, on this matter and how the intended use of this land will be managed sensitively having regard to its current use.
Q2.4.4	Applicant	We refer to the relevant representation made by the National Farmers Union dated 12th June 2015 on behalf of its members affected by the A14 proposals (RR-455). Please provide a detailed response to the points raised in the submission.
Q2.4.5	Applicant	Whilst undertaking an accompanied site visit on 16th July 2015 the attention of the ExA was drawn to the proposed land take at the rear of 8 Station Cottages, Brampton Road, Huntingdon, which is to be used in connection with the construction of a new access to the station car park. There are two rows of conifers at the rear of the property and it was not apparent from the plans whether the row of conifers nearest to the property (which form a natural screen) were included in the proposed land take or not.Can the applicant please clarify.
Q2.4.6	Applicant	We refer to the relevant representation from Mr Robert Lenton of Corpus Christi Farm, Godmanchester (RR-466). Mr Lenton has concerns regarding the proposed provision for temporary and permanent access rights being acquired over plots 9/6,9/11 and 9/14 and the configuration of the route. His concerns are set out in the representation (RR-466) sent by his agent Mr Michael Alexander dated 10th March 2015, which had attached to it a plan showing an alternative access over A – B (land which is in Mr Lenton's tenancy) and also an alternative railway bridge which is of greater width than that proposed to be used. Will the applicant consider Mr Lenton's concerns as expressed in the representation and discuss with him to see if a more acceptable alternative can be agreed which will accommodate both parties.
Q2.4.7	Applicant	At Offord Hill cottage there is doubt owing to the scale of the Land Plans as to whether the hedge boundary adjacent to the highway is included in the proposed land take .It would clearly be of benefit to the cottage if it were not. Will the applicant clarify whether or not the boundary hedge is excluded from the proposed land take.
5	Design and Engineering Standards	
Q2.5.1	Applicant	What is the forecast cost of removing the Huntingdon viaduct and providing the link roads? ((REP2-006

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		para29)
Q2.5.2	Applicant	In Table 1.6, why does traffic appear to transfer from Oakington Road to The Avenue, when it did not appear to do so in 2020? ((REP2-006 para56)
Q2.5.3	Applicant	How would the retention of the viaduct prevent connection with the link roads within Huntingdon if appropriate junctions were provided with the de-trunked A14? Could some of the new link roads be provided with the viaduct retained? (REP2-006 para62)
Q2.5.4	Applicant	How would the retention of the viaduct not resolve congestion at Brampton Hut, Spittals Interchange or Bar Hill and exacerbate congestion on the Cambridge Northern Bypass? Why is it thought that, even with a higher standard bypass, traffic would continue to use the de-trunked road through the at-grade A14 Spittals Interchange? (REP2-006 para62)
Q2.5.5	Applicant	Why would the viaduct require widening, if retained as part of the scheme, within 10 years due to anticipated increases in traffic volumes? (REP2-006 para63)
Q2.5.6	Applicant	Please provide a detailed explanation of the development of the borrow pit elements of the scheme in terms of: the volumes and types of material that it is envisaged would be available from each of the pits when excavated to their proposed depths, and additionally if further excavation was undertaken to the maximum depths permitted under the draft DCO limits of deviation; how these volumes relate to the fill requirements of the scheme at specific locations after any excavated and demolition material has been re-used; and how the specific locations have been chosen in relation to the required locations and any other factors.
Q2.5.7	Applicant	Can the applicant confirm whether all contractors, as appropriate, would be contractually obliged to make use of the minerals from the borrow pits (CCC Written Representation para 11.5.3 (REP2-159)).
Q2.5.8	Applicant	In detailed terms, how is it envisaged that the existing A14 Huntingdon viaduct would be demolished?
Q2.5.9	Applicant	Taking into account any remedial work planned to take place before the DCO scheme opening, what is the projected design life of the existing A14 Huntingdon viaduct with and without the DCO scheme?
Q2.5.10	Applicant	Please explain the final 2 sentences on page 23 of Document REP5-029 in terms of 'foreseeable future' and 'no longer than 10 years'.
Q2.5.11	Applicant	Please confirm that the tracked change version of the Code of Construction Practice submitted at Deadline 4 (REP4-026) contains all changes made since submission of the application draft COCP. Are there any further updates to the CoCP since Deadline 4?
Q2.5.12	Applicant	Fig 1 of the CoCP shows 'Examination Phase / Detailed Design Stage' See also CoCP 1.3.3 ' Local Environmental Management Plans will be developed following publication of the ES.' Can the applicant provide

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		a detailed draft of the LEMPs (in line with the Annex 1 Template).
Q2.5.13	Applicant	Please explain what is meant by the phrase 'particular requirements of this CoCP could be discharged with like requirements in the DCO'? (CoCP para 1.3.4 (APP-752)).
Q2.5.14	Applicant	How would LEMPs be organised? Are they for individual construction sites and if so how would these be determined? Would they be contiguous with the entire Order area?
Q2.5.15	Applicant	How does the LEMP feed into the CEMP and what will the LEMP commit the contractor to do? How would it be enforced?
Q2.5.16	Applicant	How would contractors' environmental management plans and method statements relate to the CoCP, LEMP and CEMPs?
Q2.5.17	Applicant	What is the status of the Register of Environmental Commitments and Actions? Should this be secured through a separate Requirement? If not, why not?
Q2.5.18	Applicant	During an accompanied site visit in July 2015 the ExA noted proposals to locate Soil Storage Areas to the south, west and north of Depden Farm (General Arrangement Regulation 5(2)(o) 9 of 24.) Please provide an explanation of the purpose and justification of the soil storage areas to the south, west and north of the Depden Farm (adjacent to Beacon Field Equine Centre). The ExA also noted on the plans that to the southwest corner of the Farm, an area of grassland with intermittent trees and shrubs is indicated. We noticed that on site planting was already present. Is it the applicant's intention to retain and expand this planting?
Q2.5.19	Applicant	During an accompanied site visit in July 2015, the ExA noted that the plans indicate two triangular areas of woodland planting of trees and shrubs to the north and northeast of Oxholme Farm (General Arrangement Regulation 5(2)(o) 11 of 24.) Please provide an explanation of the purpose of each area and the reason for their shape and size.
6	Development Consent Order	
Q2.6.1	Applicant	Can the applicant please confirm that all the matters to be submitted for Deadline 7, discussed at the first DCO hearing on 15 July and referred to in HE's written submission following the hearing (REP5-028) have been submitted to the ExA?
Q2.6.2	Applicant Local Authorities	At the first DCO hearing the ExA raised the matter of discharge of requirements and whether local planning authorities would be better placed to discharge requirements. The applicants response is captured in its

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		written submission (REP5-028). Do the local authorities wish to comment?
Q2.6.3	Applicant	At paragraph 2.7 (REP5-028) the applicant refers to case law being clear that the views of other parties being 'taken into account' is implicit. Please provide the relevant case law.
Q2.6.4	Applicant	Please confirm what progress has been made with consideration of a 'public register of requirements' referred to at the first DCO hearing in July and at para 2.8 (REP5-028)?
Q2.6.5	Applicant Local Authorities	At paragraph 4.52 of HEs written submission following the first DCO hearing (REP5-028), the applicant refers to noise issues being 'fundamentally a trunk road design issue' and that 'this matter is not something that it is appropriate for the local authorities to be consulted on prior to the mitigation details being approved by the Secretary of State.' Do the local authorities wish to comment?
Q2.6.6	Applicant Interested Parties	At paragraph 5.7 of HEs written submission (REP5-028) the applicant comments that 'except to the extent already covered by the proposed requirements... detailed design issues such as the River Great Ouse crossing including its structures, were intended to be approved by the applicant itself.' Do Interested Parties wish to comment?
Q2.6.7	Applicant Local Authorities	How would reasonable costs associated with the discharge of requirements be determined? If the local planning authorities were to have a role in the discharge of requirements, what arrangements could be put in place to provide funding for this to take place in association with the scheme?
Q2.6.8	Applicant Local Authorities	How would the appeal process for non-determination of requirements operate?
Q2.6.9	Applicant Local Authorities	Cambridgeshire County Council's suggested revised wording for Requirement 3 (now 4) (WR para. 9.2.1 REP3-006) would mean that no part of the authorised development could take place until written details of the CoCP for that part, together with the CEMP and LEMP were submitted to and approved by the Secretary of State, following consultation with the relevant planning authority. In its response to Written Representations (REP4-011) and its written response to oral questions at the DCO Hearing (REP5-028) the applicant indicated that it is not required because the CoCP is proposed to be secured through a Requirement in the draft DCO and would become a certified document. Furthermore, the applicant considers that the CEMP and LEMP which would be produced in response to the CoCP would provide extensive opportunities for engagement with relevant local authorities and therefore no need to include a consultation obligation within the Requirement. What has the applicant concluded, having given further consideration to the wording of this Requirement, on the basis of other DCOs? Would the local authorities wish to comment?
Q2.6.10	Applicant	The County Council suggested an amendment to Requirement 10 (now 11) (Written Representation para.

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
	Local Authorities	9.2.1 (REP3-006)) which would have prevented excavation until the details of works, including aftercare proposals, were submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant planning authority. The applicant rejected the proposed amendment in its response to Written Representations (REP4-011) on the basis that the borrow pits restoration plan would be developed during the Examination and be secured under a Requirement. In the light of its comment in its written response to oral questions at the DCO Hearing (REP5-028) could the applicant indicate what progress has been made in the development of the borrow pits restoration plan? Would the local authorities wish to comment?
Q2.6.11	Applicant Environment Agency	Borrow Pit number 6 (near Dry Drayton) is located within a geologically sensitive area due to the underlying Woburn Sands aquifer. EA requests that the DCO provides a requirement for the EA to retain a role in assessing any design and monitoring information for the borrow pit in this location (should also include the production of a scheme for dewatering to be incorporated within the borrow pit design plans.) Baseline monitoring data is also required for hydrocarbons. The applicant advises that this will be secured through protective provisions to be included in the DCO. Should this be a requirement or a protective provision?
Q2.6.12	Applicant Environment Agency	Can the EA and the applicant provide an update in relation to EAs request for an Accident Management or Emergency Plan.
Q2.6.13	Applicant	Can the applicant confirm that the DCO will be in the form of the template for validated SI's. In particular, has the applicant followed necessary drafting conventions including where applicable, footnotes, gender neutral references, a preamble which recites statutory powers, avoids ambiguous wording and archaic language?
Q2.6.14	Applicant Local Authorities	Article 36 – Who would undertake the tree survey that would form part of the detailed design process referred to in the CoCP? How would this survey be undertaken and at what time of the year? How would the findings of the tree survey be disseminated and consulted upon and with whom?
Q2.6.15	Applicant	Schedule 9 includes a list of trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders. This includes works to be carried out and the work number to which that tree relates. Would the findings of the tree survey for the detailed design process have any effect on the trees listed in this schedule? If not, why not?
7	Economic and Social Effects	
Q2.7.1	Applicant	Local authorities are seeking an assessment of the impact of artificial lighting on people and their living conditions to assess potential impacts of quality of life and health. As a minimum they suggest there should

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		be a commitment to ensure that artificial lighting would be installed having due regard to national and industry best practice and standards. What is the applicants view?
Q2.7.2	Applicant	In view of reduced costs for specific items of works, what would be the effect of excluding the removal of the existing A14 Huntingdon viaduct and the associated road works from the scheme on its overall cost, the economic appraisal for the scheme and the projected benefit to cost ratio?
8 Environmental Impact Assessment		
Q2.8.1	Applicant	Cambridgeshire County Council has suggested that further work to assess the archaeological significance of the borrow pit sites is necessary, in order to establish that all of the mineral is winnable and is not sterilised by archaeological remains. Could HE comment on the need for further archaeological investigations at the borrow pit sites, and the fall back position should sterilisation by archaeological remains occur in the existing proposed borrow pit sites. Could the fall back position result in additional adverse effects?
Q2.8.2	Applicant	The applicant has commented on the local authorities' concerns about archaeology which are summarised in paras 9.2.15-9.2.20 of the JLIR(REP2-184). Can the applicant confirm what progress has been made on these matters and confirm whether the additional information referred to in its comments in para 9.2.20 has been provided to CCC.
Q2.8.3	Applicant Environment Agency	How is the applicant responding to requests from EA to change the detailed design of the proposed viaduct across the River Great Ouse and the location of Borrow Pit 7? What would be the impact on the ES of any changes made?
Q2.8.4	Applicant Local Authorities	The applicant has indicated (Response to Relevant Representations page 67, REP1-035) that it is anticipated that between 2017 and 2020 there would be sufficient on-site accommodation for 500 workers. Please provide a detailed explanation of how accommodation for workers would be provided and in what locations. Are any adverse effects on community cohesion anticipated?
Q2.8.5	Applicant	The residual impact of the proposals on All Saints' Church, Church, Lolworth (Grade II*) has been assessed in the ES as slight adverse. Should the impacts of the proposed scheme on the church and its setting be mitigated and if so, how? If not, why not?
Q2.8.6	South Cambridgeshire District Council	In response to Q1.8.1 (REP2-190) and in their WR (REP2-147), SCDC has stated that not all development sites along the route have been addressed in the applicant's cumulative impact assessment, including Darwin Green 2 and Cambridge Northern Fringe East. SCDC also note that a number of development sites have been

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		incorrectly identified on ES Figure 2.2 (sheets 5 & 6). The applicant has responded to the Council's WR. Does SCDC wish to comment further?
Q2.8.7	Applicant Environment Agency	The DCO would permit the contractor to reduce the headroom of the viaduct across the River Great Ouse to below 3000mm, which is of concern to the EA because of the potential effects on navigation. The EA suggest in their WR (para 2.2.1) (REP2-154) that their concerns could be overcome by a suitable DCO Requirement. What progress has been made towards agreeing wording for an additional requirement?
Q2.8.8	Applicant	What would be the consequences of the omission of the removal of the existing A14 Huntingdon viaduct and the associated road works from the scheme in terms of the ES?
Q2.8.9	Applicant	In response to the ExA's questions on the DCO (REP5-028) the applicant has made reference to section 7.4.5 of the CoCP (APP-752) to describe measures to be implemented should unexpected archaeological remains be identified. Why is this not addressed as part of Requirement 8 to follow established precedent in DCOs?
9 Landscape and Visual Effects		
Q2.9.1	Applicant Local Authorities	Requirement 7 provides for the approval and implementation of a landscaping scheme, but sets no time by which such a scheme should be submitted. Should the Requirement be amended to begin 'No part of the authorised development shall commence until a written landscape scheme applicable to that part of the scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State, following consultation with the relevant planning authority'. How would this requirement be monitored and enforced?
Q2.9.2	Applicant	Can the applicant confirm that Requirement 7 applies to ecological mitigation generally and not simply to landscaping works?
Q2.9.3	Applicant	In order to further assess the effect of the proposed scheme on the crossing of the River Great Ouse and East Coast Main Line how would the applicant demonstrate to the ExA, using physical features, the height and alignment of the proposed A14. (General Arrangement Regulation Sheet 6 and 7 of 24). This should be in addition to any photomontages which the applicant may wish to prepare to show the likely visual effects of the proposals in this location.
10 Noise and Vibration		

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
Q2.10.1	Applicant Local Authorities	Post-construction noise monitoring has been requested by the local authorities particularly in relation to the impacts on Brampton Primary School and at Stewart Close, Brampton, RAF Brampton, Pear Tree Close, Fenstanton, Rhadegund Cottages, Cambridge, Hackers Fruit Farm, Lolworth and Catchall Farm Cottages, Cambridge. How would this be secured in the DCO? (CCC para 7.1.3/4, REP3-006)
Q2.10.2	Local Authorities	A new Requirement to address noise mitigation has been included in the revised draft DCO submitted for Deadline 4 (Requirement no.12). Do local authorities and others wish to comment?
Q2.10.3	Local Authorities	The County Council has indicated that the noise impacts with regard to the borrow pits have been assessed using criteria appropriate for road construction and not those appropriate for mineral extraction. The County Council has requested that noise impacts be appropriately mitigated in relation to the borrow pits. The applicant's view is that the CoCP establishes control measures that would provide the most effective level of protection to ensure that the noise standards for mineral sites would be met in the majority of, if not all, cases. Would the local authorities wish to comment?
Q2.10.4	Applicant University of Cambridge	With regard to the applicant's answer to Q1.10.11, can the applicant and the University of Cambridge outline what progress has been made towards reaching agreement on the matters raised in the original question.
Q2.10.5	Applicant Local Authorities	SCDC is seeking additional noise impact assessment and mitigation at sensitive locations including Orchard Park Primary School, Neighbourhood Play/Recreation Area, Cambridge Regional College and Cambridge City Crematorium/Huntingdon Road Cemetery. What progress has been made in addressing these concerns?
Q2.10.6	Applicant	SCDC have requested clarification as to why a predicted baseline calculation method was used and pointed out some discrepancy with baseline noise levels as monitored and as predicted in the vicinity of Orchard Park. Could the applicant comment?
Q2.10.7	Applicant	Ref Q1.10.3. While the applicant has indicated that it is proposed that the contractors will seek to submit S61 prior consent notices, what is the process for ensuring this takes place?
Q2.10.8	Applicant	Please provide an update in relation to the detailed review of the implications of IAN 185/15 with regard to the noise assessment as referred to in Q1.10.4.
Q2.10.9	Applicant SCDC	SCDC are seeking changes to the assessment of night time effect and receptors affected. What progress has been made with discussions between the parties?
Q2.6.10	Applicant Hilton Action on Traffic	Hilton Action on Traffic (HAT) and Hilton Parish Council have engaged a noise consultant to consider the effects of the scheme. Has dialogue taken place between the parties and if so, what was the outcome? If not, why not?

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
Q2.6.11	Applicant Local authorities	A new proposed Requirement (12) does not provide for consultation with local authorities on the basis that noise issues are considered by the applicant to be a technical trunk road design issue on which the applicant has the necessary expertise. Does the applicant and local authorities wish to comment?
Q2.6.12	Applicant	'A 2m high absorptive barrier is proposed alongside the B1043 (A1 southbound off-slip) (Ref M16 in Table 14.21 of Chapter 14 of ES APP-345 and Figure 14.7 of ES APP-416). Can the applicant explain why the proposed barrier on this side of the A1 is proposed to be 2m high when on the opposite carriageway the proposal is to replace the existing 2m reflective barriers with 4m absorptive and additional 2m absorptive barrier alongside existing 2m earth bund?'
Q2.6.13	Applicant Buckden Marina Residents Association	Can the applicant provide an update regarding discussions with Buckden Marina Residents Association about noise data and the applicant's noise model. The Residents Association may wish to comment.
11 Planning Policy Context		
11	Planning Policy Context	
12 Transportation and Traffic		
12	Transportation and Traffic	
Q2.12.1	Applicant	Why is Scenario 1, which uses the same assumptions as in the 2013 Road Traffic Forecasts, the most directly comparable with the 2015 Road Traffic Forecasts? (REP2-013, para5)
Q2.12.2	Applicant	Why is there a higher percentage change in relation to traffic on The Avenue between the 'with' the scheme and 'without' scenarios in 2035 than in 2020? (REP2-013, para18)
Q2.12.3	Applicant	Why, from the improved connectivity at its junction with the Local Access Road, is The Avenue being made available for traffic wishing to travel into Cambridge via Huntingdon Road avoiding the A14? How does the 'with' scheme availability of this alternative route along The Avenue compare with the provision of Government funding in 2003/04 to discourage 'rat running' in the village of Madingley? (REP2-013, para19)
Q2.12.4	Applicant	Notwithstanding the fact that the full closure of The Avenue to through traffic is not part of the A14 scheme, is the increased connectivity between The Avenue and the Local Access Road part of the scheme? (REP2-013, para29)
Q2.12.5	Applicant	What is the route of the through traffic that would not be significantly impacted by the full closure of The

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		Avenue to through traffic, with and without the closure in place and with the scheme in place? (REP2-013, para 29)
Q2.12.6	Applicant	It is suggested that main contractors would be prevented from using certain construction site access routes in accordance with Drawing No. A14-JAC-ZZ-00-SK-Z-00001 Rev P00.1. How would this be enforced on a daily basis? The drawing shows non-permissible haul routes. What is the difference between haul routes and construction site access routes? (REP2-013, para35)
Q2.12.7	Applicant	What effect would Phase 3 of the Northstowe development have on traffic forecasts on the new A14 between Swavesey and Girton in relation to its carriageway and junction design capacities? (REP2-013 para189)
Q2.12.8	Applicant	What would be the dis-benefits of maintaining the left turn only nature of the junction between The Avenue and the new Local Access Road? (REP2-013, para217)
Q2.12.9	Applicant	What would the forecast RFC value be for the Bar Hill junction south roundabout under the 100% development scenario for Northstowe? (REP2-013, para300)
Q2.12.10	Applicant	What is the forecast RFC value for the Bar Hill B1050 and Local Access Road (North) junction under the 100% Northstowe development scenario? (REP2-013, para310)
Q2.12.11	Applicant	What is the forecast RFC value for the Bar Hill B1050 and Local Access Road (South) junction under the 100% Northstowe development scenario? (REP2-013, para320)
Q2.12.12	Applicant	Would the provision of an additional lane on Brampton Road leading to the Edison Bell Way junction on the existing railway bridge be possible and could it improve the forecast RFCs in this area? If not, why not? (REP2-013, para 354)
Q2.12.13	Applicant	The observations referred to in the question were made at approximately 15.30 and 17.30 and comprised stationary traffic. How do these relate to the model operational assessment? (REP2-013, para 366)
Q2.12.14	Applicant	The observations referred to in the question were made between 08.30 and 08.45 and comprised slow moving traffic. How do these relate to the model operational assessment? (REP2-013 para, 372)
Q2.12.15	Applicant	What is the CHARM3a forecast impact of the scheme on Junction 26 of the A14 (A1096/B1040) and why is this forecast impact thought to occur? (REP2-013, para 447)
Q2.12.16	Applicant Local Authorities	What are the available options for an improvement scheme at this junction? (REP2-013, para 452)
Q2.12.17	Applicant Cambridgeshire County Council	What would be the specific consequences of the omission of the removal of the existing A14 Huntingdon viaduct and the associated road works from the scheme?

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
	Huntingdon District Council	
Q2.12.18	Applicant	Why is removal of the existing A14 Huntingdon viaduct and the associated road works a necessary element of the A14 improvement scheme?
Q2.12.19	Applicant	'It is expected that a significant proportion of people would continue to use the existing A14' if the existing viaduct was retained in the context of the availability of the re-routed A14 as now proposed. Has any modelling work been carried out to support this expectation? If so, please provide details; if not, why not? (REP5-029, page 22)
Q2.12.20	Applicant	Please provide plans showing the locations and details of any existing vehicle weight limits on roads within a corridor of 4km width to either side of the scheme from its junction with the A428 to its junction with the A1.
Q2.12.21	Applicant County Council	If the closure of the junction of The Avenue with the A14, or indeed any other traffic restrictions such as weight limits on roads within the general A14 corridor, were thought to be necessary following the opening of the scheme, what arrangements could be put in place to provide funding for this to take place in association with the scheme, such as through a Section 106 agreement?
13	Water Issues	
Q2.13.1	Applicant EA	As the 2001 flood event has been said to be the result of blocked culverts and insufficient maintenance, would the scheme increase the number of culverts on the eastern Award Drain? If so, how would the maintenance of the additional culverts be regulated. (REP2-014, para3)
Q2.13.2	Applicant	Please explain the rationale behind the addition of a climate change allowance to some 1% AEP event water levels, such as in Table 13-2, and not others, such as in Table 13-4? (REP2-014, para18)
Q2.13.3	Applicant	More than 4 properties are located on the eastern side of Buckden Marina. Notwithstanding that property threshold levels are said to be typically between 100-150 millimetres above ground level, do the additional properties have particularly elevated floor levels? How do the existing and with-scheme water levels relate to the actual floor levels of these properties? (REP2-014, para18)
Q2.13.4	Applicant	What is the current status and content of the documents which set out the change in flood risk from Ellington

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		Brook, Brampton Brook and River Great Ouse to the various landowners concerned? (REP2-014, para29)
Q2.13.5	Applicant	When is the on-going discussion with the landowner expected to conclude? Is it envisaged that the resulting works will be identified during the course of the Examination? Would the resulting works be undertaken under powers within the DCO, and if so how? If not, how would they be undertaken? (REP2-014, para37)
Q2.13.6	Applicant	Will the consultation with landowners include consultation related to the additional four properties on the eastern side of Buckden Marina affected by the 1% AEP plus climate change event? (REP2-014, para40)
Q2.13.7	Environment Agency	What are the 'minor outstanding issues' with the applicant referred to by the Environment Agency at the draft DCO Hearing?
Q2.13.8	Applicant	The Environment Agency has requested submission of the revised FRA (as detailed in their Written Representation REP2-154). How is the applicant responding to this request?
Q2.13.9	Applicant	During the ExAs accompanied site visit in July 2015, the location of an attenuation pond was noted to the south east of Lodge Farm (General Arrangement Regulation 5(2)(o) 6 of 24.) adjacent to the emergency only access. What is the justification for the location of the attenuation pond in this location? What would be the effects on the scheme if the attenuation pond was relocated to the north of the A14 at this point?
14 Other Matters		
Q2.14.1	Applicant	In the light of SCDC's comments about the extent of Statutory Nuisance could the applicant clarify their position as set out in the application.
Q2.14.2	Applicant	What consideration has been given to the use of the Chesterton railhead to deliver locally unobtainable aggregates? (CCC para 9.1.3 REP3-006) Why can a strategy not be developed before a decision on the DCO? (Ref: CCC WR para 9.1.3 REP3 -006).
Q2.14.3	Applicant	The ES refers to different stages or parts of the construction process. Should there be a Requirement to ensure that works do not commence until a written scheme setting out the phasing of construction of each stage or part has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State, following consultation with the relevant planning authority? And that the works must be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme. Should each stage be defined by reference to Work Numbers together with a time limit for commencement of each stage?
Q2.14.4	Applicant Interested Parties	Please provide an update on progress with each of the Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) submitted in response to Deadline 3. This to confirm which SoCGs are now finalised and which SoCG are still in discussion.

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
		It is the ExAs expectation that all SoCGs will be finalised by Deadline 8. If the applicant or other interested parties foresee difficulties in meeting this deadline, they are requested to advise the ExA accordingly of the additional steps that are being taken to secure agreement.
15	HE Traffic Modelling Update Report REP2-018	
Q2.15.1	Applicant	For each of the Base Year model refinements, and notwithstanding the explanation in Para 2.2.4, briefly explain which generally increase traffic flows, which generally result in a decrease and which have a varied effect outside of these two categories? (REP2-018, para 2.2.2)
Q2.15.2	Applicant	For each of the forecast year 'Do-Minimum' model refinements, and notwithstanding the explanation in Para 2.2.8, briefly explain which generally increase traffic flows, which generally result in a decrease and which have a varied effect outside of these two categories? (REP2-018, para2.2.6)
Q2.15.3	Applicant	For each of the forecast year 'Do-Something' model changes, and notwithstanding the explanation in Para 2.2.8, briefly explain which generally increase traffic flows, which generally result in a decrease and which have a varied effect outside of these two categories? (REP2-018, para2.2.7)
Q2.15.4	Applicant	Please provide details on the assignment methodology employed and an explanation for its choice including consideration of the following range of alternatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steady State Assignment models Dynamic assignment methods • Steady State Assignment Models • User Equilibrium Assignment • Stochastic User Equilibrium Assignment as well as consideration of capacity restraint, including the approach adopted for Junction Modelling and choice of Speed/Flow Relationships.
Q2.15.5	Applicant	Please provide detailed information including tables, graphs and maps for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assigned flows and counts totalled for each screen line or cordon, before and after any matrix estimation procedure is employed. • assigned flows and counts on individual links and turning movements at junctions. • modelled and observed journey times along routes. • allowance made for the relationships of the highway assignment model with induced/latent demand effects (variable demand model issues)and any public transport assignment- sub models employed in the wider suite of models 'used' to inform the modelling process.

Ref No.	Respondent:	Question:
Q2.15.6	Applicant	Please provide the disaggregated performance of the model in relation to Web TAG endorsed validation measures, criteria and acceptability guidelines. Details of any 'stress tests' undertaken should also be provided. Any further assessment undertaken by the applicant of the goodness of fit for the assignment and generalised cost function fit should also be provided.
Q2.15.7	Applicant	Please provide a comprehensive description of data sources employed for calibration and validation data should also be provided for traffic counts and journey times.
Q2.15.8	Applicant	Please provide details of the procedures adopted for network calibration and route choice calibration should also be provided for HGVs as well as for smaller vehicles/private travel.
Q2.15.9	Applicant	Please provide details of the application of and implications arising from matrix estimation procedures.
Q2.15.10	Applicant	Please provide a commentary on the overall consideration of fitness for purpose of the assignment model including consideration of the potential for evidence of conditions consistent with the Pigou Knight Downs Paradox and/or the Downs Thomson Paradox.