

From: Spencer Claire [<mailto:Claire.Spencer@scams.gov.uk>]
Sent: 07 July 2015 11:59
To: A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon
Subject: RE: A14 DCO Examination Deadline 4

Dear Ms Fernandes,

This email provides the response to the matters addressed in Deadline 4 on behalf of South Cambridgeshire District Council (Reference 10030865), to the Examination into the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme DCO Application

Comments on Written Representations

The Council is not submitting any comments on Written Representations.

Comments on Responses to ExA's First Round of Written Questions

Please find attached comments from the Council on Highways England's Responses to the Examining Authority's First Round of Written Questions.

Comments on the Traffic Modelling Update Report

The Council notes Highways England's Traffic Modelling Update Report and would like to reserve its position until the results of the additional local traffic impact testing work is available in August.

Kind regards

Claire Spencer | Senior Planning Policy Officer



South Cambridgeshire Hall | Cambourne Business Park | Cambourne | Cambridge | CB23 6EA
t: 01954 713418 | e: claire.spencer@scams.gov.uk
www.scams.gov.uk | facebook.com/south-cambridgeshire | twitter.com/SouthCams

This email was scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisations IT Helpdesk.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.



A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme Development Consent Order

**Comments on responses made by Highways England
to Examination Authority's First Written Questions by
South Cambridgeshire District Council**

7 July 2015

Question Reference:	Q1.1.1
Question:	
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?	
SCDC Initial Response (15 June 2015):	
<p>South Cambridgeshire District Council has had discussions with Highways England and their air quality consultants and we are in broad agreement with the baseline approach used in the Air Quality Assessment.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire District Council is still in discussion with Highways England over post completion air quality monitoring. An appropriate baseline for future air quality monitoring of PM₁₀ and NO₂ should be agreed with the Council prior to the commencement of monitoring work when a full monitoring year of data is available, early next year. Further information is provided in the Council's Written Representation (see paragraphs 87-93).</p>	
Summary of Highways England (HE) Response (15 June 2015):	
<p>Early meetings were held with the Local Authorities to discuss the scope of the air quality assessment, informing the EIA scoping inputs including methodology for establishing baseline conditions. This included using data from the local authorities' own monitoring sites.</p> <p>The EIA Scoping Report was shared with the Councils for comment on 21 March 2014 and no comments were received.</p> <p>HE undertook extensive monitoring using NO₂ diffusion tubes at 32 sites to gather baseline data, supplementing data provided by local authorities.</p> <p>Information from the scheme-specific monitoring and the existing long term local authority monitoring was used to establish baseline conditions across the scheme area. Full results of all monitoring used in the assessment are provided in the Environmental Statement (ES) Appendix 8.1 (document reference 6.3).</p> <p>The draft ES was shared with the local authorities and SCDC raised a question regarding a monitoring site at Impington.</p> <p>When analysing the data from SCDC monitoring sites, HE noted the PM₁₀ data from the Impington site appeared anomalous. This was raised with SCDC and discussions held in September 2014. There remains disagreement on validity of PM₁₀ data collected at Impington. It is HE's position that this data incorrect and should be discounted (Full report at Appendix 1.1 & 1.2)</p> <p>HE considers there is agreement with all three local authorities, with the exception of the Impington monitoring site.</p>	

SCDC Comment on HE Response:

The Council is in agreement with the baseline approach used in the Air Quality Assessment by HE, except with their view that the Impington site should be discounted. The Council considers that it should be possible to reach agreement with HE on an appropriate baseline for future monitoring for PM₁₀ and NO₂ using more recent data for this site, as well as for other air quality monitoring stations within the district.

Note – the reference in the Council's initial response (15 June 2015) to the Council's Written Representation should refer to paragraphs 89-95.

Question Reference:	Q1.8.1
Question:	
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?	
SCDC Initial Response (15 June 2015):	
As indicated in the ES at paragraph 18.2.1 South Cambridgeshire District Council responded to the Scoping Report.	
<p>Whilst anticipated major developments have been included, it is unclear whether the assessment fully addresses the Darwin Green site. It includes reference to the site of 1,593 dwellings with planning permission within Cambridge City, and a development of 1,000 dwellings. It should be clarified that the 1,000 dwellings is in South Cambridgeshire identified in the South Cambridgeshire LDF and Submitted Local Plan (referred to as Darwin Green 2/3). Table 18.4 appears to refer to both, but the map in figure 18.1 does not show the site in South Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>Reference is made to Cambridge Northern Fringe East, but it does not fully reflect the proposals in the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Submitted Local Plans. The maps in figure 18.1 also do not fully reflect the extent of the area.</p>	
Summary of Highways England (HE) Response (15 June 2015):	
HE outline the process behind the sites included within the traffic modelling – how it approached the Councils for details of allocated housing and employment sites, together with information on planning applications.	
HE set out how cumulative effects were considered, initially through the EIA Scoping Report. SCDC responded to the Scoping report that development sites included within adopted and emerging Local Plans should be taken into consideration.	
In June 2014 HE updated their information to include those within adopted and emerging Local Plans, and to include subsequent planning applications. Table 18.1 details the list of sites considered, by district.	
HE consider the list of major allocations in the Local Plans and planning applications to be the same ones used in the traffic modelling and cumulative impacts assessment, and that the list was agreed with each of the Councils.	

SCDC Comment on HE Response:

The Council acknowledges the steps taken to consider developments within the adopted and emerging Local Plans. However, there remains an apparent inconsistency specifically with ES Chapter 18: Cumulative Impacts (Table 18.4) and what is shown on the accompanying map (Figure 18.1).

ES Table 18.4 refers to 1,000 dwellings, which the Council has interpreted as referring to the land within South Cambridgeshire (on Darwin Green 2 & 3) as the City site has planning permission for approximately 1,500 dwellings, which is referred to in the subsequent paragraph. However, the map (Figure 18.1) only shows Darwin Green 1 within Cambridge City, and not Darwin 2 & 3 within South Cambridgeshire.

Note - Figure 18.1 also does not show the full extent of the area being explored for development through an Area Action Plan for the Cambridge Northern Fringe East (Issues and Options report December 2014).

Question Reference:	Q1.10.4
Question:	
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?	
SCDC Initial Response (15 June 2015):	
<p>This IAN provides supplementary advice to users of DMRB Volume 11, SECTION 3, PART 1 (HA207/07- Air Quality) and PART 7 (HD213/11- Noise). Advice is provided on the assessment of link speeds and generation of speed-band vehicle emissions to reflect fact that noise and air quality prediction models may under predict. This includes advice regarding the modelling speeds to be used in the vicinity of junctions experiencing varying degrees of congestion.</p> <p>This is a Highways England advice note and was only issued weeks after the submission of the DCO.</p> <p>Outputs for noise are likely to be higher but without undertaking detailed assessment and a noise model rerun it is not possible to conclude whether the outcomes of any impact assessment would be significantly different or would alter the significance already reported in the ES.</p> <p>In terms of noise an additional 1 to 3 dB can alter the significance of impact assessment outputs and may influence mitigation requirements.</p> <p>For completeness SCDC have asked Highways England and their noise consultants to update the ES or provide an addendum or similar. They should follow and incorporate the advice in IAN185/15 into the noise model and report the findings and any potential changes in the impact assessment for the proposed scheme to better represent the conditions likely to be experienced within the vicinity of various junctions.</p> <p>SCDC are awaiting a response from Highways England.</p>	
Summary of Highways England (HE) Response (15 June 2015):	
<p>Of relevance to this Question is the advice to use 'speed-band categories' for noise modelling and assessment.</p> <p>Initial outline sensitivity tests have been undertaken on potential implications of using speed band categories to assess whether there could be a greater magnitude of impacts using IAN 185/15 than reported in the ES. The results are shown in Table 10.1, which shows a moderate risk that noise impacts may be worse along the Cambridge Northern Bypass between Histon & Impington and Milton.</p> <p>HE is undertaking a detailed review of the implications for IAN 185/15 for the Cambridge Northern Bypass. The detailed review will consider the potential need for further noise mitigation in line with sustainability criteria in ES should the assessment identify any new likely significant effects.</p>	

SCDC Comment on HE Response:

The Council would like the opportunity to review and respond to HE's detailed review of the implications for IAN 185/15 on the Cambridge Northern Bypass when it is made available. If the results show there to be a need for further mitigation of noise impacts, the Council would like to be involved in the detailed design of any mitigation measures.

Question Reference:	Q.1.10.8
Question:	
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?	
SCDC Initial Response (15 June 2015):	
<p>The Environmental Statement (ES) makes reference to a number of important issues being resolved at the detailed design stage. For example, with regard to noise barriers, the ES shows an indicative location for where noise barriers will be positioned and what length and height they will be. It does not, however, specify the style or materials of the barriers (see Table 14.21: Envisaged noise mitigation measures for operation of the scheme of Chapter 14 details typical barrier locations and indicative lengths and Figures 14.7.1 sheet 25).</p> <p>The DCO does detail the process for agreeing detailed design matters and the involvement of the Local Authority in Table 20.1. There are a number of areas however the LPA wish to be consulted where there is no reference.</p> <p>As per Para. 78 of SCDC Written Representation as the location of any environmental noise fence barriers or bunds both new and replacement as proposed are only indicative, their detailed design including the final location, length, height and technical details such as acoustic performance specifications in order to optimise mitigation should be secured and approved in consultation with SCDC through the requirements / conditions of the DCO.</p> <p>There are also ongoing discussions with Highways England on some technical issues associated with noise assessment including proposed noise barriers or those not been proposed (as recorded in the Statement of Common Ground). It is envisaged that agreement and clarification will be reached on the majority of these matters and common ground can be agreed. However the Council reserves the right to raise any additional concerns and issues in relation to these items when additional information is provided.</p>	
Summary of Highways England (HE) Response (15 June 2015):	
<p>HE outlines that the envisaged noise barriers shown on General Arrangement Plans and ES Outline Environmental Design Plans & Table 14.21. Other mitigation measures include low noise surfacing & landscaped earthworks (ES section 14.2). The effectiveness of the mitigation measures is considered at ES Chapter 14 (Figures 14.5 & 14.7), noise contour maps (Figures 14.4-14.7), tabulation (Appendices 14.5 & 14.6). The Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments records an Action (AN2) to “<i>Develop permanent noise mitigation as part of detailed design in line with Appendix 14.1 of the ES (scheme operational noise and vibration policy) and indicative noise barrier locations in Figure 3.2.</i>”. (ES Appendix 20.1).</p> <p>HE propose that a new Requirement will be added to secure details of noise mitigation measures for the scheme, reflecting the measures outlined in the ES.</p> <p>In addition, HE propose to amend Requirement 6 (regarding implementation and maintenance of landscaping) to deal with landscape earthworks in the Huntingdonshire area.</p>	

HE is proposing to submit both of these revisions to the DCO Requirements at deadline 4 on 7 July 2015.

SCDC Comment on HE Response:

Via ongoing discussions with HE, SCDC are seeking justification for not providing mitigation or additional mitigation in certain locations e.g. Orchard Park noise barrier, New Barns Farm, Friesland Farm and Grange Farm. In addition, the Council is seeking clarification on how the length and height of the proposed indicative environmental noise barriers have been determined in terms of optimising noise mitigation, and justification for additional noise mitigation scheme measures (such as glazing etc.) at certain properties.

The Council would like the opportunity to review and respond to revisions to the DCO wording when it is made available - there does not appear to be provision for 'Comments on the Applicant's revised draft DCO' within the Examination programme.

Note – the reference in the Council's initial response (15 June 2015) to the Council's Written Representation should refer to paragraph 80.

Question Reference:	Q1.10.10
Question:	
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?	
SCDC Initial Response (15 June 2015):	
<p>The Council is in general agreement regarding day time impact, however, there are in ongoing discussions with HE regarding night time impact assessment in accordance with DMRB <i>Volume 11, Section 3, Part 7, HD213/11 – Revision 1 Noise and Vibration</i> (HD213/11)</p> <p>The ES does not adequately assess night time effect and receptors affected.</p> <p>In particular for night-time noise impacts, comparisons in the long term should be considered.</p> <p>SCDC are requesting information on the following assessment as recommended by DMRB <i>Volume 11, Section 3, Part 7, HD213/11</i>:</p> <p>Do-Minimum scenario in the baseline year against Do-Something scenario in the future assessment year (long term):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where the introduction of a project results in a sensitive receptor being exposed to night time noise levels in excess of 55 dB L_{night}, outside where it is currently below this level; and • where a receptor is exposed to pre-existing L_{night}, outside in excess of 55 dB and this is predicted to increase. 	
Summary of Highways England (HE) Response (15 June 2015):	
<p>At the pre-application stage HE met with the local authorities (29 January 2014) to discuss & agree the methodology. This included the approach to baseline data, including the need to measure night-time noise.</p> <p>Baseline measurement locations were identified on a map and circulated to local authorities for comment (10 March 2014). SCDC responded (1 May 2014) with specific locations to be considered, which were included in the <i>ES</i>.</p> <p>The details of the baseline noise measurements are set out in the <i>ES Appendices</i>: appendix 14.2, section 2.4 of which provides the results graphically.</p> <p>Since submission of the DCO application, HE has met with SCDC (14 May 2015) to discuss, amongst other matters, the approach to noise assessment. The only matter of disagreement that has been identified, specifically by Huntingdonshire District Council, relates to borrow pits.</p> <p>It is considered that the suggestions regarding the need for night time baseline measurement at appropriate agreed locations have been included in the assessment</p>	

SCDC Comment on HE Response:

The Council does not wholly agree. The Baseline data is generally agreed apart from Orchard Park / Cambridge Northern Bypass area. During a meeting with HE representatives (14 May 2015) the Council requested further night time noise assessment.

Night time is the most noise sensitive time of day.

The baseline noise levels are generally agreed but the ES does not adequately assess night time effects and receptors affected in accordance with DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 7, HD213/11 – Revision 1 Noise and Vibration (HD213/11).

In particular for night-time noise impacts, comparisons in the long term should be considered.

SCDC are requesting information on the following assessment as recommended by DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 7, HD213/11:

Do-Minimum scenario in the baseline year against Do-Something scenario in the future assessment year (long term) for the following:

- where the introduction of a project results in a sensitive receptor being exposed to night time noise levels in excess of 55 dB L_{night}, outside where it is currently below this level; and
- where a receptor is exposed to pre-existing L_{night}, outside in excess of 55 dB and this is predicted to increase.

Question Reference:	Q1.10.11
Question:	
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?	
SCDC Initial Response (15 June 2015):	
None proposed.	
<p>The ES in the long term and an operational mitigated scheme year of Assessment Location 756 in The Avenue Area of Madingley (which is in fact Beck Brook Farm, The Avenue, Girton, Cambridge, CB23 8AD approximately 1,150 metres from the current Girton Cloverleaf Junction) reports changes in noise with and with the scheme of adverse +0.1dB Day and beneficial -1.8 at Night. Such changes are considered negligible.</p>	
<p>The University of Cambridge, Sub Department of Animal Behaviour at Madingley will be further away from the scheme than Beck Brook Farm and it is considered that noise impacts would be similar if not lower.</p>	
<p>Beyond 200-300m, the effects of and reductions provided by environmental noise barriers such as bunds and fences are often zero as ground attenuation becomes the most significant factor in noise reduction.</p>	
<p>Therefore no specific mitigation proposed.</p>	
Summary of Highways England (HE) Response (15 June 2015):	
<p>The noise effects of the scheme on the Sub Department of Animal Behaviour have been assessed, as reported in chapter 14 of the <i>ES</i> and figures 14.1 and 14.3 and appendices 14.4, 14.5 and 14.6 of the <i>ES Figures and Appendices</i> (Assessment Location 761).</p>	
<p>With reference to the map (Figure 10.1), the receptor is directly adjacent to Huntingdon Road, close to the A14/A428 and A14 to M11 slip (to immediate north west of the receptor) and close to the M11 (to south west of the receptor). The existing environment is therefore characterised by elevated levels of road traffic noise.</p>	
<p>No likely significant effect at this receptor has been identified either during the construction or operation of the scheme. No specific mitigation is therefore proposed for this receptor. However, the protection measures set out in the <i>CoCP</i> will apply.</p>	
<p>HE will seek to engage with the owners and operators of the research facility to confirm their agreement to the specific points raised in the ExA's question.</p>	

SCDC Comment on HE Response:

The location / address considered by HE appears incorrect.

Assessment location 761 is off Huntingdon Road and the premises considered is a different establishment: The Animal Research Station, 307 Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 OJQ.

The Sub-Department of Animal Behaviour at Madingley is part of the Zoology Department of Cambridge University, and is situated in the village of Madingley, CB23 8AA, 4 miles west of Cambridge.

<http://www.zoo.cam.ac.uk/departments/madingley>

The most appropriate assessment location in the ES is likely to be Assessment Location 756 in The Avenue Area of Madingley (which is in fact Beck Brook Farm, The Avenue, Girton, Cambridge, CB23 8AD approximately 1,150 metres from the current Girton Cloverleaf Junction)

Question Reference:	Q1.10.12
Question:	
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.	
SCDC Initial Response (15 June 2015):	
Section 14.1.6 states:	
<p>“For the assessment of operational noise and vibration, two scenarios have been assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the base scheme, which is the scheme including mitigation measures integrated into the scheme, such as low-noise road surfacing and landscaping earthworks; and • the mitigated scheme, which is as the base scheme plus any additional mitigation including new and enhanced noise barriers.” 	
Section 14.5.4 states that:	
<p>“To avoid significant observed adverse effects from the scheme, minimise as far as sustainable other likely significant adverse effects from the scheme and reduce existing and future significant observed adverse effects in a number of Important Area, the additional mitigation described in Table 14.21 is envisaged. This includes the replacements or upgrade of existing barriers in a number of locations. Equivalent or better mitigation would be developed during detailed design of the scheme.”</p>	
Table 14.21: Envisaged noise mitigation measures for operation of the scheme of Chapter 14 details typical barrier locations and indicative lengths.	
As per Para. 78 of SCDC’s Written Representation as the location of any environmental noise fence barriers or bunds both new and replacement as proposed are only indicative, their detailed design including the final location, length, height and technical details such as acoustic performance specifications in order to optimise mitigation should be secured and approved in consultation with the Local Planning Authority through the requirements / conditions of the DCO.	
There are also ongoing discussions with Highways England on some technical issues associated with noise assessment including proposed noise barriers or those not been proposed (as recorded in the Statement of Common Ground). It is envisaged that agreement and clarification will be reached on the majority of these matters and common ground can be agreed. However the Council reserves the right to raise any additional concerns and issues in relation to these items when additional information is provided.	
Summary of Highways England (HE) Response (15 June 2015):	
Noise mitigation has been proposed in line with the NPS NN (paragraph 5.198) in terms of the following hierarchy of avoiding, reducing and offsetting effects which in noise terms is about mitigating at source first, then by looking at noise barriers and only then mitigation at the receiver. Example measures under this hierarchy include low noise surface, layout, maximising mitigation and minimising adverse impacts.	
A hierarchical approach has been applied in determining whether additional	

mitigation of noise is sustainable in the context of Government noise policy. This hierarchy considers benefit, engineering practicability, other environmental effects potentially caused by the mitigation (for example landscape or visual effects); and stakeholder engagement and consultation responses.

The scheme noise policy (appendix 14.1 of the *ES Appendices*) sets out how noise and vibration would be controlled through detailed design, post making of the DCO, in line with the assessment methodology defined in the ES (chapter 14, section 14.2 and appendix 14.3 of the *ES Appendices*).

The base scheme for which operational noise has been assessed includes landscape earthworks (i.e. earth bunds and false cuttings) where proposed to mitigate visual and landscape effects. Noise reduction provided by a barrier is determined by its height, its offset to the edge of the carriageway and its length.

Three dimensional noise modelling, implementing the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise procedures required by DMRB HD213/11 and the NPS NN has identified where additional noise mitigation could address likely significant effects that would otherwise exist for the base scheme. The design of this mitigation has considered the visual and other impacts, as well as the other hierarchy of parameters.

As noted in appendix 14.6 of the *ES Appendices* (paragraph 2.1.5): “Noise barriers and landscape barriers would be designed in accordance with DMRB, HA 65/94 Design Guide for Environmental Barriers (Highways Agency 1994/2001) and HA 66/95 Environmental Barriers: Technical Requirements (Highways Agency 1995).”

To avoid noise reflecting off the inner side of a fence barrier and potentially increasing noise on the far side of the highway noise fence barriers can be made acoustically absorptive. The *ES* notes which fence noise barriers are envisaged to be acoustically absorptive as set out in table 14.21 of chapter 14 of the *ES*.

SCDC Comment on HE Response:

Noted. However, via ongoing discussions with HE, SCDC are seeking justification for not providing further mitigation in certain locations (e.g. Orchard Park noise barrier), and clarification on how the length and height of the proposed indicative environmental noise barriers have been determined in terms of optimising noise mitigation. In addition, the Council is seeking clarification of the reasoning behind additional noise mitigation measures and schemes at certain properties.

Note – the reference in the Council’s initial response (15 June 2015) to the Council’s Written Representation should refer to paragraph 80.

Question Reference:	Q1.10.15
Question:	
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.	
Summary of Highways England (HE) Response (15 June 2015):	
There are Important Areas to the northern end of the interchange (IA5138 & IA6113) and eastern edge (IA5043), shown on sheet 15, figure 14.7 of the <i>ES Figures</i>	
The assessment assumes low noise road surfacing would have been installed at Important Areas on the existing network by 2021 with or without the proposed scheme. This applies to the Important Areas around the interchange.	
To the northern end of the interchange the <i>ES</i> identified the inclusion of two new noise fence barriers as shown on sheet 15, figure 14.7 of the <i>ES Figures</i> :	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a 200m long and 3m high barrier (M23 at IA5138) for Catchall Farm properties; and • a 100m long 3m high barrier (M24 at IA6113) for Grange Farm cottages. 	
The <i>ES</i> identified the inclusion of various noise fence barriers on the southern and northern side of the Cambridge Northern Bypass (A14) at IA5043 as shown on sheet 15, figure 14.7 of the <i>ES Figures</i> , namely:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a 110m long 3m high barrier south of the bypass and west of Girton Road (M25); • a 40m long 3m high barrier south of the bypass and east of Girton Road (M26); • a 100m long and 3m high barrier north of the bypass and east of Girton Road (M27); and • a new 390m long 4m high barrier to replace the existing barrier north of the bypass and west of Girton Road (M28/ M34). 	
The noise barriers were designed for optimal sustainable performance. In particular, the package of mitigation measures for Girton Interchange would:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure that noise levels do not exceed significant observed adverse effect thresholds (refer to table 14.1 of chapter 14 of the <i>ES</i>); and • provide a significant beneficial effect on the Girton community, based on the magnitude of the noise and the number of dwellings benefiting from a reduction in road traffic noise levels. 	
Other than those mitigation measures identified in this section, further noise mitigation is not considered to be required at Girton Interchange.	
SCDC Comment on HE Response:	
SCDC have received a response from HE regarding a request for clarification on proposed noise mitigation measures at the reconfigured Girton interchange.	
SCDC request that HE revise and amend Figures 14.5 and 14.7 (sheets 15 of 25) to fully annotate and identify existing noise barriers that will be retained north and south of Girton where the A14 divides. These are currently not clearly annotated on these Figures. These are paramount for completeness, long term retention and the avoidance of doubt.	