

A14
Cambridge to Huntingdon
improvement scheme
Development Consent Order Application

HE/A14/EX/55

TR010018

HE/A14/EX/55

Highways England's comments on the Written Representations
Report 7: Local community / public

July 2015

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme

Development Consent Order Application
Response to written representations
(Report 7: Local Community/Public)

HE/A14/EX/55

07 July 2015

Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Tables | 2 |
| 1 Introduction | 3 |
| 1.1 Purpose of this report..... | 3 |
| 1.2 Structure of this report | 4 |
| 1.3 Ongoing engagement | 5 |
| 1.4 Support for the scheme..... | 5 |
| 2 Air quality and emissions | 6 |
| 3 Biodiversity and ecological conservation | 17 |
| 4 Design and engineering standards | 22 |
| 5 Development Consent Order | 41 |
| 6 Economic and social effects | 46 |
| 7 Landscape and visual effects..... | 62 |
| 8 Noise and vibration | 73 |
| 9 Other environmental | 78 |
| 10 Traffic and transportation | 98 |
| 11 Water issues | 112 |
| 12 Borrow pits | 114 |
| 13 Consultation | 115 |

Tables

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 1 Air quality and emissions | 6 |
| Table 2 Biodiversity and ecological conservation..... | 17 |
| Table 3 Design and engineering standards | 22 |
| Table 4 Development Consent Order | 41 |
| Table 5 Economic and social effects..... | 46 |
| Table 6 Landscape and visual effects..... | 62 |
| Table 7 Heritage | 70 |
| Table 8 Noise and vibration | 73 |
| Table 9 Other environmental..... | 78 |
| Table 10 Traffic and transportation | 98 |
| Table 11 Water issues | 112 |
| Table 12 Borrow pits | 114 |
| Table 13 Consultation | 115 |

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this report

1.1.1 A total of 32 written representations were submitted to the Examining Authority at deadline 2 (15 June 2015) by members of the local community/public:

- Alan Farrow
- Ann Goodridge
- Anne Callow
- Chris and Lynne Slater
- Chris Graveling
- David Ousby
- David Prior
- Derek Norman
- Dr Allan Salem
- Dr J Patrick Doody
- Dr R W Hodder
- Godfrey D Williams
- Ian Weitzel
- J A Thomas
- Jeff Shaw
- Joanne Worsdall
- John and Valerie Burningham
- Joseph Brien
- Kay Norman
- Keith Barker
- Leonard Lean
- M L Boyles
- Margaret Shardlow
- Mark Stanton (submitted two written representations)
- Michael Laughton
- Mr R D and Mrs J A Bowers
- Sara Partridge

- Simon Norton
- Stewart Bottoms (submitted two written representations)
- Trevor Lee

1.1.2 The report identifies key issues on a thematic basis and provides Highways England's response to these issues, while also identifying the interested parties who have raised them, thereby providing a reference document to all interested parties and the Examining Authority.

1.1.3 The report focuses on substantive issues raised in written representations and does not comment on introductory or contextual information.

1.2 Structure of this report

1.2.1 The written representations raised a wide range of specific and detailed issues, which the report addresses in line with the principal issues identified in Annex C of the Rule 6 letter. The report addresses the written representations in the following chapters:

- **Chapter 2 Air Quality and Emissions**
- **Chapter 3 Biodiversity and Ecological Conservation**
- **Chapter 4 Design and Engineering Standards**
- **Chapter 5 Development Consent Order**
- **Chapter 6 Economic and Social Effects**
- **Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Effects**
- **Chapter 8 Noise and Vibration**
- **Chapter 9 Other Environmental**
- **Chapter 10 Transportation and Traffic**
- **Chapter 11 Water Issues**
- **Chapter 12 Borrow Pits**
- **Chapter 13 Consultation**

1.2.2 Chapter 9 provides a response to other environmental issues raised, including issues concerning 'Environmental impact assessment' and 'Carbon emissions', which were both identified as principal issues in the Rule 6 letter.

- 1.2.3 Chapters 12 and 13 provides a response to issues concerning borrow pits and consultation. Borrow pits and consultation were not specifically identified as principal issues in the Rule 6 letter, however as the issues were raised by several interested parties it is covered specifically in this report.
- 1.2.4 The principal issue of 'Planning policy context' has not been addressed as an individual chapter. Instead, planning policy context is captured in the specific chapter relevant to the topic raised by policy.
- 1.2.5 Issues concerning 'Compulsory acquisition' were not specifically raised by the local community, therefore the report does not address this principal issue in an individual chapter.

1.3 Ongoing engagement

- 1.3.1 Highways England continue to engage with the local community including through Parish Forum Update events and ongoing meetings. Many of the issues set out in this report, will also be addressed as part of this ongoing engagement.

1.4 Support for the scheme

- 1.4.1 In addition to the issues raised, Highways England notes the following points were made by the local community in support of the application:
- The need for improvement of the current A14 has been recognised and the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme is supported (Jeff Shaw)
 - New rights of way to compensate for severance of villages from countryside are a welcome mitigation measure (Joanne Worsdall).
 - Supports the need to improve the A14 as part of national and local development (J A Thomas).
 - No disagreements with the overall need for the A14 improvement scheme (David Prior).

2 Air quality and emissions

Table 1 Air quality and emissions

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>Derek Norman, Kay Norman</p> | <p>Concerns regarding the impacts of the extreme peaks in traffic volume on the Huntingdon Railway Station access roads. The resulting patterns of deceleration and acceleration leads to very significant increases in noise and air pollution levels compared to flows at constant speed. The amount of air pollutants (e.g. NOX, CO2 and CO) a vehicle produces per distance travelled massively increases with decreasing velocity at low speeds.</p> <p>This will be further exacerbated by the fact that engines will be cold when commuters leave the station car park, leading to an additional increase in pollution. This will result in very high levels of pollution at the intersections of the station access roads with the de-trunked A14, and along the entire length of these access roads. Pollution mitigation</p> | <p>The issue described regarding model set up relates to slow speeds and start/stop emissions. These factors have been accounted for within the model by modelling the slow traffic speeds assuming that these occur 24 hours each day rather than only at the peak times. This method is pessimistic and will reduce any uncertainty that peak hour emissions may have been underestimated and provide a conservative result for the air quality assessment.</p> <p>Using this methodology, there is a negligible change predicted in the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference 6.2) between the 'with scheme' and 'without scheme' options. The predicted concentrations for annual mean NO₂ and PM₁₀ are well below the objectives for these pollutants.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| | measures must be carefully considered to minimise impacts on residents. | |
| Derek Norman, Kay Norman | It could be argued that the negative impacts on air quality and health are unrealistic as they are not reflected by the pollution levels predicted by the Highways England modelling. However, any modelling does not take account of the station access-specific factors (peak traffic volumes, stop-start pattern and cars with cold engines). The predicted pollution levels based on these models are therefore under-representations. | As noted above the model results can be considered pessimistic due to the slow speeds being modelled over the full 24hrs rather than only during the peak traffic period. Even with these pessimistic assumptions the results indicate the pollution at these receptors will be well below the air quality objectives. |
| Derek Norman, Kay Norman | <p>Despite the potential under-representation of air pollution, the predicted exposure of the Station Cottages to NOx and especially PM10 is very high. The long term exposure values for PM10 as predicted by the flawed models are already above the WHO air quality guideline (AQG) limit of 20µg/m³ (WHO 2006) for all Station Cottage properties.</p> <p>Mitigation against noise and air pollution at Station Cottages is currently provided by the</p> | The model is not flawed and as noted above the results are not likely to be under predicted due to the conservative assumptions within the air quality model. The PM ₁₀ concentrations are well below the EU limit value and UK air quality annual mean objective for PM ₁₀ (40µg/m ³) and are also below 20µg/m ³ as shown in the appendix to the air quality chapter (receptors 58,59, 60). As the scheme does not create any significant effects at this location there is no requirement for any mitigation. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>prevailing westerly winds and mature planting along the existing A14.</p> <p>The proposed scheme will bring the southern station access road much closer to Station Cottages, will create a significant break in the embankment of the elevated de-trunked A14 and will severely compromise the current protective screen of planting. Once the planned new embankment planting eventually matures, the channelling of pollutants down the southern station access road towards Station Cottages will be exacerbated. The increased noise and light exposure to these properties could mean that compensation regulations would apply.</p> | |
| Derek Norman, Kay Norman | <p>The embankment on which part of the proposed new southern station access road is to be built would effectively create an additional barrier that would 'dam up' harmful emissions around Station Cottages and hinder their effective disposal.</p> | <p>There is a negligible decrease predicted between the 'with scheme' and 'without scheme' options. The predicted concentrations for annual mean NO₂ and PM₁₀ are well below the objectives for these pollutants.</p> |
| Derek Norman, Kay Norman | <p>More effective mitigation for Station Cottages could be provided by building a solid</p> | <p>In relation to barriers as mitigation for air quality, there is currently no conclusive evidence within the air quality profession about the effectiveness of barriers as a mitigation method for air pollution.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | physical structure such as a soundproof screen in association with appropriate planting which in time would absorb pollutants and improve the visual appearance. | Where space allows additional woodland planting of trees and shrubs would be carried out within the highway boundary to supplement the visual screening provided by existing vegetation |
| Derek Norman, Kay Norman | Areas to the south of the proposed new southern station access road will benefit from protective planting while Station Cottages would not receive any such protection. | <p>In relation to barriers as mitigation for air quality, there is currently no conclusive evidence within the air quality profession about the effectiveness of barriers as a mitigation method for air pollution.</p> <p>Where space allows additional woodland planting of trees and shrubs would be carried out within the highway boundary to supplement the visual screening provided by existing vegetation</p> |
| Stewart Bottoms (WR dated 10 June) | When local farmers harvest crops there is a noticeable increase in airborne dust. Elevated levels of exhaust emissions, carbon particulate and dust are inevitable with the proposed road and represent a hazard to health. | There is no association between the particulate levels from harvesting and the air quality impacts from this scheme. Elevated levels of exhaust emissions are not inevitable and in many places in the study area air quality would improve. The scheme effects along the whole scheme area and adjoining affected roads has been assessed within the air quality chapter of the Environmental Statement. The scheme does not result in any significant effects on air quality. Overall the scheme has a beneficial effect on air quality in the scheme area as vehicular pollution is removed from urban areas. |
| Simon Norton | The UK is currently in breach of air quality obligations in many areas and this will get worse if the amount of traffic grows. | This scheme does not result in breach of any air quality obligation. The scheme effects along the whole scheme area and adjoining affected roads have been assessed within the air quality chapter of the Environmental Statement. The scheme does not result in any significant effects on air quality. Overall the scheme has a beneficial effect on air quality in the scheme area as vehicular pollution is removed from urban areas. The scheme therefore does not impact the UK's ability to comply with the EU air quality directive. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Dr R W Hodder | Concerns regarding the serious adverse effects of atmospheric pollution on cardiac and respiratory systems demonstrated in a recent WHO report. The effects were particularly significant in infants and young children of which there are many in Hilton. | The air quality impacts in Hilton have been considered in the Environmental Statement. The Environmental Statement clearly notes that there are no adverse impacts in Hilton village itself, and in some cases there are improvements in air quality. Receptors 581-588 are located in the village and the predicted concentrations of nitrogen dioxide and PM ₁₀ can be found for these receptors on pages 80, 81 and 106 of Appendix 8.1 of the Environmental Statement. In 2020 the predicted traffic changes are too small to require any assessment in air quality as they do not meet the thresholds in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). An assessment was carried out for 2035 which shows that pollutant concentrations change by very small amounts. No exceedance of the air quality standards is predicted. |
| Dr R W Hodder | It was not possible at the meetings with the contractors and Highways England to gain any indication of either present levels of pollution or a prediction of future exposure. | The air quality chapter of the environmental statement includes details of the existing 'baseline' pollution concentrations, based on air quality monitoring undertaken by the local authorities and scheme specific monitoring undertaken by Highways England, as well as detailing the concentrations with and without the scheme in the proposed opening year. |
| Dr R W Hodder | Slow moving traffic, with a high proportion of HGVs, particularly from abroad with no emission regulations, will cause high levels of pollution. | The scheme effects along the whole scheme area and adjoining affected roads has been assessed within the air quality chapter of the Environmental Statement. The scheme does not result in any significant effects on air quality. Overall the scheme has a beneficial effect on air quality in the scheme area as vehicular pollution is removed from urban areas. |
| Joanne Worsdall | The proposed road will concentrate east west traffic instead of dispersing it around other routes. The growth of traffic therefore concentrates pollution for settlements close to the route (e.g. Brampton, Buckden). This is in breach of | The scheme effects along the whole scheme area and adjoining affected roads has been assessed within the air quality chapter of the Environmental Statement. The scheme does not result in any significant effects on air quality in Buckden or Brampton nor any breach of air quality standards. Overall the scheme has a beneficial effect on air quality in the scheme area as vehicular pollution is removed from urban areas. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | health and environmental legislation. The elevation of the road ensures that air borne pollutants will be widely dispersed. | |
| Joanne Worsdall | The aggregates and fill extraction adjacent to the proposed route is an additional cause for concern regarding pollution including particulates and dust. | The CoCP includes a range of measures designed to reduce dust emissions during construction to a negligible level. These mitigation measures are simple to apply (such as watering of surfaces and enclosure of dusty operations) and have been shown to be highly effective. The Institute of Air Quality Management guidance on construction notes that with the application of these measures, significant impacts can be avoided and this would be expected in this case. |
| Ann Goodridge | Recommend that full account is taken of the Supreme Courts recent ruling on UK air pollution before making a judgment on its worth. PINS must undertake a thorough, challenging and incisive analysis of what has been submitted by HE and not only at the disaggregated parts but also the overall impact. | It is noted that the latest Supreme Court ruling requires the UK Government to tackle air pollution levels based on the 2010 EU air quality directive and that all proposed infrastructure schemes should be reviewed in the light of tighter standards across all air quality measures. The Supreme Court ruling (the Client Earth case) has not resulted in any new "tighter" air quality standards, it requires the UK Government to prepare new plans to show that it will meet the limit values for nitrogen dioxide more quickly. In the case of the A14 the air quality assessment (see chapter 8 of the <i>Environmental Statement (ES)</i> , document reference 6.1) shows that there will be no delay to compliance as a result of the scheme and it largely brings about improvements in air quality in the most polluted areas. Further details of this are provided in Highways England's response to the ExA's First Written Question 1.1.15 (<i>Response to ExA's First Written Questions, Report 1: Air Quality and Carbon Emissions (document reference EX-28)</i>). |
| Ann Goodridge | An increase in traffic through Hilton, particularly of HGV, will worsen pollution. HGV traffic in Hilton parish is already high – | Traffic data used for the air quality assessment includes HGVs which are predicted to use the local roads through Hilton. An assessment was carried out for 2035 which shows that pollutant concentrations change by very small amounts. No exceedance of the air quality standards is predicted. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | e.g. 575 HCVs over 7.5 tonnes in one day. | |
| Ann Goodridge | <p>The standards adopted by HA to measure expected air quality do not comply with the WHO (2005), Air quality Guidelines for Europe, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Particulate matter levels - for PM10 HA use a higher standard annual mean, 40µg/m³, rather than WHO 20 µg/m³ • Particulate matter levels – HA do not measure PM25 as suggested by WHO. • HA do not measure Sulfur/sulphur dioxide, or ozone. Yet these feature in reported incidents of UK high air pollution. | <p>The standards used in the assessment by Highways England are the UK statutory standards which are based on the 2010 EU air quality directive, they are consequently completely appropriate for this assessment. PM_{2.5} measurements were not carried out; the reason for this is detailed in the Highways England response to the Examining Authority's written question 1.1.5.</p> <p>There are no significant emissions of sulphur dioxide or ozone from motor vehicles. Sulphur levels in fuel have been reduced to low levels and hence emissions of sulphur dioxide are also not significant. Ozone is not directly emitted from motor vehicles, it is formed from a series of complex chemical reactions at a regional scale and consequently is not a relevant pollutant to examine in a local assessment.</p> |
| Ann Goodridge | European Respiratory Society (April 2014) has cited several examples of air pollution incidents in our region. In September 2014 the European Respiratory Society called for urgent action to tackle air pollution in Europe following the release of new data underlining the link between air quality and lung health, particularly for | As noted in Highways England's response to the ExA's written question 1.1.9 (<i>Response to ExA's First Written Questions, Report 1: Air Quality and Carbon Emissions (document reference EX-28)</i>) the European air quality standards are based on a balanced interpretation of all the available evidence on the health impacts of air pollutants and there is no reason why any one study should be given greater weight when determining the impacts of air quality. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|--|
| | children and people suffering from obesity. | |
| Ann Goodridge | Cambridgeshire County Council is currently undertaking a verification study on the HE traffic modelling data to confirm actual impacts, therefore impacts on Hilton cannot be certain. | The Traffic Modelling Update Report submitted on 15 th June 2015 provides updated traffic forecasts further to incorporation of revised economic parameters and further refinement work. At the request of Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridge City Council, further work has been undertaken to verify the performance on CHARM3a on local roads in central Cambridge. Details of on-going work with Cambridgeshire County and Cambridge City Councils can be found in Highways England's response to these Councils' written representations. The results of this further work will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in a Local Traffic Impact Report on 3 rd August 2015. |
| Ann Goodridge | The traffic modelling does not take account of additional local traffic changes that will combine with A14-specific pollution levels. For example, refer to Joint Parishes HCV Group response to the pre-application consultation (June 2014). | The air quality impacts in Hilton have been considered in the Environmental Statement. The Environmental Statement clearly notes that there are no adverse impacts in Hilton village itself, and in some cases there are improvements in air quality. Receptors 581-588 are located in the village and the predicted concentrations of nitrogen dioxide and PM10 can be found for these receptors on pages 80, 81 and 106 of Appendix 8.1 of the Environmental Statement. In 2020 the predicted traffic changes - which are reported in the Transport Assessment (document reference 7.2) and the Traffic Modelling Update Report (document reference HE/A14/EX/44) and include the consideration of predicted local traffic changes in addition to those on the A14 resulting from the proposed scheme - are too small to require any assessment in air quality as they do not meet the thresholds in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). An assessment was carried out for 2035 which shows that pollutant concentrations change by very small amounts. No exceedance of the air quality standards is predicted. |
| Ann Goodridge | The increasing application of molecular biology in routine laboratories is already affecting | The air quality impacts in Hilton have been considered in the Environmental Statement. No exceedance of the air quality standards is predicted and no health effects related to air quality would therefore be expected. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>over 70% of decisions in medical diagnosis and will continue to grow. We can expect that the call for action on air pollution to significantly increase as NHS Funding is curtailed. It is not viable that the Government states it will safeguard and invest in the NHS, while encouraging and allowing infrastructure projects which are known to seriously affect health.</p> | |
| Ann Goodridge | <p>Consideration should be given to all the above factors together to determine the full impact on Hilton in terms of air quality. A full study should be made of these combined issues before stipulating the final design, including height levels of the A14 and local roads crossing it, and before stipulating mitigation measures which currently are minimal. Once the study is complete, it is recommended that the construction parameters set for the building contractors are both highly specified and evaluated regularly.</p> | <p>The air quality within Hilton is assessed within the air quality chapter of the Environmental Statement and is a full study. At 800 metres the contribution of the road to ambient pollution concentrations would be negligible. In Hilton it is the contribution from vehicles travelling directly through the village that have the greatest impacts on air quality. The air quality assessment shows some small improvements in air quality in 2035 from the proposed scheme as a result of predicted reductions in traffic in the village.</p> |
| Anne Callow | <p>Concerns regarding air quality impacts on 'Kenmore' property adjacent to Park Farm East,</p> | <p>The CoCP includes a range of measures designed to reduce dust emissions during construction to a negligible level. These mitigation measures are simple to apply (such as watering of surfaces and enclosure of dusty operations) and</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Park Farm Road, Brampton. Kenmore will directly experience significant increases in air pollution during and after the construction processes, specifically as a result of cement, dust and exhaust particulates and similar pollutants. This will be exacerbated by the volume and nature of works traffic, including excavators, HGVs, tipper lorries and similar plant. This will require more time and costs to be spent cleaning and maintaining the property. The effects will be worsened by prevailing west and south west winds and the absence of any screening on the ground between the construction site and the property.</p> | <p>have been shown to be highly effective. The Institute of Air Quality Management guidance on construction notes that with the application of these measures, significant impacts can be avoided and this would be expected in this case.</p> <p>The scheme effects along the whole scheme area and adjoining affected roads has been assessed within the air quality chapter of the Environmental Statement. The scheme does not result in any significant effects on air quality. Overall the scheme has a beneficial effect on air quality in the scheme area as vehicular pollution is removed from urban areas.</p> |
| Anne Callow | <p>WHA and Defra literature refers to the importance of air quality both as an environmental issue and a major factor in health. Reassurance is required that the adverse effects will be properly taken into account by HE and PINS with regards to mitigation, costs and prevention during construction and operation.</p> | <p>Adverse effects have been properly been taken into account by Highways England in the assessment and design of the scheme and the mitigation attached to it. The air quality chapter in the Environmental Statement assesses the predicted air quality once the scheme is operational. The UK and EU air quality objectives and limit values are used to assess the potential impact of any pollution. The objectives and limit values are health based standards which are designed to protect human and ecological health. The scheme has a beneficial impact on air quality as pollution is reduced in the main urban areas along the scheme.</p> <p>The CoCP includes a range of measures designed to reduce dust emissions during construction to a negligible level. These mitigation measures are simple</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|------------------|---|
| | | to apply (such as watering of surfaces and enclosure of dusty operations) and have been shown to be highly effective. The Institute of Air Quality Management guidance on construction notes that with the application of these measures, significant impacts can be avoided and this would be expected in this case. |

3 Biodiversity and ecological conservation

Table 2 Biodiversity and ecological conservation

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| <p>Derek Norman, Kay Norman</p> | <p>Large parts of the site that would be largely destroyed by the proposed southern railway station access road in Huntingdon contain an intricate vegetation mosaic. For considerable parts of the proposed route this contains a mixture of bramble and rose shrub mixed with young elm trees and nettles, providing food in the form of berries, nectar and other plant material, as well as shelter, to a diverse community of invertebrates, birds and mammals.</p> <p>Other parts of the proposed access route are covered by tree saplings, herbs and grasses, forming a fine mosaic further altered by numerous ant mounds and nests of solitary bees.</p> <p>The area plays an important role in connecting the main local site of international conservation importance (Port Holme) with the green spaces surrounding Huntingdon.</p> <p>The proposed scheme would reduce this corridor to much more homogenous, densely planted vegetation containing evergreen species. This would substantially lower its ecological value,</p> | <p>Highways England has followed standard published guidance for the survey and evaluation of habitats and species and has assessed the effects of these on biodiversity within chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement (ES). All of the habitats and species in the area of the access road are of only site or local ecological value and the scheme as a whole will lead to an increase of 271ha of semi-natural habitats that are better connected in the ecological network. Highways England considers the scheme to be compliant with all policies, legislation and regulations with regard to biodiversity. The approach used has been agreed with Natural England.</p> <p>Phase 1 survey of habitats</p> <p>The Phase 1 habitat survey was carried out using standard methods published in the Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey. (Joint Nature Conservation Committee, 2010). This methodology summarises stands of vegetation types. All areas of semi-natural habitats have a mosaic of habitat communities within them but for the purposes of impact assessment it is not necessary to identify every sub community unless the site supports particularly ecologically valuable habitats.</p> <p>Evaluation of value of habitats and species</p> <p>The value of ecological habitats was assessed using the methodology in guidelines for ecological impact assessment in the UK (Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM), 2006) and this area was assessed as of only site value due to the common and widespread nature of the habitats present.</p> <p>All areas of semi-natural habitat contribute to the ecological network of “stepping stone” habitats and connective features such as watercourses and hedges. The area in the vicinity of the proposed access to the railway station</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>particularly for the diverse groups of invertebrates using the existing corridor.</p> <p>The site that would be largely destroyed by the proposed southern railway station access road in Huntingdon is an important habitat for wildlife, including a number of protected red-listed species. WE have observed a range of bird species of conservation importance including <i>Turdus philomelos</i>, <i>Stumus vulgaris vulgaris</i>, <i>Passer sp.</i> And <i>Pyrrhola pyrrhola</i>. Local residents have also observed <i>Natrix natrix</i> and badgers. The proposed access road would have a strong negative impact on the local population of all these species, contradictory to environmental legislation and policy including PPS9 and objective 3 of the Huntingdon West Area Action Plan Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal Non-technical Summary Document.</p> <p>The site that would be largely destroyed by the proposed southern railway station access road in Huntingdon also supports a wide range of other noteworthy species including newts, bats, green and greater spotted woodpeckers, kestrels and a large variety of small garden and parkland birds. Although not highly protected, these species' habitats should</p> | <p>does not however represent a site within the network more than of site value. The habitats within this area do not provide a significant contribution to the conservation of Port Holme Special Area for Conservation (SAC) as this site is designated for lowland hay meadows and the habitats present in this area are ecologically very different.</p> <p>The species present in the area (including song thrush <i>Turdus philomelos</i>, common starling <i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>, sparrows <i>Passer sp.</i>, bullfinch <i>Pyrrhola pyrrhola</i>, solitary bees, newts, badgers and bats) have all been evaluated as of either site or local value and the assessment in chapter 11 of the ES (document reference 6.1) has shown there would be no significant effects on these species. There would even be a slight beneficial effect for many of these species because of the extent of mitigation for the scheme as a whole and landscape planting in this area would effectively mitigate any localised effects in this area.</p> <p>The listing of species of conservation concern (e.g. red list birds) does not afford protection to these species. Such lists are used to evaluate the value of populations of these species, but conservation concern is managed through ecological impact assessment as described in the ES. Some of the species in this area are listed on the red list because of widespread declines in their populations, but remain widespread and common and so local populations are valued at only site or local level.</p> <p>Mitigation proposals</p> <p>The landscape planting and ecological mitigation would provide a more diverse and better ecologically connected network than at present, with approx. 271ha of additional semi-natural habitats. The habitats created would be developed through detailed design, after the development consent order (if the application is granted) but would aim to provide as diverse a mosaic of habitats as possible within the constraints of the landscape screening function. In the area of the Station access road, landscape planting would provide new habitats for species.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>not be willingly destroyed (see European legislation e.g. 79/409/EEC). Highways England stated in a reply letter to the previous version of the scheme that the area of the proposed southern railway station access road in Huntingdon was “not likely to be important to foraging or commuting bats”, which stands in marked contrast to our own observations.</p> <p>Particular reference should be made to the solitary bees observed at the site of the proposed southern railway access road in Huntingdon. This species are of great ecological value especially in view of the general decline in pollinator species observed in Britain and other parts of Europe.</p> | |
| <p>Derek Norman, Kay Norman</p> | <p>The scheme appears to be in contradiction to the National Planning Policy Framework. Section 11 paragraph 109 states that ‘the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ... minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity including by establishing coherent ecological</p> | <p>Chapter 11, paragraphs 11.1.4 to 11.1.6 of the ES gives the policies that have been considered within the assessment of the scheme. The consideration of the protection afforded to protected species is detailed in Appendix 11.11 of the ES (Document reference 6.3). Appendix 11.12 of the ES (Document reference 6.3) details the assessment of implications for European sites (including Portholme SAC). The scheme is compliant with all policies, legislation and regulations regarding the ecological effects of the scheme.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|--|
| | networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures'. | |
| Joanne Worsdall | The environmental impact of such a large scheme will inevitably have negative consequences for wildlife. Any mitigation whilst welcome is only going to have a minimal impact given the scale of disruption. | Chapter 11 of the ES describes the assessment of likely significant effects on wildlife and concludes there would be a neutral or slight positive effect on most ecological features in the long term because of the extensive mitigation. The scheme would result in a net gain of approx. 271ha of semi natural habitats. |
| Dr J Patrick Doody | With regards to question 1.2.4 of the ExA's first written questions, it should be noted that the route will affect several places where there are badgers. There is no definitive map of their location but there are setts in the following locations: - TL195690 active earlier this year - TL 204697 previously active | All setts potentially affected by the scheme have been surveyed and mapped. Because of on-going abuse of badgers, definitive maps are treated as confidential. |
| Dr J Patrick Doody | With regards to question 1.2.7 of the ExA's first written questions, it should be noted that the Brampton Meadows SSSI site has suffered in the past through lack of management. This is despite agreement with the Highways Agency to provide money for restoration of transplanted turf, which was part of the mitigation when the original A14 was built destroying part of the SSSI. I have a detailed draft paper on this, which is available on request. | Chapter 11, paragraph 11.5.41 of the ES proposes the creation of "an ecological mitigation area with the planting of semi improved grassland designed to complement the adjacent SSSI enhancing the resilience and value of the existing SSSI habitat". The principal objective for the creation of an ecological mitigation area is to create a habitat as close in nature to the SSSI habitat as possible, and maintain it in the long term in a way that complements the SSSI and enhances its overall resilience. The proposals will be developed during detailed design and in consultation with Natural England. The design of the habitat creation and management would be informed by whatever information is available and Highways England would consult with Dr Doody to obtain such information. |
| Dr J Patrick Doody | With regards to question 1.9.10 of the ExA's first written questions, it should be noted that the design of the proposed scheme between Brampton Hut and Brampton Junction is of course of | The presence and flight lines of bats have been extensively surveyed and are reported in Appendix 11.8 of the ES. Chapter 11, table 11.29 of the ES concludes that the effects of lighting on bats would be neutral. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>relevance to Brampton. Lighting along a stretch of road this size and length will have implication for a variety of species. Bats will almost certainly be affected. Has any detailed assessment been made of the presence and movement of bats and other nocturnal species?</p> | |
| <p>Dr J Patrick Doody</p> | <p>Detailed information provided on the biodiversity status of the land west of Brampton biodiversity, noted from the results of 30 years of recording and surveying in the area. This includes 170 species which have been recorded within the corridor of the proposed A1/A14. Less common species noted in the area include Golden Plover, Lapwing, Moles, Yellow Hammer & Whitethroat, and Orchid.</p> | <p>The assessment of biodiversity has been reported in chapter 11 of the ES, following extensive surveys. However, Highways England would be happy to discuss this with Dr Doody to obtain any information that might help inform detailed design after the development consent order (if the application is granted) is made.</p> |

4 Design and engineering standards

Table 3 Design and engineering standards

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Derek Norman, Kay Norman | It is not clear how access to Station Cottages would be provided as part of the scheme. Clarification is required on which of the two proposed station access roads would be linked to the private road. In addition, it is not clear how safe pedestrian, cycling and vehicle access to the properties will be provided at all times. | <p>The existing access road from the station forecourt area to the cottages would not be affected permanently by the works proposed at the station. Access would be re-provided to the Station Cottages via the new Huntingdon Station forecourt access junction (i.e. northern access road) with the Mill Common Link (de trunked A14) as shown on <i>General Arrangement Drawing Huntingdon Town Centre 2 document reference 2.2</i> ; this directly replaces the existing access from Brampton Road.</p> <p>Because a separate new southern access would be provided from the new Mill Common Link to the main section of the car park, traffic passing in front of the station building and the cottage access road would be reduced, which should ease access/egress for the residents of the cottages, deliveries and refuse collection .</p> <p>The detailed design of the works within the station area and forecourt to reconfigure the drop off, parking, and bus and taxi facilities, would be developed in consultation with Network Rail and the Train Operating Companies. In doing this, the need for vehicles to access Station Cottages will be taken into account. This will include provision for pedestrian access that allows for safe and convenient access across the station area (including from the cottages) to the town centre and the existing path through Mill Common, which is a key design criterion in this area. The detailed design would take account of this.</p> |
| Joseph Brien, Ian Weitzel, Jeff Shaw | <p>Provision for incidents/accidents/road works</p> <p>In the event of an accident or road works on the proposed A14 an alternative route will be required and it is not clear how</p> | <p>Highways England has agreed strategic and tactical diversions for all sections of the national road network, including the existing A14. None of these involve the new local access roads or routes through Huntingdon.</p> <p>All diversion routes proposed for the new A14 would use existing nominated diversion routes. No changes are necessary as existing diversion routes would be used as diversion routes for the new A14.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>traffic would be re-routed. The Consultation Report refers to a “draft Operational Strategy” which identifies diversion routes in the case of incidents. It would be useful for this document to be made available and to see the predicted traffic flows when an incident has occurred.</p> <p>To divert southbound onto the A14 then eastbound on the A428 would result in gridlock.</p> <p>The proposed scheme creates a single preferred route for traffic through the Huntingdon area with limited access and exit junctions and designed to encourage the improved passage of vehicles predominantly east/west. Any incidents occurring on the proposed road would result in considerable delays for vehicles “trapped” between junctions and cause management difficulties for emergency vehicles.</p> | <p>The new A14 Huntingdon Southern Bypass would be used as part of the strategic diversion route (e.g. in the case of incident on the A1 in the Buckden Area) in place of the existing nomination of the A1198 (north of the proposed Ermine Street junction on the new A14), and the existing A14 around Godmanchester and Huntingdon. This would reduce the impact on the roads used in those existing diversion routes.</p> <p>The Local Access Road (Cambridge to Swavesey junction) and the de-trunked A14 to Huntingdon are not proposed as strategic diversion routes. There would remain a 7.5-tonne weight restriction in Huntingdon</p> <p>Dedicated maintenance and emergency accesses are proposed at Buckden Road, Conington Road on the new Huntingdon Southern Bypass and at the reconfigured Girton Interchange. These new accesses would facilitate swift emergency and maintenance access to sections of the proposed A14 route, also allowing such vehicles to return on the opposite carriageway if required.</p> <p>In the event of a full carriageway closure the scheme includes emergency slip roads at the Brampton Interchange and new A1198 junctions, which would enable traffic to be taken off the A14 Huntingdon Southern Bypass. The diversion routes employed in these circumstances would be agreed in advance and would depend on the location and severity of the incident. The strategic diversion routes for this section of the A14 would be via the A1/A428 or the A1198/A428, depending on the location of the carriageway closure.</p> <p>Additional resilience would be created by the use of tactical variable message signs (VMS) on the wider network, controlled by Highways England's Regional Control Centre. This, in combination with the extensive technology which would be provided on the A14 would assist in reducing the volume of traffic using the route in the case of an incident, and enable effective management of the traffic on the route.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Joseph Brien, David Prior, Keith Barker, Mr R D and Mrs J A Bowers</p> | <p>Queries regarding Views Common Link:</p> <p>The proposed link from the existing A14 either side of the viaduct over the B1514 Brampton Road is not necessary.</p> <p>The proposed link from the existing A14 to Hinchingsbrooke Park Road by the police Headquarters would make the existing congestion to Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Brampton Road worse and would not be an improvement. The aim should be to minimise the through traffic using Hinchingsbrooke Park Road whilst providing an additional exist from the school.</p> <p>Alternatives are suggested: <i>"It would be more sensible to have a single carriageway connection from the Spittals roundabout to near the bend in Parkway and end the dual carriageway before the Spittals roundabout. This would mean that traffic would not be driving</i></p> | <p>The proposed alternative road arrangement (linking Parkway and A14 near Spittals) would result in more traffic running further along Hinchingsbrooke Park Road past the hospital and Hinchingsbrooke School, worsening traffic conditions in this area.</p> <p>The <i>Traffic Modelling Update Report</i> June 2015, document reference HE/A14/EX/44, table 3.4, shows that the in the 2035 "with scheme" assessment the proposed Hinchingsbrooke Park Road/Views Common junction would operate at 75% of capacity in the am peak and 72% in the evening peak and Brampton Road/Hinchingsbrooke Park Road junctions would operate at 63% in the am peak and 57% in the pm peak. Hence, the proposed road layout in the Hinchingsbrooke area is considered appropriate and operating well within capacity (85% being the desirable benchmark used for design purposes.).</p> <p>The Traffic Modelling Update Report section 3 includes analysis of the Brampton Road/Edison Bell Way/Mill Common Link junction. Non-motorised users are especially important at this junction with high flows to the station and along Brampton Road toward Hinchingsbrooke School and the presence of a national cycle route, hence the design of the junction caters for these at some expense to vehicular traffic.</p> <p>With respect to the suggested alternative of routing through traffic via the A141, Ermine Street and Edison Bell Way, the route via the Views Common Link and Brampton Road is approximately 1.4km shorter than travelling via Ermine Street and Edison Bell Way, however, peak hour journey times on these two routes are forecast to be similar. Consequently, traffic would be expected to equalise between these two routes depending on the prevailing traffic conditions. Highways England's traffic model (CHARM3a) suggests that some traffic coming from the A14 to the west of Huntingdon would use the route via Ermine Street and Edison Bell Way to access the town centre and areas to the east of the town, rather than travelling via the Views Common Link and Brampton</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | <p><i>through the estate. It should allow quick access/exit for ambulances/private vehicles to the hospital. It would also provide another exit from the estate. It would allow Views common to be merged back together. The material from the removed A14 could be used to fill in the Spittalls roundabout. The dual carriageway will need to be blocked before the roundabout anyway when the viaduct is being removed. Any traffic using the old A14 from the A1 would have to go along the A141 in this situation. Any traffic wishing to continue along the old A14 would need to use Stukely Road, Ermine Street and Edison Bell Way. This would decrease the number of vehicles turning right off Brampton Road to access the station or the old A14. At present there is only space for three or four vehicles in the right turn lane and the road cannot be widened due to the railway bridge.”</i></p> <p><i>“A much simpler alternative to building the proposed Views Common Link would be to provide a short link from the</i></p> | <p>Road. This routeing has been taken into account in the operational assessments reported in the <i>Traffic Modelling Update Report</i>. Both routes would be signed from the de-trunked A14, with the route via Views Common Link and Brampton Road signed for movements towards southern Huntingdon while the route via the A141, Ermine Street and Edison Bell Way would be signed towards western and northern Huntingdon. The potential to sign through traffic towards Godmanchester on both routes will be discussed with the local highway authority, Cambridgeshire County Council.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| | <p><i>hospital to the de-trunked A14 close to the existing roundabout junction with the A141 (the Spittals Interchange). It would run from the main hospital car park area, joining the hospital road system in the north west corner of the site, pass over open land east of Hinchibrooke Business Park near the western edge of Views Common, and join the existing A14 (see attached map and aerial photograph). We believe this option should be investigated further. It would bring significant benefits whether the viaduct is demolished or not. By providing a direct link most visitors, staff, delivery lorries and ambulances to the hospital from north Huntingdon and from outside the town would be able to access the main road system quickly, rather than via the overcrowded circuitous local road network with significant benefits for both road users and residents and for the environment. This is likely to divert sufficient traffic from Hinchibrooke Park Road, its junction with Brampton Road and the overloaded Edison Bell Way/ Brampton Road Junction to</i></p> | |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| | <p><i>bring congestion here down to workable levels even with the demolition of the viaduct. Local hospital traffic and buses could continue to use Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and benefit from the overall reduction in traffic."</i></p> | |
| <p>Mr R D and Mrs J A Bowers</p> | <p><i>"If hospital traffic is diverted (as suggested in section ii above) we question the need to retain the section of the de-trunked A14 known as the Mill Common Link for other than station traffic, including buses, to help further relieve the Edison Bell Way/ Brampton Road Junction and to reduce station car park queuing. The de-trunked A14 from the east would then end in Huntingdon at the ring road via the Pathfinder Link."</i></p> | <p>The proposed Mill Common link from the de-trunked A14 would improve connectivity to the existing Huntingdon local road network for traffic travelling west towards north-west Huntingdon and south towards Hinchingsbrooke and Brampton, avoiding the need to use the Huntingdon inner ring road.</p> <p>Removing the section of the Mill Common Link from the Pathfinder Link to Brampton Road would increase the volume of traffic using the Pathfinder Link and the Huntingdon town centre ring road. As set out in the <i>Transport Assessment and Traffic Modelling Updated Report</i>, it is estimated that removing this link would triple peak hour traffic flows on the Pathfinder Link in the design year of 2035 to around 3,000 vehicles per hour (2-way), while peak hour traffic flows through the Ring Road / Pathfinder Link junction would more than double. In order to accommodate traffic increases of this magnitude, both the Pathfinder Link and the Ring Road / Pathfinder Link junction would need to be significantly expanded, increasing the impact of the scheme on Mill Common. It would also put greater pressure on the town centre ring road, which is already busy at peak times and would do little to improve the operation of the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction, as around 70% of the diverted traffic would still need to pass through this junction.</p> <p>The proposed route would also be an important link for local traffic from Godmanchester wishing to travel north on the A1. The Mill Common Link would form part of this route and without this such traffic would have to traverse the ring road, a less direct route, adding inconvenience to all road users.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|--|
| <p>Ian Weitzel</p> | <p><i>There is a lack of detail on the layout of some of the junctions, including Ellington and Buckden. They appear complex and hazardous to road users. Issues are also raised with the routings – it appears to be impossible for northbound traffic on the A14 to join the new A14 in an easterly direction. In addition, the proposed road has few exit routes.</i></p> | <p>The <i>General Arrangement Plans</i> (document reference 2.2) are indicative drawings and do not show details of items like road markings because at the scale presented they would not be legible, would clutter the drawing and would provide detail which is not necessary at this stage.</p> <p>However, Highways England can confirm that the junctions in question would have clearly marked lane arrows and the appropriate amount of signage required by design standards.</p> <p>The proposed layout uses standard highway junction types combined to form the most effective network in this area, making use for instance of the existing infrastructure present at the Brampton Hut junction. The use of the existing Brampton Hut junction provides a cost effective solution for the small amount of traffic on the A1 northbound wishing to join the A14 eastbound (noting that strategic long distance traffic from the A1 south would likely use the A428 instead,). Highways England's latest traffic forecasts contained within the Traffic Modelling Update Report suggest that fewer than 700 vehicles per day would make the movement from A1 northbound to the A14 eastbound at Brampton Hut. This equates to less than 2% of the traffic on this section on the A1. This avoids making this junction an even more complex layout with additional slip roads and associated increased environmental impact.</p> <p>Highways England considers that the proposed layouts are not "hazardous" as the design process, including compliance with design standards and reviews, ensures this. The scheme design shown on the <i>General Arrangement Plans</i> has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit in accordance with Highways England's design standard HD19/03 'Road Safety Audit', whereby the design is appraised by an independent team. Cambridgeshire County Council have also contributed to this process, especially in relation to the side roads, having been involved in discussions on items raised in the audit and potential changes to the</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---|--|---|
| | | <p>design to address them. In accordance with standards. Further audits would be undertaken on the detailed design, prior to opening and post opening.</p> <p>As detailed in section 2 of the <i>Case for the Scheme (document reference 7.1)</i>, the proposed A14 deliberately has few 'exit routes' as too many junctions, too closely spaced, are one of the sources of accidents and congestion with the existing A14.</p> |
| Ian Weitzel | <p><i>The relationship between the scheme and the Ellington / Fen Drayton project and the two projects to improve the route between the M1 junction 13 and the Black Cat roundabout on the A14 need to be considered. More joined up thinking is needed.</i></p> | <p>Improvements to the single carriageway section of the A428 between Black Cat and Caxton Gibbet were identified by Government in the Roads Investment Strategy which was published in the Autumn 2014 Statement. This scheme will be progressed as quickly as possible subject to it demonstrating value for money and passing through its own statutory process.</p> <p>The A14 and A428 schemes do not, however, rely on each other for the justification of each separate scheme, neither does one remove the need for the other. Initial analysis suggests that while there may be some transfer of traffic from the A14 corridor to the A428 corridor, this is not very much. The scheme is doing a different job and catering for different traffic needs. The A14 will continue to be the main strategic route between the east coast ports and the Midlands/ the North.</p> |
| Ian Weitzel, Jeff Shaw, Stewart Bottoms, Trevor Lee | <p>Alternatives regarding the A428</p> <p>The dualling of the A428 between St Neots and Caxton Gibbet would relieve some congestion on the A14 and be a much simpler and cheaper scheme.</p> <p>Develop the A428 by completing the dual carriageway from Girton</p> | <p>Improvements to the single carriageway section of the A428 between Black Cat and Caxton Gibbet were identified by Government in the Roads Investment Strategy which was published in the Autumn 2014 Statement. This scheme will be progressed as quickly as possible subject to it demonstrating value for money and passing through its own statutory process.</p> <p>The A14 and A428 schemes do not, however, rely on each other for the justification of each separate scheme, neither does one remove the need for the other. Initial analysis suggests that while there may be some transfer of traffic from the A14 corridor to the A428 corridor, this is not very much. The scheme is doing a different job and catering for different traffic needs. The A14 will</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>to St Neots, and introduce a St Neots bypass south of the Little Barford power station, crossing the A1 at the current A1/A421 junction. This would create a shorter and more direct route to the motorway network for HGV traffic joining the motorway network at M1/J13.</p> <p>Improve access onto the M11 for traffic to and from the west by introducing a spur road connecting the A428 with the M11.</p> <p>The scheme should include widening of the A1 from the wider section to the west of Huntingdon to the south of the Black Cat roundabout and continuing the A428 as a dual carriageway to meet the A1 at St Neots.</p> <p>The remaining section of the A428 should be developed into a dual carriageway, as long as it is mainly kept to its current alignment. This would be a direct route for traffic travelling on the A14 from Felixstowe and Newmarket towards the A1 – without having to negotiate Girton</p> | <p>continue to be the main strategic route between the east coast ports and the Midlands/ the North.</p> <p>Widening the A428 sits alongside the the A14 scheme, however it does not serve the same function as the A14 scheme nor remove the need for it.</p> <p>Whilst it is not proposed as part of the Scheme to provide connections at Girton Interchange between the A428 eastbound and the A14 westbound or M11 southbound, M11 northbound and A428 westbound, the Scheme does not preclude the future provision of works to provide these movements. For details of possible future solutions separate from the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Scheme and an explanation as to why the Scheme does not provide these movements, refer to question 1.5.9 in Highways England's <i>Response to the First Written Questions Report 5: Design and Engineering Standards</i> HE/A14/EX/32.</p> <p>Widening the A1 was considered in 2012 as part of <i>the A14 Study Options Recommended for Further Assessment</i> as part of the <i>A14 Study</i>, explained in the <i>Case for the Scheme</i> Package reference K therein considered the benefits of widening the A428 and A1 along a strategic route as far as St Neots. The Package performed badly in the strategic and economic case and on that basis, it was removed from further consideration.</p> <p>Feasibility studies into the removal of the remaining at-grade junctions on the A1 have also been announced by government as part of the nationwide Road Investment Strategy.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>and Spittals interchanges. For traffic wishing to travel further west, then there is the alternative of the A421 through to the M1.</p> | |
| <p>J A Thomas, Joanne Worsdall</p> | <p>The route was selected 15 years ago and traffic patterns have changed since. The routing exercise should be re-done to properly assess the option of a road line to the north of Huntingdon.</p> <p>This scheme is based on CHUMMS work that is out of date and needs to be reconsidered.</p> | <p>The Cambridge to Huntingdon Multi-Modal Study (CHUMMS) was a strategic study commissioned to consider the wider needs of transport in the Cambridge to Huntingdon Corridor.</p> <p>The key time sensitive issues of traffic modelling and analysis have been completely revised and brought up to date, reflecting current travel patterns in the area and considering future developments. For further details of this work refer to the <i>Transport Assessment</i> (DCO document reference 7.2) and the subsequent <i>Traffic Modelling Update Report</i> (document reference HE/A14/EX/44, issued June 2015)</p> <p>The A14 Study options reports, developed in 2012, reappraised the CHUMMS Strategy by looking at the whole area and assessing the potential improvements that could be made to the transport network. This included public transport and rail packages as well as highway proposals.</p> <p>A northern bypass ("Package F") for Huntingdon was considered in this study but rejected on the grounds of poor performance across a range of indicators, especially environmental effects.</p> <p>The study concluded with recommending "Option 7", a package of highway proposals, including a three lane Huntingdon Southern Bypass. "Option 7" has been developed into the proposed scheme as per the DCO application. Further details of the history of the scheme can be found in section 4 of the <i>Case for the Scheme</i> (DCO document reference 7.1)</p> |
| <p>Chris and Lynn Slater</p> | <p>Why is the elevation of the proposed road so high?</p> | <p>The highway alignments have been designed with a consideration of the environmental impacts of the scheme whilst providing a safe, cost-effective, and</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|------------------|--|
| | | <p>practicable solution. The height of the alignment above the existing landscape has been minimised, keeping it as low as possible, subject to the following constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watercourses –alignments must be at a suitable height above existing watercourses/drainage channels. This is necessary to preserve the function of this significant part of the local land drainage system and maintain its connectivity. In determining the height of the alignments, allowance has been made for factors including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the size of culverts – noting current requirements for design storms; ○ climate change allowance; and ○ including freeboard above maximum water level – the thickness of structures and the depth of new road pavement. • Carriageway drainage - alignment height is governed by the requirements of the carriageway drainage system and pavement design, including compliance with current design standards <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)</i> and in particular <i>Volume 4 - Section 2, Volume 6 and Volume 7</i>. The height of the alignment is required to provide effective drainage to the foundation layers of the pavement. This is required for the longevity of the pavement and to provide sufficient height and falls to achieve outfalls by gravity. The alternative to a gravity system would be pumped outfalls. Pumped outfalls are fundamentally undesirable as these would be an ongoing maintenance and operation risk. Pumped outfalls would incur running costs and would require monitoring and more frequent maintenance than a gravity outfall. Additionally, notwithstanding the inclusion of multiple or backup systems, pumped outfalls have some risk of failure with a potential for flooding of the new roads. • Side road crossings – generally existing side roads are maintained where they cross the A14 or A1 mainlines, closing roads not being an option unless there is a reasonably convenient alternative. For |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>crossings, with the side roads being a lower design speed than the mainline A14 or A1, to conform to standards it is generally preferable to take the side road over the main carriageway. This is because tighter crest curves can be used which limits the extent of the embankment required. This reduces both the embankment's environmental effect and also the amount of fill material used. The height of the side road crossings is determined by the height of the mainline carriageway (noting the other factors described in this response), headroom in accordance with the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i> (DMRB) and allowance for the depth of the structure (noting the form of the structure, length of span(s)). In the design for the DCO application, to allow for flexibility in development of the detailed design, headroom of 5.7m has been used rather the minimum of 5.3m specified in standards (<i>DMRB, TD 27/05 Cross-Sections and Headrooms</i>).</p> <p>As per the first sentence of para 1, above, by keeping embankments as low as practicable the environmental impacts are minimised. To mitigate the impact of the scheme landscape bunds are provided adjacent to the road in order to integrate the scheme into the landscape especially when viewed from adjoining settlements. Chapter 10 of the <i>Environmental Statement</i> (document reference 6.1) provides more detail on the measures Highways England have taken to minimise the visual impact of the scheme.</p> |
| Keith Barker | <p>Alternative proposals: <i>"2. Retain the road between the Spittals and Godmanchester interchanges, including the viaduct. In order to ensure that it is used only by light vehicles, as set out in the Public Notice, there should be a fixed height restriction of 1.9m and gross vehicle weight restriction of two</i></p> | <p>With regard to Alternative proposal 2, various scheme options including the retention of the Huntingdon viaduct, downgraded to a single carriageway, were considered in the 2012 A14 Study. Options including this proposal performed poorly and were rejected.</p> <p>The reasons for the removal of the viaduct have been set out in Highways England's responses to Examining Authority question 1.7.9. In summary, removal of the viaduct:</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | <p><i>tonnes between the two interchanges. Also, to reduce further the impact on the viaduct, a speed restriction of 30 mph should be imposed over the viaduct itself. This proposal should save at least £1 million from the overall A14 construction costs.</i></p> <p><i>3. As proposal 2 but with a link into the Huntingdon town centre ring road at Mill Common. This link should be given priority direction at the junction with the former A14. In this case, the west bound height and weight restrictions would apply immediately west of the junction with the former A14.</i></p> <p><i>4. Obliterate all traces of the road between the Spittals and Godmanchester interchanges. All the land released should be returned to the local council. A short spur, for emergency vehicles only, should be constructed from west of the Spittals interchange to the northwest corner of the hospital complex where the A & E department is situated. This would give the hospital its best connection with the surrounding</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supports Huntingdon District Council's strategic regeneration objectives, as articulated in the West Area Action Plan, as well as enhancing the character of the Huntingdon Conservation Area; • would improve air quality in the town as a consequence of the redirection of strategic traffic to the new bypass; • enable improved road connections within the town, to the existing link roads, notably to the railway station, and also to the hospital and secondary school for those travelling from Godmanchester; • improves accessibility of the town for local travellers; <p>Furthermore,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • due to continued use by strategic traffic, its retention would not resolve congestion at Brampton Hut and Spittals Interchange; • there is an ongoing annual maintenance cost of £342,000 whilst the viaduct remains; and • the economic life of the existing viaduct is ten years only in its current use, due to anticipated increased traffic requiring widening which could only be achieved through demolition and rebuild. This would require additional land take in an urban area. <p>The <i>Case for the Scheme</i> also explains the development of the scheme, and why the chosen route has been selected.</p> <p>With regard to Alternative 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative Proposal 3 includes Alternative Proposal 2 but with the addition of a link into Huntingdon town centre ring road at Mill Common. This option by retaining the viaduct would not meet the regeneration objectives of Huntingdon District Council and would still entail the annual maintenance costs of the Huntingdon viaduct. As the general principle of the option is similar to Proposal 2, the performance in the metrics used in the A14 Study and the poor performance would similarly apply. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | <p><i>road network compared with anything currently available. 5. As proposal 4 but with the link from the Godmanchester interchange to Mill Common retained.”</i></p> | <p>With regard to Alternative 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete removal of the A14 would not bring the benefits in terms of improved access to Huntingdon town centre that the proposed scheme does. In particular, traffic from the east would still have to pass through Godmanchester and so such a solution would not bring the benefits to the travelling public and inhabitants of Godmanchester that the proposed scheme does. The proposed scheme balances environmental impacts and local access needs. <p>With regard to Alternative 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst provision of a link at Mill Common to the Ring Road, similar to that in the proposed scheme, would afford improved local access from the east, the lack of similar link in this alternative would then not bring the improvements to local access, especially to the Hinchingbrooke area and the hospital and school, that the Views Common Link in the DCO scheme brings. |
| <p>Joanne Worsdall</p> | <p>The scheme will increase severance of existing villages from the surrounding villages. New rights of way are welcomed, however they should be open to all non-motorised users to maximise availability to walkers, cyclists, and horse riders with appropriate surfaces.</p> | <p>The scheme would provide significant additional linkages for local vehicular traffic between villages as a new local access road would be provided alongside the A14 corridor from Dry Drayton to Girton. The provision of the new local access road would ensure that local traffic and strategic traffic use appropriate roads, and that traffic making local trips would not need to travel on the A14.</p> <p>Additionally, a shared equestrian, cycle, pedestrian facility, segregated from the carriageway would be provided between Fenstanton and Huntingdon Road, Girton. This non-motorised user (NMF) facility would link Fenstanton, Swavesey, Bar Hill, Dry Drayton and Girton. This new NMF facility is intended to link a number of existing bridleways and footpaths and provide a link between</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Cambridge, Girton, Bar Hill, Swavesey and Fenstanton to enable travel on foot, by bicycle or on horseback.</p> <p>New bridges would be provided for non-motorised users at Bar Hill and Swavesey to enable links between villages, developments and the non-motorised user facility on the local access road. NMU paths would be provided on most of the new road bridges over the A14, and controlled toucan crossings would be provided at key junctions, such as on the local access road at Bar Hill, at Histon junction, and across new road links in Huntingdon. A number of new bridleways would be provided in the vicinity of the Girton junction and bridleway 28/19 (Brampton Woods), footpaths 28/2 and 28/15, West End, Grafham Road, Brampton Hut Services and Brampton would all be reconnected by the proposed scheme.</p> <p>All of these facilities would be provided, amongst other objectives, to reduce severance created by the A14, and to provide connectivity for communities, developments and other destinations</p> <p>Surfaces would, in each case, be appropriate for the intended usage. New bridleways would have generally a loose compacted surface to enable comfortable use by equestrians. The equestrian track alongside the local access road would include a grass verge which equestrians could use if desired, at the rear of the metalled path provided for pedestrians and cyclists. Shared pedestrians/cycle facilities would have metalled surfaces, generally.</p> |
| Joanne Worsdall | The blocking off of existing access points for traffic will involve longer journeys for local people and bring more vehicles through villages as they are forced to detour. E.g. preventing access to the A1 and A14 from the Grafham Road. This needs to | <p>Grafham Road is a minor unclassified road. To improve the safety and allow free flowing traffic on the major roads, existing minor junctions have been removed throughout the length of the scheme from the A1 and A14. For more details on the need for this, refer to sections 2 and 3 of the <i>Case for the Scheme</i> (DCO document reference 7.1)</p> <p>Specific provision is being made to cater for the needs of local farms that are the main users of Grafham Road junction.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>be re-considered. Particularly the closure of the existing A14 near Fenstanton, which forces local traffic to use parallel local roads that do not connect to the new A14.</p> | <p>The existing A14 near Fenstanton is being retained as a dual carriageway and traffic will continue to use this route for local access, whilst strategic traffic is diverted onto the new Huntingdon Southern Bypass.</p> |
| <p>Jeff Shaw</p> | <p>The scheme should provide a local access road parallel to the A14 from J31 – J34.</p> | <p>The offline Local Access Road to the west of Girton Interchange is proposed to provide an alternative access to the numerous properties and land plots which are to have their access directly from the A14 carriageway removed as part of this scheme. There are currently no direct accesses to the mainline carriageway of the Cambridge Northern Bypass (Junctions 31 to 34). Further, there are numerous existing constraints to both the north and south of the A14 (including numerous developments, Cambridge Science Park, Impington lake, Milton landfill site). Providing such a solution would require demolition of numerous properties and provision of numerous costly structures. This would have significant environmental impact and would be prohibitively costly and therefore is not considered to be feasible.</p> |
| <p>Chris Graveling</p> | <p>Queries regarding the need for the bridge over the route for the A14 and the B1040. The removal of this bridge would reduce the through traffic at Hilton and make the B1040 a safer road. The bridge is not required as there is already an eastbound exit onto the A14 from Hilton via the Fenstanton Road.</p> | <p>The B1040 (Potton Road) provides Hilton with direct access to and from the existing A14 which is proposed to be de-trunked.</p> <p>The Huntingdon Southern Bypass would significantly reduce traffic from the de-trunked A14, leaving it open for local traffic. The additional capacity on the A14 would allow traffic that is currently using alternative routes to divert back onto the A14. The Traffic Update report (June 2015 document reference <i>HE/A14/EX/44</i>) shows minimal changes to the traffic on Potton Road, increasing by 3% from 7,700 to 7,900 vehicles per day in 2020 and by 5% from 8,800 to 9,200 vehicles per day in 2035 (see Tables 2.9 and 2.10).</p> <p>Removal of the B1040 bridge would force all local traffic onto Hilton Road which is a less suitable unclassified route, with narrower carriageway and verges, tighter bends and overhanging vegetation. Hilton Road is forecast to have a traffic flow of 600 vehicles per day in 2020 with the scheme and 800 vehicles</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>per day in 2035 with the scheme (rounded to nearest 100), however if the B1040 Potton Road traffic was forced to detour onto Hilton road this would increase the number of vehicles using the road by 1400% from 600 to 8,300 vehicles per day in 2020 with the scheme and from 800 to 10,000 vehicles per day in 2035 with the scheme. Given the nature of Hilton Road such increase in traffic would increase journey times, be a less reliable route and also detrimental to road safety.</p> <p>Moreover, there would be significant impact to Non-Motorised Users (NMUs) as Potton Road provides access over the A14 for NMUs on the realigned Footpath Hemingford Grey 10, as well as those using Potton Road itself. Removal of the B1040 Potton Road overbridge would sever this link and NMUs would be forced to make a lengthy diversion to Hilton Road.</p> <p>The construction of the A14 severs access between fields for local farmers. The realigned B1040 would provide new access to farmers' lands adjacent to Potton Road. If Potton overbridge were to be removed from the scheme, farming activities in the area would be hindered by forcing farmers to make a diversion over Hilton Road and across West Brook to gain access to the land.</p> <p>Hence, given the factors above, it is not appropriate to remove the proposed Potton Road bridge.</p> |
| Alan Farrow | The proposed Girton Interchange does not allow traffic from the west along the A428 to access with the M11 or the northbound section of the A14. Consideration should be given to directing traffic from the west to the Histon/Impington roundabout on the A14, from where it would turn | This is an option that will be considered during the detailed design stage after the development consent order is made (if the application is granted). It could be delivered within the limits of deviation of the Development Consent Order as it would just be signage that is required. However, further consideration of the risk of confusing drivers would also have to be undertaken before a decision is made whether or not to adopt this idea. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>back along the westbound carriageway a short distance to allow traffic to use the existing turn to the M11 southwards and the A14 northwards.</p> | |
| <p>Simon Norton</p> | <p>There are two alternative options that should be considered. One is described as “do minimum”, while the other is based on downsizing the scheme as proposed.</p> <p>Both options include suggestions discussed in Cambridge Campaign for Better Transport’s response to the 2012 A14 Challenge Consultation.</p> | <p>The respondent suggests two alternative routes. One alternative is described as a ‘do minimum’ scheme which retains the A14 on its current alignment with no widening. The second alternative would provide no widening of the A14 east of Bar Hill, 3 lane dual carriageway between Bar Hill and the A1198 and 2 lane dual carriageway between A1198 and the A1.</p> <p>Both alternatives would additionally involve improvement works to different transport modes including rail improvements between Felixstowe and Nuneaton and provision of a coach service from Cambridge to Rugby. The alternative options would require additional works on the local road network including further provision for non-motorised users and introducing another movement at Girton for traffic to link between M11 and A428.</p> <p>The Cambridge to Huntingdon Multi-Modal Study (CHUMMS) was a strategic study commissioned to consider the wider needs of transport in the Cambridge to Huntingdon Corridor.</p> <p>The A14 Study options reports, developed in 2012, reappraised the CHUMMS Strategy by looking at the whole area and assessing the potential improvements that could be made to the transport network. This included public transport and rail packages as well as highway proposals.</p> <p>The alternative options would not provide the required traffic flow capacity on the A14 as the number of lanes would be less than required for the forecast traffic volumes. Consequently these alternatives would fail to meet the scheme objective of combatting congestion and unlocking growth, as set out in the <i>Case for the Scheme</i>, document reference 7.1.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|------------------|--|
| | | <p>Section 4 of document reference 7.1 (<i>Case for the Scheme</i>) provides a summary of the identification and selection process that led to the scheme, as set out within the draft DCO application, being selected from the array of possible options. It explains the process used to arrive at the preferred solution and how this has been guided by an examination of the identified issues and objectives, as well as the comments and responses received from the public and other consultees through multiple rounds of consultation. It sets out options considered and how these have informed and evolved the scheme. It explains the considerations that have been given to different transport mode options in order to meet the identified needs of the A14 corridor.</p> |

5 Development Consent Order

Table 4 Development Consent Order

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Ilan Weitzel | <p>There has been a growing sense of unease regarding the role of Highways England.</p> <p><i>“To say that they act as Judge and Jury would seem to be rather understating the case. They exist to build roads – hence all their decisions result in plans to build roads!”</i></p> | <p>Highways England is a Government-owned company established in accordance with section 1 of the Infrastructure Act 2015. As such Highways England is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network. Highways England carries out its duties in accordance with the licence granted by the Secretary of State for Transport (DfT, April 2015). This includes ensuring the effective operation of the network including maintenance, resilience, renewal and replacement of the network in conformity with the principles of sustainable development.</p> <p>Highways England's statutory predecessor the Highways Agency submitted the DCO application to the Planning Inspectorate. Highways England is therefore the ‘applicant’ for the DCO and the appointed Examining Authority will make a recommendation regarding the application to the Secretary of State within three months of the end of the six month examination period. The Secretary of State then has three months to make his independent decision on whether to grant or refuse development consent.</p> |
| Ilan Weitzel | <p>The consultation process selectively limits the area in which consultation takes place and information is distributed. Responses are sought using skilfully worded questionnaires that only allow polarised replies.</p> <p>Highways England ensure that the consultation <i>“catchment areas will persuade the majority to vote in favour of themselves and condemn those in the</i></p> | <p>Highways England undertook a statutory consultation process in accordance with the Planning Act 2008. This included consultation with the local community. The geographical area of the community consultation on the proposed scheme was an extensive one. It extended between Cambridge and Huntingdon, covering areas where the current A14 exists and where the new A14 is proposed. This covers a range of areas as listed in paragraph 3.4.9 of the <i>Consultation Report</i> (document reference 5.1). This is considered the appropriate area for consultation as defined in the Planning Act 2008 as the <i>“people living in the vicinity of the land”</i> (s47 1)).</p> <p>The approach to consultation was documented in the <i>Statement of Community Consultation</i>, which was reviewed by the hosting local authorities.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| | <p><i>minority to have their lives blighted without compensation... this Planning Inspection remains the only means by which the minority may express their views with a hope to having them heard."</i></p> | <p>Highways England took into account all consultation feedback that was received in response to the statutory consultation process. This included questionnaires, emails and letters as reported in Appendix E of the <i>Consultation Report</i>.</p> |
| <p>Margaret Shardlow</p> | <p>Have the relevant details from the Hilton Village Design Statement (2006) and the Parish Plan been taken into account in the planning process.</p> <p>Vehicular traffic on the B1040 was a main issue raised in both documents. There are ongoing concerns regarding the increase in traffic flows, especially the number of HGVs. Steps should be taken to alleviate the effects both during and after construction.</p> <p>In light of this, there is an urgent request to study the Parish Plan and the Hilton Village Design Statement.</p> | <p>Highways England has considered the proposed scheme against national policy and adopted and emerging local development plans, prepared by local planning authorities. This is reported in Chapter 6 of the <i>Case for the Scheme</i> (document reference 7.1). This does not include the Hilton Village Design Statement and the Parish Plan.</p> <p>Highways England has, however, considered impacts on the B1040, as reported in the <i>Transport Assessment</i> (document reference 7.2) and the Response to the Examining Authority's first written questions (see response to question 1.12.33, Report 12 Transportation and Traffic document reference HE/A14/EX/39). In addition, Highways England's <i>Response to Relevant Representations</i> (document reference HE/A14/EX/25) responds to concerns regarding HGVs through villages in table 13.5. It explains that the main contractors for constructing the scheme will each prepare a traffic management plan, in consultation with the local planning authorities, which will describe the traffic management, safety and control measures proposed during construction.</p> |
| <p>Mark Stanton</p> | <p>Concerns that Highways England chose to submit the Development Consent Order (DCO) application without possessing all of the relevant traffic modelling information.</p> | <p>Highways England considers that sufficient information was provided with the application when submitted. Further, an extensive, fully compliant, statutory pre-application consultation process was undertaken by Highways England ensuring information was openly available to the public and other stakeholders.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>The submission of the DCO application effectively triggered the start of the examination timetable and imposed unreasonable time constraints on the Examining Authority (ExA) and interested parties to assess the revised traffic modelling data.</p> <p>In order to understand the implications of the data and raise concerns to the ExA, members of the public would need more time to assess the data compared to councils and professionals.</p> <p><i>“HE’s delays may well deny other interested parties the right to raise such concerns for due consideration. It may well have already denied other interested parties the right to consult on important issues with HE before they finalised the DCO application.</i></p> <p><i>I respectfully ask the ExA to reject the DCO application now and ask HE to resubmit when they are in a position to disclose</i></p> | <p>The nature of the Examination is such that there are several opportunities for interested parties to comment on matters, including traffic modelling, prior to any decision being made on the DCO application. Indeed, the Examination timetable allows for further traffic modelling information to be submitted by Highways England and allows interested parties reasonable time to consider and comment on this, such as has been done with Highways England's Traffic Modelling Update Report (document reference HE/A14/EX/44). As such, Highways England considers that all parties will have adequate time and opportunity to consider the traffic modelling data before the end of the Examination.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| | <p><i>all relevant information for consideration for the full amount of time set out in the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and after allowing for a period of due consultation if necessary”.</i></p> | |
| <p>Godfrey Williams</p> | <p>Highways England have awarded contracts for constructing the new A14 be awarded when the ExA are in the process of consultation and a final decision on the application is yet to be made.</p> | <p>Highways England appreciates that consent for the scheme has not been granted, however the appointment of contractors for the detailed design and construction stages is important in order to ensure the project would be able to proceed to time and budget if consent is granted.</p> |
| <p>Michael Laughton</p> | <p><i>“Highways England have not carried out their role impartially and with honesty and have cut corners to meet the house building and freight lobbies. I refer you to the recent press statements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>The Huntingdon Flyover has many years of use left in it</i> - <i>The new A14 is going to create congestion on the de-trunked A14</i> - <i>The whole of the road transport up- grading in the area needs to be looked at again in the</i> | <p>The design of the scheme has been informed by several consultation processes including the statutory pre-application consultation process. Highways England took into account all feedback received in response to the statutory consultation process, including feedback from statutory consultees, interest groups and the public. This resulted in the refinement of the scheme, with several changes to the design as reported in the <i>Consultation Report</i> (document reference 5.1).</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| | <p><i>light of an urgent need to up-grade the A428</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>No proper reasons have been given by the Highways Agency as to why the existing A14 cannot be managed and improved without the need for a £1.5 billion price tag for effectively 12 miles of new road</i> - <i>The HA have never told Hilton why the new A14 needs to be so close to the village I understand your role will not come without its fair share of political pressure but surely the old traditional criteria of `value for money' must appear somewhere in the planning process ?”</i> | |

6 Economic and social effects

Table 5 Economic and social effects

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Stewart Bottoms | Suggests that the proposed route should pass close to businesses in order to enhance businesses and manufacturing in the area. It is considered that the route is far from the centres of businesses in St Neots, St Ives and Huntingdon. Suggests that links with Peterborough are ignored. | The development of the scheme is set out in section 4 of the <i>Case for the Scheme, document reference 7.1</i> and explains how the alignment of the proposed route has evolved over a long period of time and results from the outcomes of a number of studies and consultations, taking into account the urban areas that exist across the region. The route responds to the objectives of the scheme and reflects, as far as is practical, the views of the public expressed through non-statutory and statutory consultations. The development of the scheme is set out in section 4 of the <i>Case for the Scheme, document reference 7.1</i> . This document also explains how the Scheme meets one of its core objectives of unlocking growth (both in housing and employment terms) in the East Anglian region. Chapter 16 of the <i>Environmental Statement (document reference 16.1)</i> also explains the socio-economic impacts of the Scheme, summarising that the local economy of the region would benefit, including as a result of the creation of approximately 800 to 1,600 additional jobs in the region during construction. |
| Stewart Bottoms | Limited points of access demonstrate that the proposal is "no more than a Trans-Cambridgeshire By- Pass that will satisfy the road hauliers' self-interest and little more." | As the <i>Case for the Scheme</i> explains, one of the objectives of the scheme is to put the right traffic on the right road; providing an efficient trunk road for strategic traffic wishing to pass through the region and a local access road together with a de-trunked section of the existing A14 providing for local traffic movement. The scheme would improve connectivity for local communities whilst improving safety and reducing congestion on the trunk road by the removal of direct accesses. |
| Stewart Bottoms | Investment should be focused on alternative transport modes which are more sustainable and long term than a road. | Section 4 of the <i>Case for the Scheme (document reference 7.1)</i> sets out the development of the scheme and options considered. It refers to the Cambridge to Huntingdon Multi Modal Study (CHUMMS) and confirms the actions that were taken, including improvements to the rail network to better serve freight needs and public transport. The proposed scheme represents the one remaining recommendation of the CHUMMS study that has yet to be actioned. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>The development of the Scheme has also involved extensive work with Non-Motorised User Groups has taken place and is ongoing with representative groups to provide for this mode of transport. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A shared NMU facility for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians, segregated from the carriageway, is provided adjacent to the Local Access Road (the LAR NMU facility). This links existing facilities between Cambridge City Centre and Huntingdon Road, south of the Girton junction and extends continuously for around 12 km to link to existing facilities at Fenstanton. • Restoration of bridleway links between Brampton and the west side of A1/A14 to Brampton Woods and Grafham Water, making use of grade separation provided for the A14/A1 Brampton highway junction. • Provision of an NMU link from Brampton Hut services across A14 to Woolley Road on the west side of A1, all of which are represented in the DCO application General Arrangement Drawings. <p>While ports play an important part in the transport of goods, inland waterways cannot realistically provide the required capacity to move goods inland. The CHUMMS study took a holistic review to the problems of the A14 corridor; the outputs included rail, road and public transport solution. More detail on this is provided in document 7.1, the <i>Case for the Scheme</i>.</p> |
| Ian Weitzel, Sara Partridge | There are more viable and cost effective ways to achieve the objectives of the scheme. | The development of the scheme is set out in section 4 of the <i>Case for the Scheme, document reference 7.1</i> . This sets out how a wide range of options was refined over a prolonged period of time, resulting in the scheme as set out within the Development Consent Order application. The economic case is set out at section 5 of the Case for the Scheme. |
| Joanne Worsdall, Michael Laughton, Chris and Lynn Slater, Sara Partridge | <p>Concerns regarding value for money for the A14 scheme.</p> <p>Poor value for money considering that there is still a</p> | The development of the scheme is set out in section 4 of the <i>Case for the Scheme, document reference 7.1</i> . This sets out how a wide range of options was refined over a prolonged period of time, resulting in the scheme as set out within the Development Consent Order application. The economic case is set |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>national deficit and the length of the road is effectively only 12 miles.</p> <p>Highways England have not provided suitable reasoning as to why the existing A14 cannot be managed and improved without the need for a £1.5 billion price tag.</p> <p>It is understood that the average journey time saving is less than one minute for the new road – “a farcical amount to justify spending billions of pounds.”</p> <p>There is a need to ensure value for money, especially with the proposed upgrade of the A428</p> | <p>out at section 5 of the Case for the Scheme and demonstrates that the scheme has high value for money.</p> <p>The reasons for selection of the proposed route over an option that retained the existing A14 and the retention of the viaduct at Huntingdon are explained in Highways England's response to the Examining Authority's first written questions, question, question 1.7.9 (document HE/A14/EX/34) submitted on 15 June 2015.</p> <p>One of the objectives of the scheme is to address the issues of congestion and reliability currently experienced by users of the A14. The proposed scheme achieves this by separating strategic and local traffic; strategic traffic making use of the A14 and local traffic making use of the de-trunked section of the A14, together with the new local access road. This reduction in congestion will result in journey time savings over and above a comparison between existing and proposed routes in their free flowing state.</p> <p>The Roads Investment Strategy published as part of the Autumn Statement of 2014 confirmed a Government commitment to upgrading the remaining single carriageway section of the A428 subject to such a scheme offering value for money and proceeding through statutory processes. This scheme, which is the subject of a feasibility study, would sit alongside the A14 improvement and not replace the need for the A14 scheme as the road caters for different traffic movements. The A14 and A428 schemes do not, however, rely on each other for the justification of each separate scheme, neither does one remove the need for the other.</p> |
| Ian Weitzel, Trevor Lee | <p>The proposed scheme should be rejected on cost grounds alone. The Government should prioritise and action other matters such as reducing the national deficit, funding</p> | <p>The economic case is set out in section 5 of the <i>Case for the Scheme, document reference 7.1</i> and concludes that the Scheme has a high value for money. In calculating benefits, use has been made of recognised good practice methods. This document also sets out the development of the Scheme, which has considered multi modal options for the Cambridge to</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>education, health, pension, immigration and welfare commitments, and making drivers pay for unnecessary accidents and breakdowns.</p> <p>This will help reduce the overpopulation and thus congestion.</p> <p>“Any “economic benefits” cited has to be regarded with deep suspicion as to the parameters used to measure it.”</p> | <p>Huntingdon corridor, and has concluded that the proposed Scheme is the remaining best method for meeting the scheme objectives.</p> |
| <p>Chris and Lynn Slater</p> | <p>Queried the requirement for the new road.</p> <p>Considering the need for public spending cuts, it would be prudent to improve the flow of traffic at Huntingdon roundabout and Girton Interchange at first instance. The flows of traffic could then be monitored following the improvements, and assessments could then determine if a new road is required at all.</p> | <p>The objectives of the scheme are set out in the Case for the Scheme (document reference 7.1). In relation to those objectives, significant growth is planned in Cambridgeshire in the period to 2035. While some of this development is dependent on the A14 scheme, most of it is not and therefore could happen whether or not the A14 is improved. Capacity improvements to the Brampton Hut (Junction 21), Spittals Interchange in Huntingdon (Junction 23) and Girton Interchange (Junction 31) may offer some short term relief, however, Highways England's traffic forecasts predict that traffic flows would soon exceed the capacity of the existing infrastructure in a number of locations, leading to further congestion and delay and greater unreliability. Consequently, it is expected that further interventions would be required soon afterwards.</p> <p>Given the scale and complexity of these junctions, the cost of delivering improvements is likely to run into the hundreds of millions of pounds and also result in significant disruption while the works are carried out. Furthermore, given that forecasts show that a new road will still be required after such improvements have been delivered, any improvements made to Brampton Hut (Junction 21) and Spittals Interchange (Junction 23) would become redundant</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---|--|---|
| | | as the proposed route of new road would bypass both of these junctions, leading to a substantial reduction in traffic flows compared with the existing situation. |
| Stewart Bottoms, Joanne Worsdall, Ian Weitzel, Trevor Lee, Leonard Lean | <p>Comments regarding rail freight:</p> <p>Rail freight links is a more cost effective alternative solution.</p> <p>Construction costs of a rail link is considerably cheaper than a road, and quicker to complete.</p> <p>An alternative is to split the method off transport with more freight using the rail.</p> <p>Highways England and Network Rail should work together to create an efficient integrated freight network.</p> <p>Following the enhancement of rail freight capacity between Felixstowe and Nuneaton, there was a reduction of freight movements on the existing A14. Highways England should therefore look beyond its specific interests of roads.</p> | Section four of the Case for the Scheme, document reference 7.1, sets out the development of the scheme and options considered. It refers to the Cambridge to Huntingdon Multi Modal Study (CHUMMS), which considered rail movement as well as road, and confirms the actions that were taken to improve the rail network to better serve freight needs. The proposed scheme represents the one remaining recommendation of the CHUMMS study that has yet to be actioned. |
| Joanne Worsdall | Alternative option suggested: | It is presumed that reference to the A21 is meant to be the A421. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>“Split the traffic east west along other routes such as the A47 and A21.”</p> | <p>The development of the scheme is set out in section 4 of the <i>Case for the Scheme, document reference 7.1</i>. This sets out how a wide range of options was refined over a prolonged period of time to meet the Scheme objectives within the study area.</p> <p>Improvements to the both recently improved A421 and A47 are outside the scope of this scheme.</p> <p>As the strategic roads company with the licence to operate the strategic road network, Highways England will continue to consider the performance of the strategic road network.</p> |
| <p>Stewart Bottoms, Ian Weitzel, Sara Partridge</p> | <p>Alternatives regarding the A428:</p> <p>The scheme should include widening the A1 from wider section to the west of Huntingdon to the south of Black Cat roundabout, and continuing the A428 as a dual carriageway to meet the A1 at St. Neots. This would improve businesses in St. Neots. Bedford and Milton Keynes.</p> <p>Connect the A1 to Cambridge by dualling the A428 between St Neots and Caxton. Improve the junction between the A1, the A428 and the A421 (Bedford bypass). Combined with the completed M1/J13 to</p> | <p>The Roads Investment Strategy published as part of the Autumn Statement of 2014 confirmed a Government commitment to upgrading the remaining single carriageway section of the A428 subject to such a scheme offering value for money and proceeding through statutory processes. This scheme, which is the subject of a feasibility study, would sit alongside the A14 improvement and not replace the need for the A14 scheme as the road caters for different traffic movements. The A14 and A428 schemes do not, however, rely on each other for the justification of each separate scheme, neither does one remove the need for the other.</p> <p>An explanation of why the link between the A428 and M11 southbound is not provided by the Scheme (but is not precluded by it) can be found in Highways England's response to Examining Authority questions 1.5.9 and 1.5.10.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>Brogborough scheme, this would effectively create a dual carriageway from the M1 to Felixstowe.</p> <p>Improve the link between the A428 and the M11 Southbound. This would improve the safety of the road at the single lane section of the A428 and at the A428/M11 link via the A1303.</p> | |
| Ian Weitzel | <p>The principal grounds for those in favour of the scheme are: It would speed up traffic through the bottleneck of the Huntingdon – Cambridge section It would lower the accident rate and “save lives” It offers Huntingdon the option to demolish the section of the A14 that runs over the town.</p> <p>It is considered that Huntingdon District Council has used these grounds as “a means by which they can “transform” the environs of the town at somebody else’s expense.”</p> | <p>The reasons for selection of the proposed route over an option that retained the existing A14 through Huntingdon, together with the viaduct, are explained in Highways England’s response to the Examining Authority’s first written questions, question, question 1.7.9 (document HE/A14/EX/34) submitted on 15 June 2015. The removal of the viaduct is integral to the proposed scheme.</p> |
| Ian Weitzel, Trevor Lee | <p>The main causes of delay on the Huntingdon – Cambridge stretch of the A14 are the low level traffic accidents, vehicle breakdowns and fires.</p> | <p>The widening of the existing A14 and the construction of a dual three lane bypass would increase the resilience of the road as it would be less susceptible to total blockage. The removal of direct accesses and the improvement of junctions will improve safety, reduce weaving between lanes</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>The problem is exacerbated by the lack of hard shoulder – meaning that lanes remain blocked for a longer period of time compared to if there was a hard shoulder for obstructions to be moved on to.</p> <p>It is believed that the proposed A14 would also have no hard shoulder, therefore the problems regarding traffic obstruction would be just as bad on the new road as the existing one.</p> <p>Highways England argue that any such obstruction would present less of a delay to traffic with three lanes rather than two, however it is considered that many accidents and all vehicle fires would close a three lane road to the same extent as a two lane road. For the majority of other cases a two lane road with a hard shoulder would be just as good as a three lane road without one.</p> <p>A hard shoulder should be considered along the existing four lane section of the A14 between Bar Hill and Spittals to</p> | <p>and reduce the mixing of strategic and local traffic. These will all contribute to a more resilient road.</p> <p>Page 45 of Highway's England's Response to Relevant Representations (document reference HE/A14/EX/25) explains the measures that have been taken to improve scheme resilience to minimise disruption to road users in the event of an incident. Strategic and tactical diversions are planned and agreed, and additional capacity on the A14 and variable message signs would be provided to improve driver information and lane control.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | allow emergency vehicles easier access and to clear the road more quickly after an incident. | |
| Ian Weitzel | <p>An alternative option is to keep the road largely the same, but improve certain aspects of the road network that are contributing to accidents and delays.</p> <p>Suggested improvement measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close the laybys except for emergency use • Provide hard shoulders along as much of the length as practicable. • Improve the access and egress lanes at junctions to allow for traffic joining and leaving the A14 with adequate space for acceleration and braking • Ban HGVs from overtaking along the Huntingdon-Cambridge stretch • Put a Truck Stop in place west of Huntingdon to replace the one at Alconbury that was recently closed. | <p>The reasons for selection of the proposed route over an option that retained the existing A14 through Huntingdon are explained in Highways England's response to the Examining Authority's first written questions, question 1.7.9 (document HE/A14/EX/34) submitted on 15 June 2015. The provision of hard shoulders to the existing A14 would require demolition of properties where passing through urban areas in order to provide the necessary land and would require the reconstruction of the Huntingdon viaduct if retained.</p> <p>Some of the suggested features are already included within the Scheme:</p> <p>The proposed scheme removes lay-bys, improves junctions and introduces a high level of Intelligent Traffic Systems (ITS) to improve the functionality and safety of the road. This will include Closed Circuit TV, Motorway Incident Detection Automatic System loops, Motorway Signs 3s, Motorway Sign 4s and Emergency Roadside Telephones. Street lighting will be provided at junctions and decision points. To improve safety all Advanced Directional Signage (ADS) will be placed above the carriageway on superspan gantries. These measures will contribute to the efficient movement of traffic.</p> <p>Significant growth is planned in Cambridgeshire in the period to 2035. While some of this development is dependent on the A14 scheme, most of it is not and therefore could happen whether or not the A14 is improved. Capacity improvements and the installation of further traffic controls such as cameras to the Brampton Hut (Junction 21), Spittals Interchange in Huntingdon (Junction 23) and Girton Interchange (Junction 31) may offer some short term relief, however, Highways England's traffic forecasts suggest that traffic flows would soon exceed the capacity of the existing infrastructure in a number of locations, leading to further congestion and delay and greater unreliability.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the current average speed cameras • Install cameras at the traffic lights at Spittals and Brampton Hut interchanges to identify vehicles that either jump the lights or approach the roundabouts at inappropriate speeds. | <p>One of the benefits of the proposed scheme is increased capacity and resilience of a critical part of the trans-European Network, and improved links to and from the east coast ports. The provision of a high quality route designed to modern standards with additional lanes would lessen the effects of HGVs overtaking on other road users.</p> <p>Highways England would provide adequate emergency refuge facilities along the length of the scheme. It is not intended that these would be available for overnight truck parking. The exact location of these emergency refuges will be determined at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Facilities for overnight parking will be available at private-sector operated service areas. There are currently three privately operated truck stop service areas (Brampton Hut, Alconbury and Cambridge Services) within the boundary of the scheme.</p> <p>A restriction on HGV lane use would result in the effective blockage of the nearside lane, as a consequence of the current and predicted volume of heavy goods traffic as set out in the Transport Assessment (document reference 7.2) and Transport Modelling Update Report (document reference HE/A14/EX/44). This would reduce safety for those entering and exiting the A14, and would hinder achievement of the scheme objective of reducing congestion.</p> |
| Sara Partridge | An alternative low cost option that would be less environmentally damaging would be to restrict HGVs to one lane in peak periods with a 60mph speed limit applied at all times. | A restriction on HGV lane use would result in the effective blockage of the nearside lane, as a consequence of the current and predicted volume of heavy goods traffic as set out in the Transport Assessment (document reference 7.2) and Transport Modelling Update Report (document reference HE/A14/EX/44). This would reduce safety for those entering and exiting the A14, and would hinder achievement of the scheme objective of reducing congestion. |
| Ian Weitzel | When questioned about alternatives at the Preliminary Meeting, a Highways England representative "purported to | Highways England has responded to the alternative scheme put forward by the Brampton A14 Campaign Group. This can be found within <i>Highways England's comments on the Written Representations Report 6: Non statutory Organisations and Businesses</i> (document reference HE-A14-EX-54). |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>know nothing of any such schemes.” However an alternative scheme was forwarded by the A14 Action Group, Offord Parish Council and the Brampton A14 group as early as 2010. This suggests that Highways England “only interest is in building large, complex and expensive road schemes in order to maintain their place in the order of things.”</p> | |
| Sara Partridge | <p>Queried how the Planning Inspectorate would ensure that alternative routes have been considered.</p> | <p>The development of the scheme is set out in section 4 of the <i>Case for the Scheme, document reference 7.1</i>. Highways England considers that this document provides sufficient information for the Examining Authority to satisfy itself of the options appraisal that has led to the proposed scheme.</p> |
| Joanne Worsdall | <p>Comments that the previous Inquiry allowed alternatives to be put forward by objectors, which could be evaluated by Highways England (then Highways Agency).</p> <p>“Perhaps this inquiry will be able to withstand the in favour band wagon, truly evaluate alternatives and come up with something less costly and less wasteful. Objectors can but hope.”</p> | <p>The Development Consent Order process allows for interested parties to make representations to the Examining Authority. These can include alternatives if the interested party wishes. Suggested alternatives received thus far have been considered and responded to by Highways England either in the <i>Consultation Report (document reference 5.1)</i>, the <i>Response to Relevant Representations (document reference HE-A14-EX-25)</i> or this Response to Written Representations and Written Questions.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---|---|--|
| Michael Laughton | Reference to recent press statements as evidence to suggest that Highways England have “not carried out their role impartially and with honesty and have cut corners to meet the house building and freight lobbies.” | <p>The <i>Case for the Scheme</i> sets out how the scheme has developed and outlines the wide ranging objectives that the scheme has been designed to meet.</p> <p>Highways England is the applicant for a Development Consent Order under the Planning Act 2008, seeking to promote the Scheme. The merits of the Scheme will be independently assessed by the Examining Authority and a final decision as to whether the Development Consent Order should be made will be determined by the Secretary of State for Transport.</p> |
| Anne Callow | Comment regarding an application for compensation for the devaluation of property which would be incurred by the proposed development even after the works have ceased. Request to meet with developers to discuss concerns. | <p>Highways England is committed to liaising with all interested parties to ensure that their concerns are taken into account, wherever practicable. As stated in Highways England’s <i>Response to Relevant Representations (document reference HE-A14-EX-25)</i>, “if the DCO for the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme is made by the Secretary of State, compensation and blight procedures will be those contained in the Compensation Code created by the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, the Land Compensation Acts 1961 and 1973 and case law. Principles such as disturbance, severance, injurious affection, home loss, basic loss, occupier’s loss, blight and property devaluation will apply. Affected parties will be eligible for compensation following the vesting declaration or notices to treat and enter.”</p> |
| Joseph Brien, Ian Weitzel, Joanne Worsdall, M L Boyles , Dr Allan Salem | <p>Queries regarding the removal of the viaduct.</p> <p>The Huntingdon viaduct should be retained until a viable alternative route is provided, such as a dual carriageway A428.</p> <p>The removal of the viaduct would result in too much traffic for the town ring road and will also increase the load of traffic on the</p> | <p>The reasons for selection of the proposed route over an option that retained the existing A14 through Huntingdon and the retention of the viaduct are explained in our response to the Examining Authority’s first written questions, question, question 1.7.9 (document HE/A14/EX/34) submitted on 15 June 2015.</p> <p>The reasons for removal in the context of the viaduct’s condition are also explained in Highways England’s response to the Examining Authority’s questions 1.5.5 and 1.5.6 (document HE/A14/EX/32)</p> <p>It is not proposed to remove the viaduct until the improved A14, including the Huntingdon southern bypass, is open to traffic.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Godmanchester road bridge, which is not practical for HGVs.</p> <p>The demolition of the viaduct is an appalling waste of public money. Both in terms of it as an asset and in terms of the borrowing required for its construction and recent repairs and the additional high costs of its removal and remodelling afterwards. Strengthening work to the centre section in 2013-14 restored its original 120 year lifespan. This is stated by the trade journal New Steel Construction in its Nov/Dec 2013 issue.</p> <p>The viaduct is a more direct route for west north and southeast traffic. Splitting these flows from east west traffic would enable a lesser scheme to be built south of Huntingdon. Now that the road is no longer to be financed as a toll road it is no longer necessary to force traffic to divert and use this longer convoluted route to maximise funding of it. Retaining the viaduct would enable local journeys between Huntingdon</p> | <p>In summary, these documents set out that removal of the viaduct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supports Huntingdon District Council's strategic regeneration objectives, as articulated in the West Area Action Plan, as well as enhancing the character of the Huntingdon Conservation Area; • would improve air quality in the town as a consequence of the redirection of strategic traffic to the new bypass; • enable improved road connections within the town, to the existing link roads, notably to the railway station, and also to the hospital and secondary school for those travelling from Godmanchester; • improves accessibility of the town for local travellers; <p>Furthermore,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to continued use by strategic traffic, its retention would not resolve congestion at Brampton Hut and Spittals Interchange; • There is an ongoing annual maintenance cost of £342,000 whilst the viaduct remains; and • The economic life of the existing viaduct is ten years only in its current use, due to anticipated increased traffic requiring widening which could only be achieved through demolition and rebuild. This would require additional land take in an urban area. <p>The <i>Case for the Scheme</i> also explains the development of the scheme, and why the chosen route has been selected.</p> <p>The Roads Investment Strategy, published as part of the Autumn Statement of 2014, confirmed a Government commitment to upgrading the remaining single carriageway section of the A428 between Caxton Gibbet and the Black Cat roundabout, subject to the outcome of a feasibility study. This scheme would sit alongside the A14 improvement and not replace the need for the A14 scheme as the road caters for different traffic movements. The A14 and A428</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>and other villages and Cambridge to continue to use the existing A14 access the new stretch of it nearer Cambridge and not need to divert along parallel feeder local roads.</p> <p><i>It is of paramount importance that the existing A14 viaduct is retained in order to spread traffic flow and minimise adverse environmental impact for all affected communities and to provide the route resilience essential to prevent 'log jamming' in Huntingdon and surrounding villages when stoppages occur due to major accident or road works. This would also enable a return on the investment already made in the repair and improvement of the current A14 viaduct. Such traffic flow resilience would be further enhanced by the proposals for improvements to the A428 westward from Cambridge to the A1.</i></p> <p><i>Finally, while best use should be made of the existing A14 viaduct at Huntingdon for as long as possible, particularly for</i></p> | <p>schemes do not, however, rely on each other for the justification of each separate scheme, neither does one remove the need for the other.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | <p><i>facilitating north-south traffic flow for the A1-A14-M11, leaving any rerouted A14 to mainly facilitate east-west flows for the A14, consideration should be given at this stage to the very much longer-term replacement of the viaduct with an alternative north-south connection by-passing Huntingdon to the east and north, thereby helping to continue the spread and minimisation of environmental impact for all affected communities, and to facilitate easier access to the A1 and A14 from north and eastern Cambridgeshire and also from south Lincolnshire and north Norfolk. Early considerations for this possibility should inform current and future planning for housing and commerce together with that for associated infrastructure for the northern part of the Anglia region</i></p> | |
| <p>Joanne Worsdall</p> | <p>Alternative option suggested:</p> <p><i>“..to retain the viaduct to enable the splitting of traffic flows west north and south east from the east west and west south flows.</i></p> | <p>The reasons for removal of the Huntingdon viaduct are set out in Highways England's response to question 1.7.9 in the <i>Response to the ExA's First Written Questions: Report 7 Economic and Social Effects (document reference: HE-A14-EX-34)</i>. It is not proposed to remove the viaduct until the improved A14, including the Huntingdon southern bypass, is open to traffic.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | <p><i>De-trunking the stretch of existing A14 between Brampton Hut and The Spittals to give the village some respite from traffic growth. Retaining direct link at Fenstanton for A14 traffic and not diverting local traffic by restricting access to the new carriageway here. Consideration of a 2 lane rather than a 3 lane southern bypass for the A14. Improvements to other major east west routes further north and south e.g. A47 A421 Encouraging the continued growth in modal split for freight and public transport' (paragraph 9, page 3)</i></p> | <p>If the viaduct were retained, de-trunking of the A14 between Brampton Hut and Spittals would not reduce the level of traffic using this road. Indeed, over time traffic on this road is expected to increase without the construction of the scheme as set out within the application.</p> <p>Direct accesses to the A14 have been removed in order to improve safety on the trunk road; reducing the mixing of strategic and local traffic, moving at different speeds. Connections are maintained via the local access road.</p> <p>Traffic modelling has informed the number of lanes required to the Huntingdon southern bypass and this is set out in the <i>Transport Assessment (document reference 7.2)</i>. A dual two lane bypass would not provide the capacity needed and would be less resilient when incidents occur.</p> <p>Improvement of roads to the north and south would not address the issues experienced on the A14, which would continue to worsen without improvement to this road.</p> <p>The Cambridge to Huntingdon Multi Modal Study considered means of addressing the issues faced by the A14 through improvements to rail, public transport and roads; rail and public transport measures have been addressed and the A14 scheme represents the only outstanding measure. Further detail of multi modal considerations can be found within the <i>Case for the Scheme (document reference 7.1)</i>.</p> |

7 Landscape and visual effects

Table 6 Landscape and visual effects

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Stewart Bottoms (WR dated 10 June, he submitted two)</p> | <p>The proposed A14 would be elevation 2m above the surrounding land, and the bridge needed for the B1048 to cross the highway would be 11m high. This will create a visible scar on the landscape, in an area which is a predominantly flat open landscape.</p> | <p>We assume the reference here is to the B1040, as the B1048 is not close to the proposed scheme.</p> <p>The village of Hilton is around a kilometre south of the new A14. The environmental impact of the scheme and proposed mitigation is described fully in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement ('ES') (DCO document reference 6.1).</p> <p>Distant views towards the scheme from the northern peripheries of Hilton would be filtered by a significant amount of intervening field boundary vegetation and planted screening bunds. The mitigation proposals would include a bund of up to 2m in height above the road level on the south side of the new A14 in several locations including to the north of Hilton. Mature mitigation planting along the environmental bund and Potton Road and Hilton Road bridge embankments would largely conceal views of traffic, although filtered distant glimpses of high sided vehicles would remain for the nearest receptors. Landscape mitigation is illustrated in Figure 3.2 of the ES. Once the planting is established, it would soften the form of the new highway earthworks, and provide substantial roadside planting that ties into the existing pattern of hedgerows and copses. This would largely enclose the movement of traffic on the A14, although the scheme would still be evident as a linear planted feature through this agricultural landscape.</p> <p>A photomontage of the proposed bridge at years 1 and 15 from a viewpoint agreed with Hilton Parish Council can be found within Highways England's Response to the First Written Questions Report 9: Landscape and Visual Effects. The response to question 1.9.7 is on pages 18-20 of the document and the photomontages are within the appendices at pages 40 and 41. This</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>information reviews the visual effects of the scheme (including the proposed bridge) from Hilton and the proposed mitigation.</p> |
| <p>Ian Weitzel</p> | <p>The Ouse valley in which the Offords reside is one of the prettiest in Cambridgeshire. The view, as one heads over the top of Offord Hill towards the village, is truly beautiful. It hardly need be said that this road plan will utterly destroy this. A savage, hideous scar across the landscape in either direction as far as the eye can see.</p> | <p>That there would be significant residual adverse landscape and visual effects resulting from the proposed A14 crossing of the Great Ouse and the railway is recorded in Chapter 10 of the <i>Environmental Statement (ES)</i> (document reference 6.1), and the accompanying Visual Effects Schedules attached in the <i>ES appendices 10.2 to 10.5</i>, (document reference 6.3).</p> <p>Extensive woodland planting of trees and shrubs would be carried out on the embankments of the proposed A14 bridge over the railway and extending eastwards to assist in integrating the structure into the landscape. The screen planting is clearly seen in the photomontages from viewpoint 13 (from Offord Road north of Offord Darcy) included within Figure 10.6 of the <i>ES Figures</i> (document reference 6.2).</p> <p>The replacement of the embankments supporting the new A14 between the Great Ouse and the railway bridge with a viaduct type structure has had several landscape benefits in addition to minimising intrusion into the floodplain. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the openness of the River Great Ouse floodplain is maintained in views along the river experienced by users of the Footpath Buckden 13 Ouse Valley Way. • the footprint of the scheme and the loss of grazing marsh in the river floodplain are both reduced. <p>Without embankments it is not possible to provide dense mitigation screen planting for traffic and vehicle headlights along this part of the new A14. However, the viaducts have been carefully designed to reduce impacts on the Great Ouse valley and to support the views of key stakeholders who indicated that the aesthetic quality of the structure should be a priority consideration. An options design process has been carried out as part of the scheme development, and a design has been generated which aims to minimise visual</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>intrusion and to maintain views along the valley floor. Intermittent tall growing trees are also proposed alongside the river Great Ouse viaducts.</p> <p>The ES includes in Figure 10.6 photomontages from two viewpoints (viewpoints 5 and 13) to depict different aspects of the effects of the proposed scheme at this location.</p> |
| <p>David Prior</p> | <p>Concerns regarding impacts on Mill Common, Views Common and Spring Common, which have been an important part of the town's history for over 800 years. The commons provide an important function as pastoral land, a pedestrian link and a visual asset to provide character and sense of place. The proposed scheme will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Result in the loss of a large portion of Mill Common. - Further separate Mill Common from the town centre both physically and visually and thereby affect the overall sense of place. - Compromise the views of Mill Common, particularly from the south and east. - Compromise the remaining common through street lighting, traffic movements and noise. Traffic on the de-trunked road | <p>The scheme would result in the loss of approximately 4700 m2 of Mill Common, equating to around 7% of the current total. The Pathfinder Link, required to connect the de-trunked A14 to Huntingdon ring road, has been designed to intrude as little as is practicable into the Common. This limits any separation of the common from the town centre. The link to Brampton Road is also designed to limit this effect.</p> <p>Although a relatively small part of the common would be lost, there would be significant adverse landscape and visual effects resulting from the Pathfinder Link, as set out in Chapter 10 of the ES (document reference 6.1). The design for the new highway, including avenue tree planting set in broad grassland verges with bulbs and bounded by estate railings, mitigates these effects in part and would create an attractive, although urban, new approach to the town which complements its historic character.</p> <p>The embankment of the Pathfinder Link would inevitably obscure some views of Mill Common for pedestrians walking to Port Holme from the town centre. Residents in properties in The Walks and Castle Hill would experience a large adverse visual effect due to the prominence of the road, its traffic and lighting. This impact would remain in the longer term, albeit softened by tree planting. Most of the Common would however, remain intact and it would remain visible from many areas nearer the town centre. The removal of the existing A14 viaduct would remove a locally dominant structure in views across the commons and from the south-west, and would cause a number of beneficial visual effects.</p> <p>The eastern end of Mill Common has an urban setting and is heavily influenced by urban elements such as the car park, highways and residential</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>would be visible due to vegetation loss around the junction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Destroy part of the town's heritage. - Impact visually upon an area which has a number of period and listed buildings (thinking particularly of The Walks North and The Walks East). - Add to existing encroachments and pave the way for further encroachment on Mill Common in future. | <p>properties along its eastern edge. The contrast of the pastoral scene with the urban edge is part of the Common's character. The proposed new link road would replace these urban elements in views from the west and would form a new coherent visual edge to Mill Common.</p> <p>These impacts have to be considered in the light of the existing urban landscape, and the substantial legacy improvements to the access to Huntingdon, of which the link road forms part, and to the centre of Huntingdon as a result of the removal of the A14 viaduct. The latter includes the large beneficial effects that will arise for the Station Environs townscape area and some views, such as from users of public rights of way.</p> |
| <p>J A Thomas</p> | <p>If the route cannot be realigned to reduce impacts on Hilton then there must be effective screening erected along the edge of the road to minimise noise and visual impacts on residents of Hilton. The investment now of a relatively small sum of money will ease the blight on Hilton which will be there for many years.</p> | <p>The village of Hilton is around a kilometre south of the new A14. The environmental impact of the scheme and proposed mitigation is described fully in <i>the Environmental Statement</i> (DCO document reference 6.1).</p> <p>Distant views towards the scheme from the northern peripheries of Hilton would be filtered by a significant amount of intervening field boundary vegetation and planted screening bunds. The mitigation proposals would include a bund of up to 2m in height above the road level on the south side of the new A14 in several locations including to the north of Hilton. Mature mitigation planting along the environmental bund and Potton Road and Hilton Road bridge embankments would largely conceal views of traffic, although filtered distant glimpses of high sided vehicles would remain for the nearest receptors. Landscape mitigation is illustrated in Figure 3.2 of the ES.</p> <p>Once the planting is established, it would soften the form of the new highway earthworks, and provide substantial roadside planting that ties into the existing pattern of hedgerows and copses. This would largely enclose the movement of</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | | traffic on the A14, although the scheme would still be evident as a linear planted feature through this agricultural landscape. |
| Sara Partridge | Query how PINS will ensure that the recent change in Government policy regarding John Rhodes speech entitled 'Beautiful Roads' will now be applied to this application? | Following this speech by John Hayes MP, Highways England is committed to establishing a Design Panel. Once established, Highways England will seek advice from the Design Panel as to how it can best inform the detailed design of the scheme following the making of the development consider order (if the application is granted). Notwithstanding this, Highways England has responded to the Examining Authority on the matter of good design in question 1.9.6. |
| Joanne Worsdall | The scheme will inevitably have negative consequences for the existing landscape. Any mitigation proposed whilst welcome is going to do little given the scale of disruption. | <p>The environmental design is based upon the principles set out in DMRB Volume 10: Environmental Design – Good Roads Guide DfT 1992. These proposals have been designed to best utilise the land required for the construction of the scheme, together with additional land where this is considered essential to deliver the required mitigation. Highway elements, such as drainage lagoons, have been integrated into the overall layout of the scheme. Landscape mitigation includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • environmental bunds, where practicable and appropriate, to help limit views towards the scheme and of traffic flow; • the use of false cuttings to screen traffic and headlights in sensitive locations; • the rounding of crests and toes of embankments to achieve better integration with the surrounding landform, where space and material are available; • limiting visual intrusion of proposed main road signs and gantries through adjustment of location where practicable; • reducing the impact of road lighting through careful placement where such a system is deemed essential. The use of modern, controllable light sources with sharp cut-off properties, coupled with dynamic systems of operation, would reduce the effect of lighting on the surrounding environment; • native tree and shrub planting on and adjacent to highway earthworks to create woodlands, copses and shelterbelts in order to break up the |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>scale of the road, screen structures, traffic and lighting and to help integrate the scheme into the existing landscape pattern;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • areas of species rich grassland at locations where conditions are suitable for their establishment, to provide seasonal interest and increase local biodiversity; • retention of some open views through breaks in the planting to help create variety and a sense of place for drivers, where practicable; • use of hedgerows where appropriate, to link into existing field boundary planting to provide screening and integration into the local pattern, as well as connection of existing wildlife corridors; • structural planting within and surrounding borrow pits to integrate with the wider landscape and the scheme; • careful design of the river Great Ouse viaduct to reduce impacts on the Great Ouse valley and to support the views of key stakeholders who indicated that the aesthetic quality of the structure should be a priority consideration. <p>These principles also respond to guidance included in the Cambridgeshire Landscape Guidelines (Cambridge County Council, 1991). The design would seek to reflect the variations in local landscape character types and areas for example through the use of different plant mixes. Consideration would also be given to the use of appropriate species in the event of extreme conditions cause by climate change, such as flooding or drought, at the detailed design stage after the making of the development consent order.</p> |
| Joanne Worsdall | It is extremely difficult to assess what if any of the existing roadside vegetation will remain unscathed as a result of the construction and final design of the new A14 and its feeder or parallel roads. Ongoing maintenance of any surviving | <p>Lost and retained vegetation is shown on ES Figure 3.4 Retained and removed vegetation (document reference 6.2)</p> <p>The application and accompanying plans give an indication of the vegetation likely to be lost as part of the scheme. The detailed design process after the making of the development consent order (if the application is granted) will seek to balance engineering needs with an aim to retain as much existing vegetation as is practicable. Under paragraph [8] of Part 1 of Schedule 2</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | and newly planted landscaping is a concern. | (Requirements) of the draft DCO, vegetation that dies or becomes seriously diseased within five years of planting must be replaced with one of the same species and size as originally planted. |
| Joanne Worsdall | The elevation of much of the route equates to increased visual intrusion over what is pleasant and alongside the river beautiful countryside and degrades the surrounds of the villages it passes close to. | <p>In the area to the south of Fenstanton and north of Hilton, the existing A14 is generally on low embankment, in the order of 1m above the adjacent ground.</p> <p>The proposed new A14 as it passes north of Hilton would be on an embankment 1m to 3m above the adjacent ground. The proposed design for the new A14 is thus higher than the existing A14 relative to existing ground levels. This is due to drainage requirements to ensure that the alignment is a suitable height (allowing for factors such as the size of culverts – noting current requirements for design storms, climate change allowance and including freeboard above maximum water level – the thickness of structures and the depth of new road pavement) above existing watercourses/drainage channels that are a significant part of the local land drainage system, and maintaining the connectivity of this existing system. The alignment height is also governed by the requirements of the carriageway drainage system and pavement design, including compliance with current design standards. The height is required to provide effective drainage to the foundation layers of the pavement, which is required for the longevity of the pavement, and to provide sufficient height and falls to achieve outfalls by gravity. In relation to the side roads where they pass over the A14, the elevation of these is governed by the A14 mainline levels, as above, plus headroom and the depth of the bridge construction. If the mainline alignment were any lower, there would be impact on the existing watercourses (diversions and flood risks) and increased operational risks for the highway operation. The vertical alignment of the new A14 as proposed has been taken into account in the environmental assessment reported in the environmental statement. Appropriate mitigation is proposed to mitigate impacts to acceptable levels. The proposed highway design has been kept as low as possible to reduce environmental effects while responding to the engineering and drainage requirements for the scheme's</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>vertical alignment and the need to manage the amounts of cut and fill necessary for construction.</p> <p>The reduction of the gradients for embankments can have benefits in reducing their potential visual intrusion and making them less incongruous in the landscape. These landscape and visual benefits, however, have to be balanced against the increased land and fill material required to construct the embankments with slacker gradients. It is considered that an appropriate compromise in this regard has been adopted in the scheme design.</p> <p>The new road has to be elevated to cross the Great Ouse, in particular to retain navigation clearance at peak flood occurrence. However, Highways England's aim has been to keep structure as low profile as is practicable in the river flood plain, and to retain open views under it.</p> |
| Joanne Worsdall | <p>The mitigation works proposed are difficult to assess. Vegetation is known to be a good absorber of noise and pollution yet the planting proposed does not seem to cover the whole route or be wider than a bare minimum when it is close to adversely affected homes and businesses. It takes about 10 years for planting to grow to be an effective size, query whether the Highways England scheme includes mature planting? Vegetation is routinely clear felled beside major roads to allow contractors access to drains wires etc.</p> | <p>Vegetation is not very effective at absorbing sound. Earthworks and acoustic barriers are far more effective in this regard, however, these are not effective at 600m or more from the road. A noise impact assessment has been carried out to determine where acoustic barriers are required based on current guidance.</p> <p>The planting proposed will start to provide some visual mitigation after about 5 years, and will be fully effective after 15 years. Larger nursery stock will be used in locations where a more immediate effect is required, however, transplant sized stock that will be used for the bulk of the landscape areas actually establishes and thereafter grows more quickly than larger plant sizes.</p> <p>Planting plots will be designed to avoid areas that require regular access for maintenance of highway infrastructure.</p> |

Table 7 Heritage

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>Derek Norman, Kay Norman</p> | <p>The proposed new southern station access road will pass through a section of the Huntingdon Conservation Area which was designated as part of the boundary review in 2007. The review stated that with the proposed changes to the A14, the opportunity should be taken “to consider reintegrating this part of historic Huntingdon” (Huntingdon Conservation Area Boundary Review 2007, p.4). The proposals would in fact isolate this part of Huntingdon by completely enclosing it with busy roads and car parks, which is contrary to the aims of the extended conservation area.</p> | <p>In the Huntingdon Conservation Area Character Assessment (Huntingdonshire District Council 2007) the area is shown on page 16 as <i>historic green space</i>, but no definition is provided of this. Historic mapping indicates the original form has been significantly changed in the 19th and 20th centuries from open agricultural fields to modern development. The proposed road is situated over the line of the former Thrapston to Huntingdon railway.</p> <p>The Huntingdon Conservation Area Character Assessment identifies the triangular area of land directly north of the southern station access road as follows:</p> <p><i>The railway station and its environs is a purely 19th century space that preserves an interesting industrial relict landscape. The station building is listed and some of its associated cottages also exist. The goods yard that lies between the main line and the route of the dismantled line from St. Ives is now under used, but could be improved with imaginative development. This is an historically important space (2007, 29).</i></p> <p>The creation of the southern link road has the potential to provide interconnectivity for this part of the conservation area, reintegrating it into historic Huntingdon, in particular its historic association with the railway.</p> <p>As noted in paragraph 9.3.42 of Chapter 9 of the <i>ES (reference document 6.1)</i> the removal of the existing Huntingdon viaduct would have a beneficial impact on the area. The viaduct currently dominates the setting of Huntingdon railway station and its removal will provide open views across the area and an opportunity to improve the existing surfacing and street furniture.</p> |
| <p>Derek Norman, Kay Norman</p> | <p>In the Huntingdon Conservation Area Character Assessment, the area through which the new station road access would pass</p> | <p>The boundary review notes that the area defined as ‘<i>C b Mill Common ex parte and the Railway Station</i>’ was originally part of Mill Common, but has contained industrial elements since 1610. It goes onto note that the area was severed from Mill Common by the construction of the railway in 19th century.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>is shown as historic green space, which additionally contains a woodland area specifically protected by a tree preservation order (7/90W1, see Figure 3.4, sheet 15). Residents within the conservation area require permits to trim or fell trees, therefore query how the proposed scheme can result in substantial felling in a conservation area and TPO area?</p> <p>Overall, the proposed station road area is not entirely taken up by 'dense shrub' as indicated on Figure 11.1, sheet 15. Instead it contains a mosaic of habitats including woodland, shrubs and grassland. Objective 3 of the Huntingdon West Area Action Plan Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal Non-technical Summary is to "protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure". The destruction of a bio-diverse historic green site contradicts this objective, especially when alternative</p> | <p>In the Huntingdon Conservation Area Character Assessment (Huntingdonshire District Council 2007) the area is shown on page 16 as <i>historic green space</i>, but no definition is provided of this. Historic mapping indicates the original form has been significantly changed in the 19th and 20th centuries from open agricultural fields to modern development. Of note is that the proposed road is situated over the line of the former Thrapston to Huntingdon railway.</p> <p>The elements of the design in Huntingdon were subject to design review with heritage stakeholders including Historic England and Huntingdonshire District Council. Aspects of the design review are presented in Chapter 4 of the ES (reference document 6.1).</p> <p>As noted in paragraph 9.3.42 of Chapter 9 of the <i>ES (reference document 6.1)</i> the removal of the existing viaduct will have a beneficial impact on the area. The viaduct currently dominates the setting of Huntingdon railway station and its removal will provide open views across the area and an opportunity to improve the existing surfacing and street furniture.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>layouts that preserve this green space do not seem to have been appropriately considered.</p> | |
| <p>Ann Goodridge</p> | <p>Many residents of Hilton parish have expressed concern that the heritage of the village needs to be preserved, given the historical relationship with 'Capability Brown', the presence of a rare, world-recognised Turf Maze, dating from the restoration of the monarchy in 1660, and the existence of 10 listed Heritage properties of particular note. English Heritage did provide HA with requirements over air pollution levels with respect to our buildings. However, there is no acknowledgement of these concerns nor of the perceived loss of such amenity in the consultation, let alone in any amendments to the DCO.</p> | <p>Hilton Conservation Area is located over 200 m from the proposed scheme and therefore outside the 200 m study area as proposed by Volume 11 Section 3 Part 2 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.</p> <p>Despite being located outside of the 200 m study area, as identified in paragraphs 9.2.11 and 9.2.12 of Chapter 9 of the ES (reference document 6.1) an initial assessment of Hilton Conservation Area, which includes the maze and listed buildings, was undertaken. As stated in paragraphs 9.2.11 Chapter 9 of the ES (reference document 6.1) this included a visual assessment analysis of noise and traffic data. This initial assessment did not predict any significant impacts on Hilton Conservation Area. No further heritage assessment was therefore undertaken.</p> |

8 Noise and vibration

Table 8 Noise and vibration

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|---|
| Simon Norton | Concern about traffic noise, which can be heard both indoors and outdoors. | <p>The National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) requires the proposed scheme to “meet, the following aims, within the context of Government policy on sustainable development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; • mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and • contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effective management and control of noise, where possible.” <p>Whilst traffic noise from the proposed scheme may be audible in many locations, Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1) sets out clearly how the NNNPS aims are met by the scheme.</p> |
| David Ousby | <p>Queried the noise impacts on residential properties in and around Madingley during construction and operation of the trunk road westbound link embankment.</p> <p>Could the noise pollution at this link be improved by moving the proposed Local Access Road to the north of the A14?</p> | <p>Highways England’s response to the Examining Authority’s question 1.10.14 (<i>Response to ExA’s First Written Questions, Report 10: Noise and Vibration (document reference EX/37)</i>) covers the issues raised with respect to construction and operation of the scheme at Madingley.</p> <p>In summary, it is concluded that no significant adverse effects are likely at Madingley due to noise arising from the construction and operation of the proposed scheme, including the A14 trunk road westbound link embankment.</p> |
| J A Thomas | The new A14 will be intolerably loud. | <p>The National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) requires the proposed scheme to “meet, the following aims, within the context of Government policy on sustainable development:</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; • mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and • contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effective management and control of noise, where possible.” <p>Whilst traffic noise from the proposed scheme may be audible in many locations, Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1) sets out clearly how the NNNPS aims are met by the scheme.</p> |
| J A Thomas | There should be effective screening along the edge of the road to reduce the impact of vehicle noise. | <p>The assessment of operational noise and vibration effects reported in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference 6.1) takes account of all individual dwellings and communities in Hilton. The criteria for inclusion of operational noise mitigation for the scheme are defined in Appendix 14.1 of the ES Appendices (document reference 6.3). Sustainable mitigation measures have already been incorporated into the scheme along the Huntingdon Southern Bypass in the area of Hilton to reduce noise impacts during operation, and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • careful design of the alignment and cuttings; • the use of low noise road surfacing; and • landscaped earthworks (provided to reduce visual impact). <p>The main community at Hilton is located, at its closest point, around 900m from the proposed scheme. The <i>Highways England's Response to Relevant Representations (HE-A14-EX-25)</i> with regard the noise impact at Hilton, explained that noise barriers (as either fences or landscaped bunds) will not provide any benefit over distances of 600 metres from the road (or at greater distances). The Government's Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (ref) methodology states that the calculated level of noise should only allow for either the reduction provided by a noise barrier or the reduction for the absorption provided by soft ground cover between the road and the receiver. The reduction provided by soft ground increases with increasing distance from the road. The calculated net benefit of a noise barrier therefore decreases with increasing distance from the road being considered and with mainly flat</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---|---|--|
| | | gassed or agricultural land between the road and receiver the net benefit will be negligible at a distance of 600m (further information on the design of noise barriers is provided in Highways England response to Written Question Q1.10.12). |
| J A Thomas | Reference to the European investment of thousands of kilometres of acoustic and visual screening erected along major European roads to protect communities. Claims from Highways England that "similar protection along the A14 will not work must be discounted." | In addition to route wide mitigation measures (e.g. low noise surfacing), Highways England's proposed scheme includes many kilometres of noise barrier, where provision of the barriers is sustainable consistent with paragraph 5.195 of the NNNPS. As set out in section 14.5 of Chapter 14 to the ES (document reference 6.1), the following approach has been applied in determining whether additional mitigation is sustainable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefit (monetised benefit of noise reduction evaluated using WebTAG) compared to cost of the mitigation; • Engineering practicability; • Other environmental effects potentially caused by the mitigation (for example landscape or visual effects); and • Stakeholder engagement and consultation responses. It is not sustainable to provide a noise barrier past Hilton. Please also see Highways England's response immediately above in relation to noise barriers at Hilton. |
| J A Thomas | If the road alignment cannot be altered, then the Planning Inspectorate should insist that sound and visual screening should be included in the basic design. | Please refer to the above response in relation to the provision of noise screening. |
| Sara Partridge, John and Valerie Burningham | Concerned about the impact that proposed development would have on noise levels in the village of Hilton, including noise impacts from HGVs. | As set out in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1), mitigation measures have been designed into the scheme to minimise, as far as sustainable, adverse effects on health and quality of life. The assessment has included the forecast use of the proposed scheme by HGVs. Due to the relatively large separation distances between the scheme and the |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>measures already incorporated into the scheme design, the noise levels (calculated under downwind conditions to represent moderately adverse wind direction from the road to the receptor) resulting from the scheme are relatively low in absolute terms, and no long term perceptible increases in noise at Hilton have been identified for the vast majority of the community. Further information on traffic noise assessment can be found in Highways Agency and Welsh Office (2011), Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 11, Section 3, Part 7, HD213/11 Revision 1, Noise and Vibration. No likely significant adverse noise effects have therefore been identified at Hilton.</p> |
| <p>Dr R W Hodder</p> | <p>A recent WHO report concentrated on the serious adverse effects (especially on cardiac and respiratory systems) of atmospheric pollution. The adverse effects of noise were implicated in deteriorating health to those exposed to even low levels of both noise and atmospheric pollution.</p> | <p>The National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS – paragraph 5.195) requires the proposed scheme to “meet, the following aims, within the context of Government policy on sustainable development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; • mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and • contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effective management and control of noise, where possible.” <p>Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1) sets out clearly how the NNNPS aims are met by the scheme and also clearly sets out how the guidance published by WHO has informed the design of the proposed scheme and its compliance with the NNNPS at paragraph 5.195.</p> |
| <p>Dr R W Hodder</p> | <p>There has been no information regarding the existing and predicted future levels of noise pollution in Hilton.</p> | <p>Existing and predicted future levels of noise are presented in ES Appendices 14.5 and 14.6 (document reference 6.3) for that part of Hilton that falls within the noise study area (a study area defined consistent with DMRB guidance). Noise levels from the proposed scheme would be lower in other parts of Hilton as they are located further away from the scheme.</p> |
| <p>Dr R W Hodder</p> | <p>Received information confirming that noise reduction surfaces are</p> | <p>A new Requirement has been added to the Draft DCO, securing the details of the noise mitigation for the scheme, reflecting the measures set out in the ES.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | available, but there has been no reassurance that they would be used. | This is included in the Applicant's revised Draft DCO submitted to ExA for Deadline 4 (Tuesday 7 July 2015) as defined by the 'Rule 8 letter' dated 21 May 2015. |
| Leonard Lean | Refers to an article about absorptive acoustic barriers, suggesting that it "describes a material which could protect housing estates from road traffic noise". Mr Lean says "Even 8dB is a substantial reduction of noise; 13dB – what noise?" | <p>Highways England's Response to the ExA's First Written Questions: Report 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference HE-A14-EX-37), question 1.10.12 provides information concerning noise barrier design and the principal factors affecting noise attenuation. Paragraph 95 of Highways England's response to question 1.10.12 discusses the design features of acoustically absorptive noise fence barriers.</p> <p>A noise and vibration assessment has been undertaken and is reported in Chapter 14 of the <i>Environmental Statement</i> (ES) (document reference 6.1). The ES (Table 14.21) sets out the proposed noise mitigation measures for operation of the scheme including acoustically absorptive fence noise barriers.</p> <p>The likely noise effects as a result of the operation of the scheme (taking into account proposed mitigation measures such as noise barriers) are set out in the ES at paragraphs 14.6.19 – 14.7.17 and include an assessment of the effect on residential receptors.</p> |

9 Other environmental

Table 9 Other environmental

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| <p>Derek Norman, Kay Norman</p> | <p>Concern that substantial congestion on the proposed access roads from the de-trunked A14 would have a detrimental impact on the quality of life of the residents at Station Cottages.</p> <p>The scheme would also cause severe detrimental impact on this part of the Conservation Area and the protected woodland.</p> | <p>Air quality There is a negligible decrease predicted between the 'with scheme' and 'without scheme' options. The predicted concentrations for annual mean NO₂ and PM₁₀ are well below the objectives for these pollutants.</p> <p>Noise The main existing noise source at this location is the existing A14. This is recognised by Government and Highways England in that Station Cottages and properties on Mill Common are identified as an Important Area (IA) in the 2014 Noise Action Plan for Roads. This IA is numbered 6185 and is identified on sheet 19 of Figure 14.7 in the <i>Environmental Statement (ES)</i> (document reference 6.2).</p> <p>The substantial reduction in traffic on the current A14 resulting from the scheme (e.g. Huntingdon Southern Bypass, de-trunking the existing A14, demolishing the A14 Huntingdon viaduct, etc.) will provide benefit to over 2,900 dwellings as reported in the ES and joint Local Impact Report. Station Cottages will also benefit. Due to an error in transcription, the ES assessed the noise impact as negligible, when it ought to have been identified as experiencing moderate and major beneficial impact due to noise decreases as is already reported for neighbouring dwellings on Mill Common (sheets 19 and 25 of Figure 14.7 in the <i>ES Figures</i> – (document reference 6.2)).</p> <p>This takes account of noise from the reconfigured station access. All access currently passes immediately to the west of Station Cottages. Traffic on this existing access road will reduce with the scheme (and noise from it will also reduce) as it would be used for taxis, buses and drop off only. With the proposed scheme, access for the car park would move to the new access</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>road. For further information please refer to Figure 3.2a in the <i>ES Figures (document reference 6.2)</i>.</p> <p>Traffic volumes on, and hence noise levels from, both the existing 'western' and the proposed 'eastern' access roads are much lower than on the existing or de-trunked A14. Noise contribution from these access roads doesn't therefore reduce the benefit in overall noise terms provided by the reduction in traffic volumes and average speeds on the A14.</p> <p>Ecology/ landscape Chapter 11, para 11.5.58 to 11.5.73 of the <i>ES (document reference 6.1)</i> describes the assessment of likely significant effects on habitats (including woodland) and concludes there would be a slight positive effect in the long term because of the extensive mitigation planting. The scheme would result in a net gain of 83ha of woodland habitats. Woodland to be lost to the Scheme near Station Cottages is predominantly on the embankment of the A14 Huntingdon Bypass built in 1973. The trees are valuable for screening the existing A14 but are not historic to Mill Common. The proposed scheme would have a beneficial effect on the character of the Conservation Area by demolishing the viaduct and replacing the A14 with a link road at a lower level forming a false cutting out of the remains of the A14 embankment. Most of the trees on the embankment would be replaced with new planting. The link road would be screened in views from Station Cottages by the remaining bund and new tree planting along the southwest verge. Trees within residential boundaries north of the proposed new access road to the station car park would be retained. Some trees and shrubs south of those boundaries would be lost to the new access. There would a very small marginal encroachment on the western edge of trees protected by TPO along Mill Common Lane south of the station access.</p> |
| Stewart Bottoms | The importance of low grade agricultural land required by the scheme has been dismissed, | <p>Community & Private Assets – agricultural assessment Highways England recognise the importance of and value of soils and their protection. In developing the proposed scheme, Highways England has</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>suggesting “little environmental sacrifice”.</p> <p>Emphasised that grass, trees and hedgerows are important habitats for insects, birds and small mammals. In addition, insects are needed for the pollination of crops, and trees are highly significant in management of surface water, flow and absorption.</p> | <p>sought to balance the footprint of the scheme within the context of engineering and environmental mitigation requirements, thus limiting the permanent loss of all soils as far as is practicable. The Soils Management Strategy (<i>Appendix 12.2, document reference 6.3</i>) and the Code of Construction Practice (<i>Appendix 20.2, document reference 6.3</i> and secured by paragraph 3 of Schedule 3 to the draft Development Consent Order) would ensure that any soils that are disturbed and displaced by the proposed scheme are re-used sustainably.</p> <p>Ecology Arable farmland is of low ecological value due to the limited range of species that it supports. Chapter 11, para 11.5.58 to 11.5.73 of the <i>ES (document reference 6.1)</i> describes the assessment of likely significant effects on other , semi natural habitats and concludes there would be a slight positive effect in the long term because of the extensive mitigation. The scheme would result in a net gain of approx. 271ha of semi natural habitats (including grassland, woodland, hedgerows and individual trees.</p> |
| Stewart Bottoms | <p>Concern about the adverse effect of covering 2.5km² of land with asphalt, particularly in regards to effects on the environment and the flora and fauna.</p> | <p>Chapter 11 of the ES describes the assessment of likely significant effects on ecology flora and fauna and concludes there would be a neutral or slight positive effect on most ecological features in the long term because of the extensive mitigation planting. The scheme would result in a net gain of approx. 83ha of woodland habitats.</p> |
| Trevor Lee | <p>Under no circumstances can the UK afford to lose any more agricultural land for housing or road construction.</p> <p>Apart from losing a huge swathe of good agricultural land that remaining each side will be less economical to farm.</p> | <p>As stated in <i>Highways England's Response to Relevant Representations (document reference HE/A14/EX/25)</i> the design process has attempted to minimise land take where possible. Agricultural land loss is assessed within the Community and Private Assets chapter of the Environmental Statement. Land take from high quality agricultural land has been avoided where possible, but due to the abundant high quality nature of the land in the area surrounding the scheme, land take from this asset has been largely unavoidable. Highways England has been, and continues to, liaise with land owners to both minimise land that is to be compulsory purchased and to minimise the impact of the</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>scheme on their retained land. In its response to the Examining Authority's written question 1.7.2 (<i>Response to ExA's First Written Questions, Report 7: Economic and Social Effects (document reference EX-34)</i>), Highways England has further explained how its proposals have sought to minimise the use of best and most versatile land.</p> |
| Simon Norton | <p>Concern that additional traffic would generate extra emissions, particularly if it is transferred from other modes. If transport related emissions increase, there would be "reduced scope for wealth generating activity elsewhere in the economy... On the other hand, if our Government is setting its targets on the basis of its traffic forecasts rather than the scientific evidence on climate change, then it is being irresponsible in the face of ever growing evidence about the urgency of the problem".</p> | <p>Overall the scheme has a beneficial effect on air quality in the scheme area as vehicular pollution is removed from urban areas. In addition:</p> <p>The DfT policy proposals document "Action for Roads - A network for the 21st century" clearly reaffirms the commitment to carbon emissions reduction. Paragraph 1.48 acknowledges that the "contribution of road traffic to climate change from carbon dioxide emissions remains a major challenge". It is, however, the road traffic and not the road infrastructure itself that presents the challenge. Action for Roads goes on to articulate (in Paragraphs 3.14 and 3.15) that the Government and the Department for Transport "...remain committed to making sure transport plays its part in meeting carbon budgets and other environmental targets. Reducing carbon and other greenhouse gas emissions is at the heart of our vision for transport, and is a key component of sustainable economic growth. We want to bring about the decarbonisation of travel in a way that is cost-effective, acceptable to users and makes the most of the economic opportunities for the UK. We support reductions in the UK's greenhouse gas emissions to at least 34% below 1990 levels by 2020 and at least 80% by 2050. We have backed this with a series of legally binding carbon budgets. Over the next decade, the biggest reductions in emissions from domestic transport are likely to come from efficiency improvements in conventional vehicles, driven primarily by EU targets for new vehicle CO2 performance." There is no requirement articulated in current Climate Change or Roads legislation or policy such as Action for Roads with which the A14 scheme as proposed and appraised would not conform.</p> <p>As the scheme has an overall beneficial effect on air quality in the scheme area as vehicular pollution is removed from urban areas, including Huntingdon, it is therefore considered that the Scheme would be NPS compliant."</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>As set out in Highways England's response to Examining Authority question 1.3.1 (<i>document reference HE/A14/EX/30</i>), whilst there will be an increase in carbon emissions from the scheme, it is not so significant that it would have an impact on the ability of the Government to reach its carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>Further, the National Networks National Policy Statement (DfT, 2014) states that an increase in emissions predicted to result from an individual road development is not a reason to refuse development consent. Relevant passages are repeated below: "<i>The impact of road development on aggregate levels of emissions is likely to be very small. Impacts of road development need to be seen against significant projected reductions in carbon emissions and improvements in air quality as a result of current and future policies to meet the Government's legally binding carbon budgets and the European Union's air quality limit values.</i>", "<i>It is very unlikely that the impact of a road project will, in isolation, affect the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction plan targets.</i>", and "<i>any increase in carbon emissions is not a reason to refuse development consent, unless the increase in carbon emissions resulting from the proposed scheme are so significant that it would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.</i>"</p> <p>As overall the scheme has a beneficial effect on air quality in the scheme area as vehicular pollution is removed from urban areas, it is not considered that the Scheme would be not NPS compliant.</p> |
| Ian Weitzel | Highways England's figures on noise, light and environmental pollution seem very optimistic and it is considered that they should be examined in greater detail by experts not employed by the EA. | <p>Noise</p> <p>The assessment of operational noise and vibration effects is reported in Chapter 14 of the <i>Environmental Statement (ES)</i> (<i>document reference 6.1</i>) and follows well recognised procedures. The quantitative prediction of noise levels associated with the proposed scheme has been carried out using the established methodology described in the Calculation Of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN) memorandum. This is the standard method for calculation of road</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>noise in the UK and has been used in its present form for nearly 30 years and is the method recognised in the National Networks National Policy Statement. There has been extensive validation of the method and it has been shown to be very reliable. CRTN is the only accepted method for determining entitlement under the Noise Insulation Regulations (as amended). The application of the method to determine the study area and assessment scenarios follows the guidance given in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges document HD213/11 Rev 1. The local and county authorities have raised no concern over the fundamentals of the assessment methodology for operational road traffic noise in their Local Impact Report, Written Representations and responses to ExA First Written Questions.</p> <p>Air quality The air quality chapter in the <i>Environmental Statement</i> includes a number of pessimistic assumptions and sensitivity tests, particularly related to future vehicle emissions. The results of the assessment show there are no significant effects predicted as a result of the scheme.</p> <p>Landscape/ lighting The landscape and visual effects of artificial lighting and traffic are considered as part of the landscape and visual impact assessment reported in Chapter 10 of the <i>Environmental Statement (ES)</i> (document reference 6.1) and Appendices 10.2 - 10.7 of the <i>Environmental Statement Appendices</i> (document reference 6.3) and follow well-established methodology, guidance and good practice.</p> |
| Leonard Lean | Concern that the scheme will encourage HGVs and thus more emissions, particularly as vehicles are getting larger. | As the <i>Environmental Statement</i> (document reference 6.1) sets out, mitigation measures have been designed into the scheme to minimise, as far as sustainable, adverse effects on health and quality of life. The assessment has included the forecast use of the proposed scheme by HGVs. Chapter 8 of the <i>Environmental Statement</i> sets out that the Scheme does not have a significant impact on air quality and does not affect the UK's ability to achieve compliance with the EU air quality Directive. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| <p>Jeff Shaw</p> | <p>Concern about the dangerous increase in air, noise and light pollution for residents and villages along the proposed route. This is unacceptable in a modern society, where health implications and the cost to the NHS can be understood.</p> | <p>Noise The National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) requires the proposed scheme to “meet, the following aims, within the context of Government policy on sustainable development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; • mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and • contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effective management and control of noise, where possible.” <p>Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (<i>document reference 6.1</i>) sets out clearly how the NNNPS aims are met by the scheme.</p> <p>Air quality The scheme effects along the whole scheme area and adjoining affected roads have been assessed within the air quality chapter of the <i>Environmental Statement</i>. The scheme does not result in any significant effects on air quality.</p> <p>Overall the scheme has a beneficial effect on air quality in the scheme area as vehicular pollution is removed from urban areas.</p> <p>Landscape/ lighting The landscape and visual effects of artificial lighting and traffic are considered as part of the landscape and visual impact assessment reported in Chapter 10 of the <i>Environmental Statement (ES)</i> (<i>document reference 6.1</i>) and Appendices 10.2 - 10.7 of the <i>Environmental Statement Appendices</i> (<i>document reference 6.3</i>). Road lighting would be restricted to major junctions, some of which already exist as junctions with lighting. Existing junctions on the A14 at Brampton Hut, Cambridge Services, Bar Hill, Girton Interchange, Histon and Milton are already lit. The A1 and A14 trunk roads between the junctions would not be lit. The proposed new local access roads would not be lit. Planting and screen bunds are proposed to screen traffic and headlights in views from settlements. This can be seen in the <i>General Arrangement</i></p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p><i>Drawings (document reference 2.2) and the Outline Environment Drawings (ES Appendix 3.2 (document reference 6.2))</i></p> |
| <p>Chris and Lynn Slater</p> | <p>Query on how noise, air and light pollution would be kept at existing levels in the village of Hilton. Thus far, "these have not been suitably benchmarked".</p> | <p>Noise As set out in the Chapter 14 of the <i>Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1)</i> mitigation measures have been designed into the scheme to minimise as far as sustainable adverse effects on health and quality of life. Because of the relatively large separation distances between the scheme and Hilton and the measures already incorporated into the scheme design, the noise levels (calculated under downwind conditions) resulting from the scheme are relatively low in absolute terms and no perceptible long term increases in noise at Hilton have been identified for the vast majority of the village (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges document HD213/11 Rev 1). No likely significant noise effects have therefore been identified at Hilton.</p> <p>Air quality The air quality within Hilton is assessed within the air quality chapter of the Environmental Statement. At 800 metres the contribution of the road to ambient pollution concentrations would be negligible. In Hilton it is the contribution from vehicles travelling directly through the village that have the greatest impacts on air quality. The air quality assessment shows some small improvements in air quality in 2035 from the proposed scheme as a result of predicted reductions in traffic in the village.</p> <p>Landscape/ lighting No road lighting is proposed near Hilton. Proposed screen bunds to a height of 2m above the road level of the proposed A14 would be densely planted with trees and shrubs. The bunds would screen A14 traffic and headlights near Hilton. Headlights of vehicles crossing the proposed Potton Road bridge at approximately 900-1000m from the village would initially be visible from certain locations at the edge of the village but headlight glare would not be a problem for the following reasons. For properties on Potton Road, headlights on the bridge would be screened by roadside trees and hedges, and by trees and</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>hedges on the property boundaries. For other viewpoints the traffic would be aligned oblique to the viewer with no possibility of headlight glare. Within 10 to 15 years of planting, proposed dense tree and shrub planting on the bridge embankments would screen headlights on or near the Potton Road and Hilton Road bridges.</p> |
| <p>Jeff Shaw</p> | <p>No consideration has been given to the environmental impacts on Huntingdon and the health implications on its residents.</p> | <p>Noise The National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) requires the proposed scheme to “meet, the following aims, within the context of Government policy on sustainable development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; • mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and • contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effective management and control of noise, where possible.” <p>Chapter 14 of the <i>Environmental Statement (ES)</i> (document reference 6.1) sets out clearly how the NNNPS aims are met by the scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 14 of the <i>ES</i> reports that a large number of people will benefit from noise reductions in Huntingdon as a result of traffic volumes reducing on the existing A14.</p> <p>Air quality The air quality chapter of the <i>Environmental Statement</i> includes detailed assessment of the air quality impacts from the scheme in Huntingdon. Huntingdon is predicted to experience an improvement in air quality as a result of the scheme due to the removal of vehicle pollution from the main urban area. A summary of the air quality findings are provided in section 8.5.30 of the air quality chapter, which includes consideration of the existing Huntingdon AQMA.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|------------------|--|
| | | <p>Landscape <i>Environmental Statement (ES)</i> Chapter 10 and Appendices 10.2 to 10.4 (<i>document reference 6.2 and 6.3</i>) describe the general and residual effects of the scheme and mitigation measures on landscape and views, including for Huntingdon. Furthermore, ES Figure 3.2a Outline Environmental Design Drawing Sheets 1-4 show the scheme and proposed landscape mitigation for Huntingdon and Figure 10.6 of the ES also includes three photomontages of the visual effects in Huntingdon</p> <p>Along with the railway, the A14 trunk road currently forms a barrier of heavy fast-moving traffic separating the main part of Huntingdon from the western suburbs, Hinchbrooke Country Park and the historic buildings and grounds of Hinchbrooke School. The road embankments are planted with trees substantially screening the traffic but the A14 viaduct is a prominent and unattractive structure over Brampton Road and the railway station. The environment at Huntingdon would be improved by diverting the A14 south of Huntingdon and demolishing the viaduct. The former route around Mill Common would be downgraded to a local link road at a normal level near natural grade and the remains of the old embankment approach to the viaduct would be replanted as screen bunds on either side. Encroachment on Mill Common would be minimised with a T junction and traffic lights for the proposed new Pathfinder link road into the town centre. Demolition of the viaduct and removal of a large portion of the embankment across Views Common would reunite the eastern end of the common. Construction of the proposed Views Common Link Road would result in a smaller severance of Views Common and losses of small sections of mature TPO protected trees in belts north and south of the Cambridgeshire Police Headquarters. The link road, crossing the open space at the police property, would separate the sports fields from the headquarters buildings. The proposed link roads would carry less traffic at slower speeds than the A14 carries today.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Land grading is proposed to mask the embankment of the Pathfinder Link road and bring the pasture land gradually up to the slightly higher level of the road. Large size trees would be planted to form avenues along the Pathfinder Link and Views Common Link. Existing gaps in the trees along Brampton Road would be planted with large size avenue trees. Estate fencing is proposed to restore enclosures at the pastures on Mill Common and Views Common.</p> <p>The A14 does not have road lighting through Huntingdon but the proposed Mill Common Link would be lit due to the closeness of the proposed junctions including the proposed new station accesses. The lighting would be designed to limit light spread to adjacent areas and fit aesthetically with the conservation area, but it would be visible through and above the trees at the edge of Mill Common. Views Common link would not be lit but lighting at the proposed roundabout at the north end of the link would be visible above the trees to be planted around the junction. The junction at the south end with Hinchbrooke Park Road and Brampton Road would also be lit but these existing roads are already lit.</p> <p>In summary, the environmental disadvantages due to construction of the new link roads would be less than the environmental/landscape gains from removing the trunk road traffic, demolishing the viaduct and reuniting the east end of Views Common.</p> |
| Chris and Lynn Slater | The design does not consider the detrimental effects that the new road would have upon the village of Hilton. | <p>Noise</p> <p>As set out in the Chapter 14 of the <i>Environmental Statement (ES)</i> (document reference 6.1) mitigation measures have been designed into the scheme to minimise as far as sustainable adverse effects on health and quality of life. Because of the relatively large separation distances between the scheme and Hilton and the measures already incorporated into the scheme design, the noise levels (calculated under downwind conditions) resulting from the scheme are relatively low in absolute terms and no perceptible long term increases in</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|--|---|--|
| | | <p>noise at Hilton have been identified for the vast majority of the village (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges document HD213/11 Rev 1). No likely significant noise effects have therefore been identified at Hilton.</p> <p>Air quality The air quality within Hilton is assessed within the air quality chapter of the Environmental Statement. At 800 metres the contribution of the road to ambient pollution concentrations would be negligible. In Hilton it is the contribution from vehicles travelling directly through the village that have the greatest impacts on air quality. The air quality assessment shows some small improvements in air quality in 2035 from the proposed scheme as a result of predicted reductions in traffic in the village.</p> <p>Landscape/ lighting No road lighting is proposed near Hilton. Proposed screen bunds to a height of 2m above the road level of the proposed A14 would be densely planted with trees and shrubs. The bunds would screen A14 traffic and headlights near Hilton. Headlights of vehicles crossing the proposed Potton Road bridge at approximately 900-1000m from the village would be initially be visible from certain locations at the edge of the village but headlight glare would not be a problem for the following reasons. For properties on Potton Road, headlights on the bridge would be screened by roadside trees and hedges, and by trees and hedges on the property boundaries. For other viewpoints the traffic would be aligned oblique to the viewer with no possibility of headlight glare. Within 10 to 15 years of planting, proposed dense tree and shrub planting on the bridge embankments would screen headlights on or near the Potton Road and Hilton Road bridges.</p> |
| Chris and Lynn Slater, Godfrey Williams, Dr R W Hodder | Comments regarding the measures that would be implemented to mitigate the | <p>Noise The assessment of operational noise and vibration effects reported in chapter 14 of the <i>Environmental Statement (ES)</i> (document reference 6.1), takes account of all individual dwellings and communities in Hilton. The criteria for</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>environmental impacts on the village of Hilton, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that mitigation measures to reduce noise, air and light pollution have not been considered in the design. • Query regarding the assurances that can be given to ensure that mitigation measures are maintained in the future. In particular the retention of noise protection and low noise road surfacing, during maintenance and when it needs to be replaced. | <p>inclusion of operational noise mitigation for the scheme is defined in Appendix 14.1 of the <i>ES Appendices (document reference 6.3)</i>, that also sets out how the scheme and its mitigation will be maintained. Sustainable mitigation measures designed into the scheme along the Huntingdon Southern Bypass in the area of Hilton to reduce noise impacts during operation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • careful design of the alignment and cuttings; • the use of low noise road surfacing; and • landscaped earthworks (provided to reduce visual impact and which will reduce noise at receptors close to the new bypass). <p>The main community at Hilton is located, at its closest point, around 900m from the proposed scheme. The Highways England comments on the Relevant Representations, with regard to the noise impact at Hilton (response on page 98 of HE/A14/EX/25 Response to Relevant Representations June 2015), have already explained that noise barriers (as either fences or landscaped bunds) will not provide any benefit over distances of 600 metres from the road (or at greater distances). The Government's Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (Department of Transport and Welsh Office, 1988, Calculation of Road Traffic Noise) methodology states that the calculated level of noise should only allow for either the reduction provided by a noise barrier or the reduction for the absorption provided by soft ground cover between the road and the receiver. The reduction provided by soft ground increases with increasing distance from the road. The calculated net benefit of a noise barrier therefore decreases with increasing distance from the road being considered and with mainly flat grassed or agricultural land between the road and receiver the net benefit will be negligible at a distance of 600m (further information on the design of noise barriers is provided in 1.10.12 in Highways England Response to the ExA's First Written Questions: report 10 Noise and Vibration (document reference HE-A14-EX-37).</p> <p>The applicant's response to the Examining Authority's question 1.10.8 (<i>Response to ExA's First Written Questions, Report 10: Noise and Vibration (document reference EX/37)</i>), confirms that Highways England will add an</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|------------------|---|
| | | <p>additional requirement to the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) application to secure permanent noise mitigation. The additional requirement will be included in the next draft of the DCO application to be submitted to ExA by deadline 4 (7 July 2015) as defined by the Rule 8 letter. The new requirement will secure the details of the noise mitigation for the scheme, reflecting the measures set out in the environmental statement.</p> <p>Air quality The air quality within Hilton is assessed within the air quality chapter of the Environmental Statement. At 800 metres the contribution of the road to ambient pollution concentrations would be negligible. In Hilton it is the contribution from vehicles travelling directly through the village that have the greatest impacts on air quality. The air quality assessment shows some small improvements in air quality in 2035 from the proposed scheme as a result of predicted reductions in traffic in the village. As no significant air quality effects are predicted for Hilton, no air quality mitigation is required or proposed.</p> <p>Landscape/ lighting No road lighting is proposed near Hilton. Screen bunds to a height of 2m above the road level of the proposed A14 and densely planted with trees and shrubs would screen A14 traffic and headlights near Hilton. Headlights of vehicles crossing the proposed Potton Road bridge at approximately 900-1000m from the village would be initially be visible from certain locations at the edge of the village but headlight glare would not be a problem for the following reasons. For properties on Potton Road the headlights would be screened out by roadside trees and hedges and by trees and hedges on the property boundaries. Within 10 to 15 years of planting, proposed dense tree and shrub planting on the bridge embankments would screen headlights on or near the Potton Road and Hilton Road bridges. Planting and screen mounds along the A14 would remain in the ownership of Highways England and would be maintained by their managing agents.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Chris and Lynn Slater, Sara Partridge, Dr R W Hodder, John and Valerie Burningham</p> | <p>The new A14 threatens to ruin the beautiful village of Hilton, its tranquil nature and the lives of its residents.</p> <p>Reference to Hilton's association to Capability Brown and Hilton's historic importance.</p> | <p>Landscape</p> <p>The scheme by moving A14 traffic closer to the village would increase the background noise of traffic, slightly eroding tranquillity, however no perceptible long term increases in noise at Hilton have been identified for the vast majority of the village (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges document HD213/11 Rev 1). No likely significant noise effects have therefore been identified at Hilton. The appearance and immediate setting of the village would not change significantly. The route of the A14 would be situated more than 1km distant from the historic heart of the village, including properties on the High Street, near the Green and the turf maze. The majority of houses on the northern fringe of the village would be over 1km from the centreline of the road. No residential properties in the village would be closer than 900m from the centreline with eight properties (on Potton Road and The Paddocks) situated at distances ranging from 900m to 950m. Existing hedges and trees on property boundaries, field boundaries and along West Brook would continue to provide significant screening between the village and the A14. Trees and rising ground east of Potton Road would partially screen the highway from properties on the northern fringe of the Green and the High Street. These properties would add further separation between the A14 and the Green (and historic maze).</p> <p>As part of the scheme near Hilton a screen bund would be constructed along the verge to a continuous height 2m above proposed road level and would be densely planted with trees. This would provide a further layer of traffic screening. The Potton Road and Hilton Road bridges would rise above this with densely planted embankment slopes.</p> <p>In Year 1 at completion of construction views from residents in 18 properties at the northern fringe west of Potton Road would be subject to slight adverse effect from the Scheme. East of Potton Road the effect would be moderate adverse for residents in five properties. 15 years later taking proposed planting into account, residents of these properties would reduce to slight</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>adverse effect (see ES chapter 10 for methodology and definitions for assessment of effects on views.).</p> <p>Heritage An assessment of the designated heritage assets in Hilton was undertaken to establish if there were impacts on these assets as a result of the construction and operation of the scheme. An inspection of each heritage asset was undertaken to establish the potential for visual intrusion. The inspection noted that the village is well screened by wooded boundaries and generally looked inward to the historic core and green spaces. The majority of the designated assets are screened from the proposed A14 by the 20th century development area north of Graveley Road, or are screened by wooded boundaries that provide filtered views onto the proposed scheme.</p> <p>Interpreted data was provided to establish changes in levels of traffic movements and noise. Analysis of the traffic and noise data indicated that there would be no likelihood of significant effects.</p> <p>As the assessment identified that the assets were unlikely to experience significant effects they were excluded from further assessment. The list is presented in Table 9.1: Assets excluded from further assessment based on traffic and noise data of the <i>ES (document reference 6.1)</i>.</p> |
| Ann Goodridge | <p>Highways England have failed to address a challenge “that undue weight is given to environmental impacts at Huntingdon rather than the surrounding countryside”.</p> <p>Quotes Highways England response to this challenge to support this claim: “It is</p> | <p>Landscape In Huntingdon the new link roads and other highway infrastructure providing access to the town centre as part of the proposed scheme, would impact directly on existing townscape character. The landscape proposals are intended to mitigate this impact as far as practicable while contributing to the quality of the public realm, enhancing the main town approach routes and complementing the area’s historic character. Where trees are planted as specimens or as part of an avenue it is considered appropriate to use larger planting stock which would create an immediate visual effect and which would be sufficiently robust in the urban area. More peripheral parts of the landscape</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>acknowledged that some mitigation measures will not be fully effective immediately (for example tree and shrub planting). The use of larger planting stock would be used where appropriate (for example within Huntingdon town centre) to provide an immediate landscape effect.”</p> <p>There is clear evidence that Huntingdon is preferred over Hilton and other villages in the countryside.</p> | <p>mitigation in Huntingdon, such as the planting on the Views Common roundabout embankment, would make use of smaller forestry type nursery stock.</p> <p>The scheme would not fall directly within public realm areas in the village of Hilton. It is acknowledged however, that some adverse landscape and visual effects resulting from the scheme would be experienced from the northern edge of the village and in the wider parish. The landscape planting proposed on extensive earth bunds along the new road in the vicinity of the village, is intended to mitigate such effects as far as is practicable by integrating the new road into the landscape and providing visual screening. The massed planting of woodland trees and shrubs, predominantly using smaller forestry type nursery stock, is considered the most effective type of planting for this purpose. This approach does not indicate any lesser importance attached to Hilton compared to Huntingdon. It is simply a response to mitigating the local landscape and visual effects identified in the Environmental Statement in the most appropriate way and in the long term.</p> |
| <p>J A Thomas</p> | <p>Concerns about the proximity of the road to the village of Hilton and the impact this would have on the community.</p> <p>Environmental impacts would be traffic noise (especially at night), the visual impact of traffic and air pollution from the vehicle exhausts.</p> <p>Why have Highways England chosen to bend the route so close to Hilton, and thereby</p> | <p>Noise</p> <p>On the northern edge of Hilton, predicted noise increases from the scheme with mitigation are around 1 dBLpAeq although isolated properties north of the village closer to the scheme will experience larger increases. The village of Hilton is over 600m from the proposed scheme and the majority of the village is outside the 40 dB night time contour, below which adverse effects are not expected. The ES concluded that no likely significant noise effects were identified at Hilton.</p> <p>The proposed scheme alignment is determined by a range of design influences of which noise and other environmental factors are part. Sustainable mitigation measures also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the use of low noise road surfacing; and • landscaped earthworks. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>exacerbating the problems described?</p> <p>“If the route had followed the current A14 for perhaps another kilometre or so westwards before dipping south, then the extra clearance between Hilton and the road would have significantly reduced the triple blights of noise, sight and pollution on the village without detriment to any other community. I would ask that if the current route must be maintained then the line of the road be amended to take it further away from the village”</p> | <p>As noted, with the proposed alignment and the other mitigation measures above, no likely significant noise effects were identified at Hilton. The alignment has been chosen balancing the environmental impacts against other critical highway design considerations.</p> <p>Air quality The air quality within Hilton is assessed within the air quality chapter of the Environmental Statement. At 800 metres the contribution of the road to ambient pollution concentrations would be negligible. In Hilton it is the contribution from vehicles travelling directly through the village that have the great impacts on air quality. The air quality assessment shows some small improvements in air quality in 2035 from the proposed scheme as a result of predicted reductions in traffic in the village.</p> <p>Landscape and Views In the proposed scheme the majority of houses on the northern fringe of the village would be over 1km from the centreline of the road. No residential properties in the village would be closer than 900m from the centreline, with eight properties (on Potton Road and The Paddocks) situated at distances ranging from 900m to 950m. Existing hedges and trees on property boundaries, field boundaries and along West Brook would continue to provide significant screening between the village and the A14. Trees and rising ground east of Potton Road would partially screen the highway from properties on the northern fringe of the Green and the High Street.</p> <p>As part of the scheme near Hilton a screen bund would be constructed along the verge to a continuous height 2m above proposed road level and would be densely planted with trees. This would provide a further layer of traffic screening. The Potton Road and Hilton Road bridges would rise above this with densely planted embankment slopes.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>In Year 1 at completion of construction views from residents in 18 properties at the northern fringe west of Potton Road would be subject to slight adverse effect from the Scheme. East of Potton Road the effect would be moderate adverse for residents in five properties. Fifteen years later taking proposed planting into account, residents of these properties would be subject to slight adverse effect and therefore not significant. (See chapter 10 of the <i>ES (document reference 6.1)</i> for methodology and definitions for assessment of effects on views.)</p> |
| <p>Ian Weitzel</p> | <p>By removing the viaduct and re-routing Brampton Road into Huntingdon, there would be a sizeable loss of land within Hinchingsbrooke Country Park and there would be felling of a large number of mature trees. This would be a substantial loss of amenity for residents of Huntingdon and surrounding areas, and there is little or no compensatory benefits.</p> <p>There would also be road safety implications from the increased traffic flows near the school and hospital, which do not appear to be addressed in any detail.</p> | <p>Landscape</p> <p>The scheme would not affect land within Hinchingsbrooke Country Park. The proposed Views Common link road would cross the pasture at Views Common and pass through the park and sports field in the grounds of the Cambridgeshire Constabulary headquarters east of Hinchingsbrooke Hospital. It would require the felling of a short section of the belt of trees separating the Common from the police property. Another section of mature trees along Snowdonia Way near Brampton Road at the southern boundary of the police property would be felled to construct the link road and adjacent highway drainage retention pond. A group of trees would be lost with the proposed changes to the junction between Brampton Road and Snowdonia Way. To match the parkland character of the landscape, extensive planting of large size avenue trees is proposed along the link road and large specimen trees are proposed near the junctions and around the drainage ponds. Infill planting of large size trees is proposed along Brampton Road to fill gaps in the existing avenue.</p> <p>Land at Views Common would be lost to the link road and to construct the proposed roundabout where the existing A14 road would terminate, also to construct a nearby drainage retention pond. The loss of this land would be counter-balanced by the restoration of a larger section of Views Common with the demolition and removal of the viaduct.</p> <p>Highways England's traffic forecasts within the Traffic Modelling Update Report indicate that the traffic flows on Hinchingsbrooke Park Road in the</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|------------------|---|
| | | <p>vicinity of the school and hospital are not forecast to change significantly as a result of the scheme but would increase significantly further to the east as a result of the opening of the Views Common Link.</p> <p>This increase in traffic has been taken in to account in the design of the Hinchibrooke Park Road / Views Common Link and Brampton Road / Hinchibrooke Park Road junctions, with the operational assessments indicating that both junctions would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast peak hour traffic levels. The design of the junctions has also taken into account the needs of non-motorised users (NMU's), with the Hinchibrooke Park Road / Views Common Link incorporating a single stage crossing on the Views Common Link, while improved crossing facilities are included at the Brampton Road / Hinchibrooke Park Road junction.</p> |

10 Traffic and transportation

Table 10 Traffic and transportation

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>Derek Norman, Kay Norman</p> | <p>Concern that the existing traffic congestion at peak hours associated with rail commuters leaving and arriving at the station, will lead to severe congestion on the proposed new station access road layout and neighbouring roads.</p> <p>Traffic travelling on the station access road network will attempt to access the newly de-trunked A14 at peak times resulting in congestion across the entire section of the road network. This would not be mitigated by the traffic lights at the junctions with the de-trunked A14.</p> <p>Traffic modelling data does not take account of the station access-specific factors (i.e. travel occurring in sharp peaks, moving in generally slow, stop and go patterns and in the evenings) and this has resulted in flawed results.</p> | <p>Summary response</p> <p>Currently, a large proportion of the traffic entering and exiting Huntingdon Rail Station must pass through the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction, which is operating at or close to capacity. Despite recent improvements to the traffic signals at this junction, observations indicate that there are slow moving queues of traffic on Brampton Road during the peak periods, which are caused by congestion at the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction and a number of other secondary factors. Under the scheme proposals, access to the station forecourt and east car park would be moved to the new Mill Common Link, which would decrease the amount of station-related traffic passing through the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction, thereby reducing some of the effect of the 'traffic spikes' associated with the station on the operation of this junction. Operational assessments based on Highways England's latest traffic forecasts contained within the Traffic Modelling Update Report indicate that the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction would be operating at capacity in peak hours with the scheme. However this is primarily due to the improvements made by the scheme to the provision for non-motorised users which would reduce the capacity available for traffic movements.</p> <p>Further detail</p> <p>Currently, the main access to the Huntingdon Railway Station forecourt and east car park is via the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction, while the west car park is accessed further west along Brampton Road via a priority T-junction. Consequently, all traffic from the east car park and forecourt and any traffic from the west car park travelling through the town centre must pass through the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction, which is operating at or close to capacity.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|------------------|---|
| | | <p>Cambridgeshire County Council made changes to the signal timings at the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction in November 2014 with a view to reducing congestion and delay to traffic exiting the station in the evening peak periods. Additional green time was allocated to the station access, with a consequential reduction in the amount of green time allocated to the Brampton Road approaches. While this will have been successful in improving congestion on the station access, it is likely to have introduced some additional delay to traffic on Brampton Road.</p> <p>Observations on Brampton Road in the AM (morning) and PM (evening) peak periods indicate that there is a slow moving queue of traffic on Brampton Road. This congestion is associated with the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction, but is exacerbated by a number of other factors, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delays caused by buses using the on-road bus stops (both peak hours); Delays caused by pedestrians crossing the road away from designated crossing points (both peak hours); and Delays caused by emergency vehicles accessing the hospital, and police and fire headquarters (both peak hours); Delays associated with drop-off activity at the nearby secondary school (AM peak hour only); and Traffic exiting the west car park blocking through traffic on Brampton Road (PM peak hour only). <p>These factors are not a function of the junction design and would be expected to occur whether or not the scheme goes ahead.</p> <p>Under the scheme proposals, the existing access to the station forecourt and east car park would be closed with access to the station reprovided on to the Mill Common Link. The new access would comprise two signalised all-movements junctions. These changes combined with a direct connection on to the de-trunked A14 and a new link on to the town centre ring road would ensure that any traffic travelling from the station to destinations to the east or</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|------------------|--|
| | | <p>north of Huntingdon would no longer have to pass through the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction, thereby reducing some of the effect of the 'traffic spikes' associated with the station on the operation of this junction.</p> <p>Updated operational assessments have been undertaken based on the latest traffic forecasts produced using version 3a of the Cambridge to Huntingdon A14 Roads Model (CHARM3a). The results of these assessments are reported in Appendix A of the <i>Traffic Modelling Update Report</i> (document reference HE-A14-EX-44) (submitted at Deadline 2 of the DCO Examination). The results of the operational assessments indicate that the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction would be operating at capacity in the peak hours with the scheme (the 'Do-Something' scenario), while the junction would operate just within capacity without the scheme (the 'Do-Minimum' scenario).</p> <p>The main reason for the deterioration in performance between the 'Do-Minimum' and 'Do-Something' scenarios is the level of provision that has been made for non-motorised users at the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction has been improved. In the 'Do-Something' scenario, the two-stage pedestrian crossing on Brampton Road (W) would be replaced with a single stage crossing and a new pedestrian crossing would be provided on the Brampton Road I approach. These improvements to the facilities for non-motorised users would result in a reduction in the capacity for traffic movements, resulting in longer queues and delays.</p> <p>Observations on Brampton Road in the AM (morning) and PM (evening) peak periods indicate that there is a slow moving queue of traffic on Brampton Road. This congestion is associated with the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction, but is exacerbated by a number of other factors, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delays caused by buses using the on-road bus stops (both peak hours); • Delays caused by pedestrians crossing the road away from designated crossing points (both peak hours); and |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|------------------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delays caused by emergency vehicles accessing the hospital, and police and fire headquarters (both peak hours); • Delays associated with drop-off activity at the nearby secondary school (AM peak hour only); and • Traffic exiting the station west car park blocking through traffic on Brampton Road (PM peak hour only). <p>These factors are not a function of the junction design and would be expected to occur whether or not the scheme goes ahead.</p> <p>Under the scheme proposals, the existing access to the station forecourt and east car park would be closed with access to the station provided on to the Mill Common Link. The new access would comprise two signalised all-movements junctions. These changes combined with a direct connection on to the de-trunked A14 and a new link on to the town centre ring road would ensure that any traffic travelling from the station to destinations to the east or north of Huntingdon would no longer have to pass through the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction, thereby reducing some of the effect of the 'traffic spikes' associated with the station on the operation of this junction.</p> <p>Updated operational assessments have been undertaken based on the latest traffic forecasts produced using version 3a of the Cambridge to Huntingdon A14 Roads Model (CHARM3a). The results of these assessments are reported in Appendix A of the Traffic Modelling Update Report (Document Reference HE-A14-EX-44) submitted at Deadline 2 of the DCO Examination on 15 June 2015. The results of the operational assessments indicate that the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction would be operating at capacity in the peak hours with the scheme (the 'Do-Something' scenario), while the junction would operate just within capacity without the scheme (the 'Do-Minimum' scenario).</p> <p>The main reason for the deterioration in performance between the 'Do-Minimum' and 'Do-Something' scenarios is that the level of provision that has</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>been made for non-motorised users at the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction has been improved. In the 'Do-Something' scenario, the two-stage pedestrian crossing on Brampton Road (W) would be replaced with a single stage crossing and a new pedestrian crossing would be provided on the Brampton Road (E) approach. These improvements to the facilities for non-motorised users are proposed to accommodate the high number of pedestrians and cyclists that would use this junction, given its proximity to the rail station and its location on the desire line between the town centre and the nearby hospital and secondary school. However, these improvements would result in a reduction in the capacity for traffic movements, resulting in longer queues and delays.</p> |
| <p>Simon Norton, Ian Weitzel</p> | <p>The scheme will encourage traffic growth, reference to the "Trunk Roads and the Generation of Traffic" report prepared by the Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment (SACTRA) in 1994.</p> <p>An effect of improving the journey times will be to encourage more people to live further outside of Cambridge and therefore increase the amount of traffic on the new A14, to the point at which journey times are back to where they were.</p> | <p>Summary response</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme will facilitate some new development along its route. Northstowe Phase 2 is an example of this and has been considered in the preparation of the traffic forecasts. The traffic model forecasts for journey times in the eastbound direction in the AM peak hour (currently the most congested movement and time period) show that travel times in the Opening Year, Design Year and a further forecast year using the new Huntingdon Southern Bypass route are all lower than the current travel times for this movement. The Base Year model is well validated to travel times on the A14.</p> <p>Further detail</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the new A14 will facilitate some new development along its route. The traffic forecasts used for the operational and environmental assessments for the proposed A14 scheme have assumed additional development at Northstowe in the 'with scheme' models (representing Northstowe Phase 2). The 'without scheme' models only account for the smaller Phase 1 development at Northstowe. As the application for Northstowe Phase 2 assumes improvement of the local highway network including the A14, further expansion of development at</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Northstowe is effectively dependant on those improvements, including the A14 scheme.</p> <p>Travel times along the A14 have been observed from TomTom data collected across neutral months in 2013 in accordance with guidance from the Department for Transport (DfT). The Cambridge to Huntingdon A14 Roads Model (CHARM) has been validated against the median observed travel times from the TomTom data. On the A14, the model meets the criteria for Journey Time validation set out in the DfT's Web-based Transport Appraisal Guidance (WebTAG) unit M3.1 for both eastbound and westbound directions across all three modelled time periods. This shows that the model accurately represents the median travel times on the A14.</p> <p>The highest observed median travel time in 2013 was that of the eastbound direction in the AM peak, which is much higher than the other time periods. The observed median travel time was just over 34 minutes. The Base Year model shows a close match, reporting travel times of 33 minutes (just 3% quicker than the observed).</p> <p>Travel times for the eastbound movement have been extracted from the Opening Year (2020), Design Year (2035) and Forecast Year (2041) traffic models for the scheme. These travel times are routed along the new Huntingdon Southern Bypass, rather than the old de-trunked route. Each of these years demonstrates eastbound journey time forecasts for the AM peak that are lower than the current median observed travel time: being 23 minutes (2020); 24.5 minutes (2035); and just over 25 minutes (2041).</p> |
| Ian Weitzel | In order to address the accident rates on the A14 a stricter approach is required to regulating lorries that do not meet UK standards. In addition, those response for causing accidents should be prosecuted. | Highways England is responsible for the management of motorways and major A-roads in England. The regulation of foreign HGVs is a matter for Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) and the police. The prosecution of drivers for offences that directly result from or relate to driving incidents or the way in which a motor vehicle has been driven is a matter for the police and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| David Ousby | <p>The number of vehicles using The Avenue as reported in the Transport Assessment does not tally with the last Cambridgeshire Police traffic survey conducted in August 2012, which recorded on average 1,200 vehicles per day. It is unlikely the volume has tripled over that period. It is suggested the data used in the Transport Assessment has been extrapolated from small sets of data over short time periods. At times (such as during the August 2012 survey) the number of vehicles using The Avenue has been measured as up to 285 per hour when the A14 has been closed temporarily. Equally, a few hours can pass where there is no traffic at all in either direction, usually in the middle of the night when there are no problems with the A14 or M11.</p> | <p>Forecast traffic flows on The Avenue in Madingley are reported in paragraph 7.5.17 of the <i>Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.2)</i>. These are forecast of traffic flows in 2035 with and without the scheme and are therefore not directly comparable with the observed flows on The Avenue. Further detail of traffic flows on The Avenue following the development of the CHARM3a model are set out in the response to Written Question 1.12.4.</p> <p>Highways England's traffic model forecast traffic flows during the morning peak hour (08:00-09:00), an average inter-peak hour (10:00-16:00) and the evening peak hour (17:00-18:00). These hourly traffic forecasts are expanded to produce annual average daily traffic flows using factors derived from analysis of existing traffic flows on a sample of local roads. In some locations, this can lead to daily traffic flows being overstated, particularly on routes where there are relatively few traffic movements during the night time period. The Cambridge Police traffic survey indicates that night time traffic movements on The Avenue are low, with fewer than 400 vehicle trips made between 19:00 and 07:00 on a typical weekday. This may account for some of the apparent discrepancy between the observed and forecast traffic flows on this route.</p> <p>However, the Cambridge Police traffic survey on The Avenue north of Madingley was undertaken between 09 August 2012 and 15 August 2012. Weekday traffic flows recorded in the survey varied from 1050 vehicles per day on Monday 13 August 2012 to almost 1,900 vehicles per day on Friday 10 August 2012, with an average weekday flow of around 1,400 vehicles per day. It is noted that this survey was carried out during the school holidays, when peak hour flows on local roads are generally lower than at other times of the year. Consequently, this survey may not be representative of typical conditions.</p> |
| David Ousby | <p>How are the increased traffic flows through Madingley within the capacity of a village road network?</p> | <p>Details of the traffic flows through Madingley are set out in the response to Written Question 1.12.4. Traffic flows are expected to increase in future years through Madingley whether or not the A14 scheme goes ahead. Without the scheme, there is forecast to be an increase in the volume of traffic using all</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>routes out of the village between 2020 and 2035. Without the scheme, the increases on Church Lane and Cambridge Road to the south are larger than on The Avenue and Dry Drayton Road to the north, indicating an increasing propensity for local traffic to join the A428 / A1303 rather than the A14 due to increasing congestion on the A14. Traffic flows are forecast to increase only slightly more as a result of the proposed A14 scheme being in place, although there are some greater variations on Dry Drayton Road and The Avenue as a result of changing connectivity afforded by the scheme.</p> <p>The highest daily traffic flows are forecast to occur on The Avenue to the north of Madingley, daily traffic flows are forecast to rise from 3,800 vehicles to 6,400 vehicles per day in 2035 as a result of the scheme, an increase of 68%. The main reason for this increase is a transfer of traffic from Dry Drayton Road to The Avenue as a result of the improved connectivity at the junction of The Avenue with the Local Access Road that would be delivered as part of the A14 scheme. As set out in the response to Written Question 1.12.4, the ratio of <i>through traffic</i> through Madingley will in fact decrease with the scheme.</p> <p>The capacity of The Avenue has been calculated using the Congestion Reference Flow (CRF) calculation sets out in Annex D of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 5 Section 1 Part 3 (TA 46/97). Using this method, the CRF was calculated to be approximately 13,200 vehicles per day. This confirms that this section of road and other sections of road in the village which are forecast carry lower volumes of traffic are expected to operate well within capacity.</p> <p>Further details about the impact of the scheme on Madingley are provided in Highways England's response to Question 1.12.4 and Question 1.12.36 in the <i>Response to the First Written Questions Report 12: Transportation and Traffic</i> (Document Reference HE/A14/EX/39) submitted at Deadline 2 of the DCO Examination.</p> |
| Mr R D and Mrs J A Bowers | Since the opening of Edison Bell Way, its junction with the | A variety of improvements for non-motorised users in Huntingdon will be delivered by the scheme, taking into account future forecast traffic flows. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>Brampton Road has created a potentially dangerous barrier for pedestrians and cyclists accessing the town centre from the Hinchingsbrooke Park and Scholars Way housing areas, the secondary school, hospital and country park. Severance of the west Huntingdon area from the town centre will become even more acute if the viaduct is demolished and additional traffic from the former A14 is linked into this junction. Priority should be given to the safe passage of pedestrians and cyclists rather than motorised vehicles, should the scheme be approved. School children are particularly vulnerable.</p> | <p>There is forecast to be some increase in traffic on Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and on Brampton Road as a result of the scheme. This increase is due to additional traffic accessing Huntingdon via the Views Common Link, which would provide a new route in to the town from the A1 to the north and the A14 to the west. However the forecast increase in traffic using this part of the local road network has been taken in to account in the design of the junctions on Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Brampton Road. The design of the junctions has also taken in to account the importance of this route for non-motorised users (NMU's), recognising that this is a key walking and cycling corridor from the school and hospital and is also used by residents of Hinchingsbrooke travelling to and from the rail station and town centre.</p> <p>The Hinchingsbrooke Park Road / Views Common Link junction would incorporate a single stage crossing on the Views Common Link to accommodate the high east-west movements on this side of the road, while the existing pedestrian crossing on Hinchingsbrooke Park Road outside the school would be retained to provide a north-south connection. Pedestrian crossing facilities would also be introduced on the southern side of the junction, where there is currently no provision for NMU's. Further to the east at the Brampton Road / Hinchingsbrooke Park Road junction, crossing facilities would be provided on both Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Brampton Road. Again, there are no controlled crossing facilities at this junction currently, therefore the provision for NMU's would be substantially improved.</p> <p>Improvements would also be made to the provision for NMU's at the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction. Here, the existing of the two-stage pedestrian crossing on Brampton Road to the west of the junction would be replaced with a single stage crossing while a new pedestrian crossing would be introduced on the George Street approach to the east to improve north-south connectivity.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | Further details about the proposed measures to improve access for non-motorised users are provided in Highways England's response to Question 1.12.19 in the <i>Response to the First Written Questions Report 12: Transportation and Traffic (Document Reference HE/A14/EX/39)</i> submitted at Deadline 2 of the DCO Examination. |
| Mr R D and Mrs J A Bowers | <p>The proposed local road system for the west Huntingdon area has been drawn up without any consideration of the future requirements for car parking serving the railway station and safe pedestrian access to the station area.</p> <p>If the viaduct is demolished the re-routed de-trunked A14/car park proposals displace about 180 long-term parking spaces here. Demand for station car parking is growing and likely to increase further with current plans for major housing developments that would be served by Huntingdon Station. This could result in queues of traffic trying to access insufficient spaces and inappropriate parking in residential areas unless many more parking spaces are provided. The number and locations of these spaces will have a significant impact on the road network and</p> | The scheme would result in the loss of some parking at Huntingdon Rail Station. Highways England is in discussions with Network Rail with regards to the impact of works in the station car park and the potential provision of replacement spaces. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>should be planned in parallel with changes to local roads, particularly the de-trunked A14.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the building of a multi –storey car park with proper access on a suitable site.</p> | |
| <p>Mr R D and Mrs J A Bowers</p> | <p>Issues regarding the proposed junction arrangement at the Huntingdon viaduct. There are existing delays to traffic accessing Huntingdon along Brampton Road and Hinchingsbrooke Park Road at peak times, which will be made worse by diverting it to Huntingdon bound traffic currently using a more free flowing Ermine Street. It would also increase risk of accidents to cyclists and pedestrians in this area. Brampton and Hinchingsbrooke Park would be cut off from Huntingdon and traffic queues along the town centre ring road will be extended, creating more conflict at adjoining roads.</p> <p>The traffic volumes and congestion caused by these proposals will delay the passage</p> | <p>Updated operational assessments based on traffic forecasts produced using version 3a of the Cambridge to Huntingdon A14 Roads Model (CHARM3a) are reported in the <i>Traffic Modelling Update Report (Document Reference HE/A14/EX/44)</i> submitted at Deadline 2 of the DCO Examination. The results of the operational assessments are summarised in Table 3.1 (2020) and Table 3.2 (2035). These show that all of the junctions have been designed with sufficient capacity to accommodate the levels of traffic that are forecast to use it on a typical day in 2020 and 2035 with the scheme, with the exception of the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction which will be operating at capacity in the peak hours with the scheme.</p> <p>The results of the operational assessments for the Brampton Road / Edison Bell Way junction indicate that it would be operating at capacity in the peak hours with the scheme (the 'Do-Something' scenario), while the junction would operate just within capacity without the scheme (the 'Do-Minimum' scenario). The main reason for the deterioration in performance between the 'Do-Minimum' and 'Do-Something' scenarios is the improvements that have been made for non-motorised users at this junction, as described above. These improvements would result in the total crossing time being comparable with or lower than the 'Do-Minimum' scenario on most movements through the junction. However, they would also result in a reduction in the capacity for traffic movements, resulting in longer queues and delays.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | of emergency vehicles trying to access the town centre, Godmanchester and routes to the east. | |
| Godfrey D Williams | What traffic measures will be put in place to restrict heavy traffic using the minor rural roads of the village of Hilton? | <p>Highways England considers that the route via the de-trunked A14 and A1198 will be the preferred route between Galley Hill junction and the Godmanchester junction on the proposed Huntingdon Southern Bypass. Though it would be longer in terms of distance for light vehicles, it would be shorter in terms of journey time. For heavy vehicles, the access only restriction on Graveley Way would mean that the route via the de-trunked A14 would be significantly shorter in terms of both time and distance. Hence, Highways England does not consider that the proposals would result in an increase in heavy traffic in Hilton.</p> <p>Traffic from the north of Hilton intending to travel to the west currently joins the A14 at Junction 26 (Galley Hill). A traffic count undertaken at this point in February 2014 showed that there were nearly 2100 vehicles making such a move over a 12-hour period with a similar number in the opposite direction. This included nearly 300 heavy commercial vehicles. Some of these trips would have local destinations in Huntingdon or Godmanchester and would not need to reach the new A14. However, many of the trips would wish to join the new A14 at Godmanchester. There are a number of routes which could be used between the junction at Galley Hill and the proposed junction at Godmanchester. Due to restrictions which apply to heavy vehicles, the routes would differ by vehicle type.</p> <p>For heavy vehicles, there is an existing access only restriction on Graveley Way. Hence, the route choice would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. via the de- trunked A14 to Junction 25 and the A1198 to the proposed Godmanchester Junction; 2. via the B1040 Potton Road through Hilton to the A1198 and then the A1198 to the proposed Godmanchester Junction |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|------------|----------------|-------------|------------|--------------|------|--------|--------|------|-------|------|--------|--------|------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--|--|----------|-------|-------|--|--|
| | | <p>Route 2 would be significantly longer in terms of both distance and journey times. Hence, the assignment model indicates that all heavy vehicles would use route 1 via the existing A14 which will be de-trunked and relieved of a significant volume of traffic and congestion. Hence, the scheme would not result in an increase in heavy vehicles through Hilton. The whole of the A1198 is subject to an access only restriction during the overnight period. Hence, use of Route 2 would not be permitted between 11 PM and 7 AM.</p> <p>The roads within Hilton are the responsibility of the Local Highway Authority, which is Cambridgeshire County Council. Highways England's proposals would not result in an increase in traffic in Hilton. Graveley Way, the minor road which could be used by light vehicles as a route to reach the proposed junction already has traffic calming in the form of road humps and a width restriction.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Leonard Lean | Will the 'Bedford Bypass' be able to cope with the traffic created by the new Scheme, such that it may become a 'pinch point' | <p>Modelling of the A421 west of the Black Cat Roundabout, which would include traffic heading towards the Bedford Bypass, has been carried out, however, this location falls outside of the Scheme area of detailed modelling defined within the <i>Transport Assessment (document reference 7.2)</i>.</p> <p>The table below sets out the forecast AADT flows (2-way) on the A421 west of Black Cat Roundabout in 2020 and 2035 with and without the scheme:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1077 1050 2004 1281"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Without Scheme</th> <th>With Scheme</th> <th>Difference</th> <th>% Difference</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2020</td> <td>54,800</td> <td>54,900</td> <td>+100</td> <td>+0.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2035</td> <td>60,100</td> <td>60,300</td> <td>+300</td> <td>+0.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Change</td> <td>+5,300</td> <td>+5,400</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>% Change</td> <td>+9.7%</td> <td>+9.8%</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Without Scheme | With Scheme | Difference | % Difference | 2020 | 54,800 | 54,900 | +100 | +0.2% | 2035 | 60,100 | 60,300 | +300 | +0.5% | Change | +5,300 | +5,400 | | | % Change | +9.7% | +9.8% | | |
| | Without Scheme | With Scheme | Difference | % Difference | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2020 | 54,800 | 54,900 | +100 | +0.2% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2035 | 60,100 | 60,300 | +300 | +0.5% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Change | +5,300 | +5,400 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % Change | +9.7% | +9.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|------------------|--|
| | | This shows that with the scheme there is a slight increase in flows on the A421 when compared to a situation where the scheme isn't built. However this would be considered a minimal increase, and not one that would create a 'pinch point' on the Buckden Bypass. |

11 Water issues

Table 11 Water issues

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|---|
| Joanne Worsdall | Water borne pollutants draining from the large hardened area of the new road would affect land close to the carriageway and potentially further afield via ground water and drainage ditches. | Runoff from the new road would be treated via vegetated swales and the deposition and biological uptake in the attenuation ponds prior to outfalling into the recovering watercourses. The swales and forebays of the ponds are to be lined to prevent the water from entering the groundwater prior to treatment. |
| Jeff Shaw | There is a delicate balance for managing the water run- off to the river systems. There is a risk that the existing drainage system would become overloaded as a result of laying tarmac on fields and directing carriageway polluted effluent into the system. | <p>The drainage system is designed to store the runoff from the new road to the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability Event (1 in 100 years) plus an allowance for climate change. The runoff would be discharged at greenfield (undeveloped) rates to mimic the response of the natural environment to rainfall and to ensure that there would be no change to flood risk on the receiving watercourses.</p> <p>Runoff from the new road would be treated via vegetated swales and the deposition and biological uptake in the attenuation ponds prior to outfalling into the receiving watercourses.</p> |
| Jeff Shaw | The carriageway needs to be raised above the current level due to the high water table. Therefore bridges across the route would need to be excessively high, causing adverse visual impacts in the area. | The design takes account of the water table across the scheme. Highways attenuation ponds have been designed to store the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability Event (1 in 100 years) plus an allowance for climate change. |
| Jeff Shaw | The area surrounding the scheme is subject to flooding. | A detailed Flood Risk Assessment (<i>Appendix 17.1, document reference 6.3</i>) has been completed in accordance with national guidance (the National Planning Policy Framework) to assess the risk of flooding to the road from all |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|------------------|--|
| | | sources and also the impact the road would have on flood risk. The scheme includes mitigation to ensure that there is no deleterious impact upon flood risk. |

12 Borrow pits

Table 12 Borrow pits

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| Stewart Bottoms | <p>The term borrow pit is a “deceit”. Something cannot be borrowed if there is no intention of returning it.</p> <p>The likelihood of returning land to its former use after extraction is “completely unlikely to remote”.</p> | <p>‘Borrow pit’ is the recognised generic term used on road scheme projects and other infrastructure projects of this type to describe where material is taken from one part of the development area to be used on another part of the scheme. Where there is not a cut and fill balance in the engineering works as is the case on the A14 scheme, it is very common for borrow pits to be needed to supplement the local cut and fill material. It is acknowledged that due to the topography associated with most of the borrow pits sites it will not be possible to return the sites to their former use. The exception to this is borrow pit 5 which will be largely returned to agricultural use and borrow pit 6 where part of the site will be returned to agriculture.</p> |
| Stewart Bottoms | <p>The numerous lakes within Cambridgeshire are proof that the area is “littered” with previous gravel extraction sites.</p> | <p>Noted. However there is a demonstrable need for additional construction materials to be provided from the borrow pits which are deliberately located as close to the route of the scheme as possible to minimise the transport of materials by road.</p> |

13 Consultation

Table 13 Consultation

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|---|
| Sara Partridge | Dismayed that the accompanied site visits do not include a visit to the centre of Hilton, yet appear to cover all other locations affected by the route. | The Examination timetable set out in the Rule 8 letter issued by the Planning Inspectorate (dated 21 May 2015) included a deadline for the receipt of suggested locations and justifications for the accompanied site visits. The Planning Inspectorate published a site visit itinerary on 5 June 2015 and the site visits are due to take place on 16 and 17 July 2015. The list of locations for accompanied site visits is determined by the Examining Authority and not the applicant. |
| Sara Partridge | <p>Highways England representatives were unhelpful or unknowledgeable at all the pre-application local consultation meetings.</p> <p>Representatives stated that it was not their fault and to take it up with Government as it was their decision.</p> | <p>A range of consultation events were hosted by Highways England, along the route, in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation (<i>Consultation Report Appendix B (document reference 6.2)</i>). These events were staffed by representatives of Highways England and contact details were made available for requests for further information.</p> <p>The decision to proceed with funding for the proposed scheme was announced by the Department for Transport in 2013. The applicant for the proposed scheme is Highways England, a government owned company. The examination of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application is being undertaken by the Examining Authority, who will then make a recommendation to the Secretary of State as to whether the application should be approved. The ultimate decision as to whether the DCO should be approved will be made by the Secretary of State. The examination of the Development Consent Order application is being undertaken by the Examining Authority, who will then make a recommendation to the Secretary of State as to whether the application should be approved. The ultimate decision as to whether the Development Consent Order should be approved will be made by the Secretary of State.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Sara Partridge | I did not feel consulted and got the impression the preferred route would be pursued regardless. | <p>Highways England undertook extensive pre-application consultation in accordance with the legal requirements of the Planning Act 2008. Further details on the methodology and outcomes of the pre-application consultation process are available in the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1).</p> <p>The A14 scheme development has progressed over a period of time. Twenty-two route options were considered for the alignment of the road. This was later refined to six options by identifying scheme options which offered both value for money and which could deliver solutions to the scheme objectives. These six options were subject to a public consultation from September to October 2013. This led to the selection of a preferred route option, which was the subject of statutory pre-application consultation from April to June 2014. The design has been refined further in response to consultation feedback and ongoing technical studies. Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference 6.1) entitled 'Main Alternatives' outlines the main alternative scheme options that have been considered. The Case for the Scheme (document reference 7.1) set out the background to the scheme and the options considered.</p> |
| Sara Partridge | A local MP said that the development is a done deal and Highways England are appointing construction companies and designers before the end of the examination period. This demonstrates the contempt which Highways England hold locals with and shows the consultation was a pretence. | <p>Highways England appreciates the fact that consent has not been granted, however the appointment of contractors for the detailed design and construction stages is important in order to ensure the project would be able to proceed to time and budget if consent is granted. Highways England undertook pre-application consultation in accordance with the Planning Act 2008 and took consultation feedback into account, which resulted in several changes to the proposed scheme. This is documented in the <i>Consultation Report</i> (document reference 5.1).</p> <p>Following submission of the Development Consent Order application, 15 local authorities responded to the Planning Inspectorate regarding the adequacy of the consultation. This included the three hosting authorities (Cambridgeshire County Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council) as well as various neighbouring authorities.</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>In summary, the local authorities all responded that the consultation had been adequate. The full responses are available to view at the National Infrastructure Planning website.</p> <p>As per section 55 of the Planning Act 2008, the Planning Inspectorate when deciding to accept the DCO application had regard to the consultation report, adequacy of consultation representations received from local authorities and the extent to which the applicant has had regard to guidance.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate provided comments on their decision to accept the application in the Section 55 Application Checklist, available of the National Infrastructure Planning website.</p> <p>Section 2.16 of the checklist asks “to what extent has the applicant had regard to DCLG guidance ‘The Planning Act 2008: Guidance on the pre-application process’? In response, the Planning Inspectorate commented: “The applicant appears to have had regard to DCLG guidance with the approach they have taken for the consultation process, and there is no evidence to suggest that they have not followed this guidance” (page 16).</p> |
| Sara Partridge | <p>Provision of information has not been fair, clear or truthful. Members of the public have not found the consultation process easy and cannot be expected to assimilate and understand the DCO application.</p> | <p>During the pre-application stage, Highways England provided a <i>Consultation Brochure</i> to provide information on the proposed scheme and the DCO application process. Preliminary environmental and traffic information documents were also published, available online and at a range of consultation venues. Staff were on hand at consultation events to explain the proposals and contact details were provided on all documentation for consultees who wished to learn more about the proposals.</p> <p>The DCO application documents were accompanied by an <i>Introduction to the Application (document reference 1.1)</i>, which provides an accessible guide to the scheme, applicant and application.</p> |
| Sara Partridge | <p>At the exhibitions it was suggested by the material and</p> | <p>The alignment of these bridges has not changed since the pre-application consultation stage and are the same as presented at the consultation</p> |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|--|--|
| | discussions with representatives that the bridges over Potton Road and Hilton Road would be 8 metres at their highest point, it now turns out they were always going to be 11 metres high. This was deliberately misleading. | exhibitions. This misunderstanding could be due to the fact that the side roads would be approximately 8 metres above the main road, which itself is 3 metres above ground level. |
| Joanne Worsdall | What status will the many objections submitted against the scheme have during the examination? | Written representations and oral evidence will be considered by the Examining Authority in their examination of the DCO application. Highways England continue to consider comments and representations received post-submission of the application. This includes the Response to <i>Relevant Representations</i> (document reference HE-A14-EX-25), <i>Responses to First Written Questions</i> (document references HE-A14-EX-28 to HE-A14-EX-45) and this response to the Written Representations. |
| Joanne Worsdall | It seems that any objections to this route will not count for much compared to the “ <i>great band wagon built up over time for this solution</i> ”. | |
| M L Boyles | The proposed scheme has become very divisive for the communities of Huntingdonshire as there are some communities which will benefit and others which will be adversely affected. It is therefore required that when the results of the consultation are taken into account the perceptions of benefit and dis-benefit by different communities are properly taken into account. | The impacts on local communities which would arise from the proposed scheme have been assessed in the environmental impact assessment, as reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference 6.1). This reports both adverse and beneficial effects and the mitigation proposed to reduce adverse effects. Consideration has been given to all comments received during the pre-application stage, and Highways England's response to these is provided in the <i>Consultation Report</i> . Highways England has considered relevant and written representations, during the examination, including those that express support and raise issues with the scheme. The Examining Authority will consider benefits and dis-benefits of the scheme in its examination of the scheme and its eventual recommendation, as will the Secretary of State in making a final decision on whether to grant the development consent order. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|---|--|
| M L Boyles | There are potential conflicts of interest involving elected representatives who operate at both county council and parish council levels. The latter arises when a county councillor's views on behalf of one ward may not necessarily be in the best interests of another parish outside that ward, but also represented by the same individual at parish council level, thereby leading to potential compromise of the latter's position. | Highways England appreciates that the views of elected representatives may not reflect those of their individual constituents. Consideration has been given to all comments received during the pre-application stage, and Highways England's response to these is provided in the <i>Consultation Report</i> . |
| Ann Goodridge | Hilton residents' concerns over environmental pollution and air quality are being ignored. This is unacceptable and proves the consultation inadequate and ineffective. | All comments received during the pre-application stage have been considered and responded to in the <i>Consultation Report</i> . This includes comments from members of the local community regarding environmental impacts and air quality in Hilton, as shown in Table 6b Part 4 and Table 9 Part 3 of Appendix E of the <i>Consultation Report Appendices (document reference 5.2)</i> . |
| Ann Goodridge | The DCO application refers to concerns over air quality, particularly around Brampton and the Offords but does not acknowledge that the same concerns were expressed by many Hilton residents. Subsequent relevant representations from Hilton residents on the same subject are further evidence of Highways | Highways England will continue to engage with local community representatives through a series of Parish Forum Updates. |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | England's lack of consultation in this important area. | |
| Ann Goodridge | The way in which the consultation process was undertaken, the scope of the assessment and the determination of mitigation measures has made Hilton residents feel side-lined and insignificant. | Highways England undertook extensive pre-application consultation in accordance with the legal requirements of the Planning Act 2008. All comments received during the pre-application stage have been considered and responded to in the <i>Consultation Report</i> . |
| Dr Allan Salem | Despite having attended consultations and exhibitions over some years, I and other residents have found that our questions about measures to mitigate noise, light and air pollution have gone unanswered. We were reassured that these issues would be dealt with nearer the time, but still no helpful response has been received. | The scope of the environmental impact assessment was agreed with the Planning Inspectorate and was formally set out in a scoping opinion issued on behalf of the Secretary of State in April 2014. The likely significant effects of the scheme on the environment are reported in the <i>Environmental Statement (ES)</i> (document reference 6.1), including proposed mitigation measures. |
| Dr Allan Salem, Sara Partridge | A Highways England representative has stated that Hilton would be a loser from this project. There was no indication as to how the factors contributing to this status would be mitigated, or even that anyone had given much thought to the matter. | The impacts on local communities which would arise from the proposed scheme have been assessed in the environmental impact assessment. They are reported, along with proposals for mitigation, in Chapter 16 of the <i>Environmental Statement (ES)</i> (document reference 6.1). Hilton is likely to experience slight adverse impacts (due to potential barrier to movement), though the provision of overpasses along the route would mitigate much of this impact. A range of mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce significant environmental effects. During construction, this would include adherence to the <i>ES</i> , the use of appropriate construction phasing, the provision of alternative routes with adequate signage and the use of noise |

| Written representation | Summary of issue | Highways England response |
|------------------------|------------------|--|
| | | screens and low noise equipment. During operation, this would include the use of cuttings, low-noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks. |

