

A14
Cambridge to Huntingdon
improvement scheme
Development Consent Order Application

HE/A14/EX/67

TR010018

HE/A14/EX/67

Highways England's Response to Oral Submissions put at Open Floor Hearings

July 2015

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010



A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme

Development Consent Order Application
Highways England's Response to Oral Submissions put at Open
Floor Hearings

HE/A14/EX/67

22 July 2015

Contents

Contents	3
Tables	3
1 Introduction	4
1.1 Open Floor Hearings.....	4
2 Highways England Response to Oral Submission put at Open Floor Hearings	5
2.1 Hilton Open Floor Hearing	5
2.2 Bar Hill Open Floor Hearing: Morning Session	13
2.3 Bar Hill Open Floor Hearing: Afternoon Session.....	18
2.4 Brampton Open Floor Hearing: Evening Session	21
Appendix 1	33

Tables

Table 2-1: Hilton Open Floor Hearing	5
Table 2-2: Bar Hill Open Floor Hearing Morning Session	13
Table 2-3: Bar Hill Open Floor Hearing: Afternoon Session.....	18
Table 2-4: Brampton Open Floor Hearing: Evening Session	21

1 Introduction

1.1 Open Floor Hearings

1.1.1 This document provides responses by Highways England (the "Applicant") to the oral submissions put by interested parties at the Open Floor Hearings (OFH) held on Monday 13 July 2015 and Tuesday 14 July 2015 at the following locations:

- Monday 13 July 2015: Hilton at 18:30;
- Tuesday 14 July 2015: Bar Hill at 09:30;
- Tuesday 14 July 2015: Bar Hill at 14:00; and
- Tuesday 14 July 2015: Brampton at 19:00.

1.1.2 The OFH were attended by the Examining Authority and Highways England, together with interested parties.

1.1.3 The OFH provided a useful forum in which discussions and key issues were raised by the Examining Authority and interested parties. Highways England has listened to and considered the submissions made at the OFH and has prepared this document in response. It is not intended to repeat the discussions in full in this written response. However, this document provides the Applicant's response to points raised by interested parties and the Examining Authority (particularly where those points have not been responded to in documents already submitted by the Applicant) and, where applicable, references where these topics have been dealt with in previous submissions by the Applicant.

1.1.4 Audio recordings of the OFH have been published and are available on the Planning Inspectorate's website.

2 Highways England Response to Oral Submission put at Open Floor Hearings

2.1 Hilton Open Floor Hearing

2.1.1 Table 2.1 identifies the key topics raised by interested parties at the Hilton OFH and sets out Highways England's response. In addition, where the issue has been responded to previously the document reference has been provided to aid navigation through the examination document.

Table 2-1: Hilton Open Floor Hearing

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
Ken Atwood: Hilton Action on Traffic	Traffic Impacts in Hilton	<p>Traffic flows through Hilton are forecast to increase into the future. By 2035 the AADT (Average Annual Daily Traffic) on the B1040 through Hilton is forecast to be 5,600 AADT. As a result of the scheme this is forecast to reduce to 5,100 AADT. Flows on Graveley Way are predicted to be 3,000 AADT by 2035 which falls to 2,800 AADT as a result of the A14 improvement scheme. There is no evidence to suggest that there would be a significant increase in the volume of rat-running traffic through Hilton as a result of the scheme. Further details can be found in the response to written representations (Report 2: Parish Councils), application reference HE/A14/EX/50, examination reference REP4-012)</p> <p>These traffic forecasts are derived from a traffic model that makes a future prediction based on an accurate representation of what happens today and a set of growth assumptions which takes account of development proposals and national and regional population and employment forecasts. This is a standard procedure and has been approved by Highways England Traffic Appraisal, Modelling and Economics (TAME) team. Highways England considers the forecasts produced to be a valid prediction of the future.</p> <p>A follow up meeting with Hilton Action on Traffic has been arranged for 10 August 2015 where specific issues relating to noise and traffic will be discussed.</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
Ken Atwood: Hilton Action on Traffic	Construction Traffic in Hilton	<p>In respect of Graveley Way, this is a small single track rural road between the A1198 and Hilton and is unsuitable for HGV's. The IDT can commit to not using this road for construction purposes. The Environmental Statement Appendix 20.2 - Code of Construction Practice (document ref 6.3, examination reference APP-752) will capture this commitment when producing the Traffic Management Plan in accordance with Section 15.1.5 which states that <i>"a list of roads which may be used by construction traffic in the vicinity of the site including any restrictions to construction traffic on these routes."</i> The IDT will include Graveley Way in this list of roads.</p> <p>With respect to Construction traffic passing through other routes in Hilton, it is not envisaged that there will be any general requirement to use these routes to access the site. We will endeavour to avoid the use of these roads as far as is practical with the aim of only using them for exceptional purposes. Should the IDT determine an exceptional need to use these routes for any reason then consultation with the local roads authority and local community action group will be undertaken in advance of such use. In any event the IDT will comply with any weight restriction imposed on any route in Hilton by Local highways authority.</p> <p>Please refer to Highways England's comments on the Written Representations Report 7: Local Community / Public (application reference HE/A14/EX/55 paragraph 7.9.5, examination reference REP4-017).</p> <p>A follow up meeting with Hilton Action on Traffic has been arranged for 10 August 2015 where specific issues relating to noise and traffic will be discussed.</p>
Peter Balicki: Hilton Parish Council	Traffic Noise Mitigation in Hilton	<p>Highways England's comments on the Written Representations Report 2: Parish Councils (application reference HE/A14/EX/50 paragraph 7.8.7, examination reference REP4-012) refers to a Noise Pollution Expert referred to in the written representation from Hilton Parish Council. Highways England and its advisors can find no record of having received any request for digitised data as suggested in the representation. We would welcome further engagement with Hilton Parish Council and its noise pollution expert and the ExA would be advised of the outcomes from such discussions via an updated SoCG.</p> <p>Highways England is meeting Hilton Parish Council on the 22 July 2015 to discuss key issues (including noise and landscape and visual impact).</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
Peter Balicki: Hilton Parish Council	Photomontages Viewpoint 14 Hilton Road	<p>The additional photomontages (Viewpoint 14 Hilton Road (NE of Hilton)) prepared in response to Written Question 1.9.7 were undertaken in accordance with the methodology set out in Appendix 10.7 Detailed methodology used for production of zone of theoretical visibility and photomontages, of the Environmental Statement document reference 6.3, examination reference App-688)</p> <p>In terms of the differences between the photomontages in Year 1 and Year 15, the Potton Road bridge and embankments and vehicles crossing the A14 are clearly visible in the photomontage at year 1. The 2m high screening bund on the south side of the A14 can also be seen. In the photomontage at year 15 planting on the bridge embankments and the bund has established and there is a more limited view of the bridge and traffic using the bridge and the A14.</p> <p>Highways England is meeting Hilton Parish Council on the 22 July 2015 to discuss key issues (including noise and landscape and visual impact).</p>
Examining Authority	Traffic	<p>Cambridgeshire Constabulary undertook speed surveys on Potton Road between 2 March and 9 March 2011. The surveys included counts of vehicles by direction and vehicles were classified by length. Category 1 represents vehicles up to 6 metres in length (e.g. cars and small vans) while Category 2 represents vehicles over 6 metres long (e.g. larger vans, lorries and cars pulling trailers). The data collected indicates that on an average weekday, there were approximately 483 Category 2 vehicle movements out of a 2-way flow of 6,275, which equates to 8% of the vehicles using this route. The maximum number of Category 2 vehicle movements recorded in a single day was 517. Only 15 Category 2 vehicle movements were recorded between 23:00 and 07:00 on an average weekday, when the existing weight restriction is in operation. The enforcement of the weight restriction is a matter for the local highway authority, Cambridgeshire County Council.</p> <p>The exact location of the survey is unknown, but it is assumed that it is on the section of Potton Road to the north of Hilton. Highways England's traffic forecasts for this section of Potton Road indicate that the annual average daily traffic flow is 6,700 vehicles per day in 2014 of which 400 vehicles would be HGV's (6%).</p> <p>It should be noted that the vehicle categorisation used in the Cambridgeshire Constabulary counts is based on vehicle length and therefore may include public service vehicles and smaller vans that would not normally be classified as HGVs. Consequently, taking the Category 2 total as a surrogate for the number HGV movements may result in an overstatement of HGV activity. Taking this into account,</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		<p>Highways England's traffic forecasts for this section of Potton Road are considered to be representative of observed conditions allowing for seasonal variations in traffic flows.</p> <p>Highways England's traffic forecasts, based on version 3a of the Cambridge to Huntingdon A14 Roads Model (CHARM3a) indicate that AADT (Average Annual Daily Traffic) on the B1040 north of Hilton is forecast to increase from 8,800 vehicles per day without the scheme to 9,200 vehicles per day with the scheme (+5%). The increase is mainly the result of traffic switching from Hilton Road to Potton Road to take advantage of the improved conditions on the detrunked A14 and therefore flows through Hilton are not expected to be significantly affected by the scheme.</p>
Graham Barradell	Scheme Design	<p>The height of bridges adjacent to Hilton (Potton Road and Hilton Road) is shown on Sheets 16 and 17 of the Engineering Section Drawings (document reference 2.9, examination reference APP-213 and APP-214).</p> <p>Highways England's response as to the mitigation measures for these two bridges can be found in its response to the Examining Authority's question 1.9.7 (application reference HE/A14/EX/36, examination reference REP2-010) and paragraph 69.3.12-69.3.14 and 17.2.1-17.2.14 of Highways England's comments on the Written Representations, Report 5: Land Interests (application reference HE/A14/EX/53, examination reference REP4-15).</p>
Chris Graveling	B1040 Bridge over the A14	<p>Please refer to paragraph 69.3.12-69.3.14 and 17.2.1-17.2.14 of Highways England's comments on the Written Representations, Report 5: Land Interests (application reference HE/A14/EX/53, examination reference REP4-15)</p> <p>See also Highways England's response to the Examining Authority's question 1.9.7 (application reference HE/A14/EX/36, examination reference REP2-010)</p>
Richard Norton	Cost of A428	<p>Consideration of alternatives associated with the A428 are set out in page 29-31 of Highways England's comments on the Written Representations, Report 7: Local Community/Public (application reference HE/A14/EX/55, examination reference REP4-017).</p>
Richard Norton	Consultation	<p>Section 13 of Highways England's comments on the Written Representations, Report 7: Local Community/Public (application reference HE/A14/EX/55, examination reference REP4-017) sets out the applicant's response on various concerns regarding the consultation process.</p>
Sara Partridge	Alternative Route Options	<p>Details of how alternative options have been considered can be found at Section 33.3 of Highways England's comments on the Written Representations, Report 5: Land Interests (application reference HE/A14/EX/53, examination reference REP4-015).</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
Sara Partridge	Construction Traffic through Hilton	A response to concerns regarding HCV construction traffic in Hilton is provided at paragraph 7.9.5-7.9.7 of Highways England's comments on the Written Representations, Report 2: Parish Councils (application reference HE/A14/EX/50, examination reference REP4-012).
Sara Partridge	Beautiful Roads Announcement	<p>As set out in Highways England's response to Mr Williams' written representation on behalf of Buckden Marina Residents Association (Report 6: Non Statutory Organisations, (examination reference REP4-016, application reference HE/A14/EX/54) and the Examining Authority's question 1.9.6 (application reference HE/A14/EX/36, examination reference REP2-010), the 'Making roads beautiful' announcement was delivered after the Development Consent Order (DCO) submission of the A14 scheme, and therefore it is not possible to address all the points made in the speech retrospectively. That said, the design of the scheme and consultation on design options has adhered to Highway England's guidance and industry best practice in place during the period of its development and meets the requirement of the Planning Act 2008. Notably the environmental design is based upon the principles set out in DMRB Volume 10: Environmental Design - Good Roads Guide (DfT, 1992). This will continue through detailed design.</p> <p>Furthermore, as set out in Highways England's response to the Campaign for Better Transport's written representation (also in Report 6), Highways England is committed to establishing a nationwide Design Panel. Highways England will seek advice from the Design Panel as to how it can best inform the development of the Scheme. Notwithstanding this, Highways England has responded to the Examining Authority on the matter of good design in question 1.9.6:</p>
Allan Salem	Huntingdon Viaduct	<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 (application reference HE/A14/EX/34, examination reference REP2-008) 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 (application reference HE/A14/EX/32, examination reference REP2-006)</p> <p>It is not proposed to remove the viaduct until the improved A14, including the Huntingdon southern bypass, is open to traffic.</p>
Margaret Shardlow	Speedwatch Statistics	As detailed in section 3 of the Transport Assessment (document reference 7.2, examination reference APP-756) journey time data are required on the A14 and other strategic routes in order to validate the highway model and ensure that a realistic representation of vehicle speeds and travel times through

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		<p>the network is achieved. To this end, five routes were defined for the extraction of journey times from TomTom data – a high-sample dataset of GPS-derived journey times. TomTom data are a valid alternative to traditional Moving Car Observer (MCO) data according to Department for Transport guidelines (WebTAG M3.1 §4.4.2), providing greater sample rates, longer time-frames and greater accuracy. The routes have been selected following the guidance given in WebTAG M3.1 §4.4.3 to include both the scheme itself and other routes where it is expected traffic may be affected by the scheme.</p> <p>Speedwatch data, as collated under Cambridgeshire Constabulary's Speedwatch scheme, is not currently recognised as a reliable form of journey time information with which to validate model network speeds.</p>
Margaret Shardlow	Health Effects of Noise	<p>Highways England has established significance criteria which are based on the latest government noise policy¹ and World Health Organisation (WHO) guidance as described in chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1, examination reference APP-345) and in more detail in appendix 14.1 and 14.3 of the Environment Statement Appendices (document reference 6.3, examination reference APP-705 and APP-707). The National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS – paragraph 5.195) requires the proposed scheme to:</p> <p><i>“meet, the following aims, within the context of Government policy on sustainable development:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development;</i> <i>• mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and</i> <i>• contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effective management and control of noise, where possible.”</i>

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-nationalnetworks>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1, examination reference APP-345) sets out clearly how the NPS 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 National Policy Statement for National Networks at paragraph 5.195.
Mark Shuker	Horizontal alignment of the Huntingdon Southern Bypass	The horizontal alignment of the Huntingdon Southern Bypass is unchanged from that presented at the formal public consultation in spring 2014. Please refer to Highways England's response to Mr Shuker's written representation on this point at paragraph 39.3 of Report 5 Land Interests, (application reference HE/A14/EX/53, examination reference REP4-015) for further detail.
Godfrey Williams	Construction Contracts	A contract has been awarded to a joint venture of designers and contractors in order to develop the preliminary design shown within Development Consent Order documents, sufficient to allow construction work to start promptly if the application is approved by the Secretary of State. In addition steps are being taken to create a number of the wildlife habitats required by the scheme in the latter part of this year so that they can become established before being needed, again if approval is given. These measures serve to reduce the overall cost of the scheme by keeping the overall programme as short as practical so reducing the negative impact of inflation and supporting the scheme objective of being open to traffic by the end of the decade.
Tina Yates	Journey Times with and without the Scheme	Fenstanton would be located on the de-trunked section of the A14, which would carry significantly lower traffic flows with the scheme as a result of the diversion of long-distance traffic on to the Huntingdon Southern Bypass. Highways England's latest traffic forecasts, based on version 3a of the Cambridge to Huntingdon A14 Roads Model (CHARM3a) indicate that in 2035 the section of the A14 passing Fenstanton is forecast to carry approximately 94,000 vehicles per day without the scheme, falling to around 39,000 vehicles per day with the scheme. This volume of traffic is well within the capacity of the existing dual carriageway road and therefore the likelihood of traffic rat-running through Fenstanton to and from St Ives during peak periods would be significantly reduced, with consequential benefits in terms of improved journey times and reliability.
Ann Goodridge: Hilton Parish Council	Air Quality Guidelines	The scheme has been assessed against all relevant UK air quality objectives and EU limit values as required by law. Details of how these objectives and limit values are have been applied to conclude the overall significance of the scheme are detailed within the written response to question 1.1.10 in Report 1: Air Quality and Carbon Emission (application reference HE/A14/EX/28, examination reference REP2-002). See also Highways England's response to Ms Goodridge's written representation at page 12 of Comments on Written Representations Report 7 Local Community (application reference HE/A14/EX/55, examination reference REP4-017).

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
Ann Goodridge: Hilton Parish Council	Air Quality Baseline	<p>The air quality baseline information used within the air quality assessment includes the most recent and up to date data available. This included six months of scheme specific monitoring.</p> <p>The air quality impacts were assessed against the UK air quality objectives which are health based objectives. No significant impacts were predicted to occur as a result of the scheme and no receptors were predicted to experience an exceedance of the objectives when the scheme is operational in 2020.</p>
Jeff Shaw	Traffic Movements	<p>With regard to the volume of HGVs from ports, the Cambridge to Huntingdon A14 Road Model (CHARM) includes long-distance external movements through the A14 corridor. These are referred to as External to External trips which originate and end in the 'External Area'. The Study area is split into three distinct zones; the Area of Detailed Modelling, the Rest of the Fully Modelled Area and the External Area. The External Area covers all of the rest of the model that is not covered by simulation network (i.e. the rest of Great Britain).</p> <p>With regard to growth in demand as detailed in section 3 of the Transport Assessment, (document reference 7.2, examination reference APP-756) the future year traffic forecasts are informed by estimates of future travel demand produced using the Cambridge Sub-Regional Model (CSRМ). Forecasts of future household and employment (jobs) for each of the local authorities were input to the CSRМ land-use model. These growth forecasts are comprised of two parts; local growth forecasts, which take account of local authority growth projections, and national growth forecasts.</p> <p>With regard to the rationale for proposed route: As set out in Highways England's Response to written representations, Report 6: Non-Statutory Organisations and Businesses (document reference HE/A14/EX/54, examination reference REP4-016), the history of the development of the Scheme, including alternatives considered and the Cambridge to Huntingdon Multi Modal Study, is detailed in Section 4 of the Case for the Scheme document (document reference. 7.1, examination reference APP-755). The reasons for consideration and iterative assessment of options are explained as the scheme has been developed over time.</p> <p>With regard to the comment on the A428 as set out in Highways England's Response to written representations, Report 6: Non-Statutory Organisations and Businesses (document reference HE/A14/EX/54, examination reference REP4-016) 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. The A14</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		<p>and A428 schemes are complementary; neither scheme is able to fulfil the objectives of both.</p> <p>The A428 scheme is at a much earlier stage of planning than the A14 scheme and would need to go through the appropriate statutory processes, including an assessment of value for money and the submission of a Development Consent Order application, before construction could begin. Highways England considers that the A428 upgrade, if approved, would be complementary to the proposed A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement, as it would serve different traffic movements.</p> <p>Further consideration of alternatives associated with the A428 are set out in page 29-31 of Highways England's comments on the Written Representations, Report 7: Local Community/Public (application reference HE/A14/EX/55, examination reference REP04-017).</p>

2.2 Bar Hill Open Floor Hearing: Morning Session

2.2.1 Table 2.2 identifies the key topics raised by interested parties at the Bar Hill OFH morning session and sets out Highways England's response. In addition, where the issue has been responded to previously the document reference has been provided to aid navigation through the examination document.

Table 2-2: Bar Hill Open Floor Hearing Morning Session

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
David Ousby: Madingley Parish Council	Traffic Modelling	<p>As detailed in section 3 of the Transport Assessment, (document reference 7.2, examination reference APP-756) the following traffic data have been collected for the purposes of updating the traffic model:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobile phone signal data for a two week period in February 2014; • Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) surveys between six sites to record through trips – 6 February 2014; • One-day classified turning counts at 12 major junctions on the A14 and A1 – 4 and 5 February 2014;

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two-week automatic traffic counts (ATCs) on the approach roads to the 12 junctions – 1 – 13 February 2014; • Two week ATCs to record the turning movements at the Girton intersection between the A14, M11 and Huntingdon Road – 1 – 13 February 2014; • Short-period ATCs to record traffic flows on twenty roads mainly between the A14 and A428 – ten roads 1 – 13 February 2014, and ten roads 2 – 8 June 2014; and • Journey time data for five routes in neutral months of 2013 collected from TomTom. <p>Data have also been made available from other sources including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic flows from the Highways Agency's Traffic Information System (HATRIS) TRADS database; • Turning counts at 12 junctions in the vicinity of Longstanton, undertaken in connection with the proposed Northstowe development (25 February 2014); and • Routine traffic counts undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council. <p>With regard to closure of The Avenue as set out in Highways England's Response to written representations Report 7: Local Community/Public (document reference HE/A14/EX/55, examination reference REP4-017), Forecast traffic flows on The Avenue in Madingley are reported in paragraph 7.5.17 of the Transport Assessment (document reference 7.2, examination reference APP-756). These are forecast of traffic flows in 2035 with and without the scheme based on CHARM2 and are therefore not directly comparable with the observed flows on The Avenue. Further information about forecast flows on the roads around Madingley, including The Avenue, based on CHARM3a is provided in the response to question 1.12.34 in Highways England's Response to the First Written Questions</p> <p>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 1,050 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>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		<p>Furthermore, 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>
Edward Byam-Cook: Madingley Parish Council	Design on the Embankment if the east to north loop	<p>The proposed levels of the A14 westbound link at Girton Interchange are provided on the Engineering Section Drawings (document reference 2.09 – sheet 33 of 59 (document reference 2.9, examination reference APP-230) which shows levels), with notes indicating the approximate height of the embankment above existing ground levels.</p>
Edward Byam-Cook: Madingley Parish Council	Cycle Path	<p>The Non Motorised Users (NMU) facility proposed alongside the Local Access Road serves the purpose of linking a number of existing public rights of way which are truncated currently by the existing A14. In conjunction with other facilities proposed, it would serve a number of communities including Cambridge, Girton, Madingley, Bar Hill, Northstowe, Longstanton, Swavesey and Fenstanton. It would also contribute to providing safe and convenient facilities for NMUs along this corridor. The current A14 route creates severance for these users, and the existing facilities do not create a safe and convenient environment for NMUs. The proposed provision would encourage NMU trips.</p> <p>Although Madingley Parish Council propose to submit an alternative plan, it should be noted that the current proposals focus on a number of scheme objectives for NMUs, and these proposed facilities could also be enjoyed by users travelling from Dry Drayton (using footpaths 66/13 and 99/8), which would link with the NMU facility alongside the Local Access Road, and from the Madingley direction by using The Avenue, thus making journeys to Cambridge and other places listed on the corridor easier. Bridleway 154/2 would link the local access road facility with the area south of the A428 via Madingley Accommodation Bridge</p>
Edward Byam-Cook: Madingley Parish Council	Girton Interchange	<p>Highways England provided a response to Madingley Parish Council's suggestion of a roundabout at Girton Interchange in Highways England's Comments on the Written Representation – Report 2: Parish Councils (refer to pages 103-104 (application reference HE/A14/EX/50, examination reference REP4-</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		012). In summary, this option was rejected as it would require construction of a large elevated roundabout with numerous new structures, resulting in a large additional cost, environmental impact and significant disruption to the highway network during construction.
Edward Byam-Cook: Madingley Parish Council	LAR Link Road	Highways England provided a response to Madingley Parish Council's suggestion of locating the Local Access Road to the north east of the A14 in Highways England's Comments on the Written Representation – Report 2: Parish Councils (refer to page 105 application reference HE/A14/EX/50, examination reference REP4-012).
John Hopkins: University of Cambridge, Estates Management Department	Drainage	All details of the drainage attenuation ponds and floodplain compensation areas are included in the Flood Risk Assessment (ES appendix 17.1 document reference 6.3, examination reference APP-744). These will be refined and finalised through detailed design. The fluvial hydraulic models are currently being updated and will be reviewed by the Environment Agency during examination. The details of the highway drainage attenuation ponds will be finalised during detailed design.
John Hopkins: University of Cambridge, Estates Management Department	M11/A14 - Compulsory Acquisition	Highways England is in discussions with the University as to the extent of proposed land take at the Girton Interchange, including the land referred to by the University. These discussions will continue with the aim of identifying and agreeing a solution which best accommodates the respective interests and objectives of both parties. Given the sequencing and timescales of the DCO Examination and the detailed design process, there is a possibility that such a solution may not be fully identifiable until the detailed design process is concluded. However, a solution will be agreed as soon as is reasonably practicable.
John Hopkins: University of Cambridge, Estates Management Department	Stopping up of Robins Lane	<p>As set out in Highways England's response to the University in its Response to Written Representations (examination reference REP4-016, application reference HE/A14/EX/54), an access is provided from the realigned Robin's Lane to the University's land at Clare College Farm. This is shown at reference 4 on Sheet 19 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans (examination reference APP-134, application reference 2.5). This replacement access will utilise part of the route of the stopped up part of Robin's Lane.</p> <p>Highways England will enter into discussions with the University to determine responsibility for maintenance of this track as part of the detailed design process, after the Development Consent Order (if the application is granted) is made, but in the meantime Highways England confirms that during the operation of the Scheme, the access track (reference 4) will be available for the University's use.</p> <p>Highways England will also discuss with the University the extent of proposed land take at Robin's</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		Lane. These discussions will continue with the aim of identifying and agreeing a solution which best accommodates the respective interests and objectives of both parties at this location, but taking into account the design and environmental needs of the Scheme. Given the sequencing and timescales of the DCO Examination and the detailed design process, there is a possibility that such a solution may not be fully identifiable until the detailed design process is concluded. However, a solution will be agreed as soon as is reasonably practicable.
Steven Walsh: Unex Properties	Orchard Park Noise and Air Quality	Highways England understands that Unex development plots ² are the same as those that were the subject of a Written Representation by Kings Hedges Investment Ltd. Highways England has provided a detailed response to the written representation received by King Hedges Investments Limited (see Section 32 of Highways England's response to written representations, Comments on Written Representations Report 6 - Non Statutory Organisations and Businesses (application reference HE/A14/EX/54, examination reference REP4-016)). In particular, Highways England addressed the likely air quality effects on development at this location at section 32.2 of its response, and likely noise effects at section 32.5 of its response.
Steven Walsh: Unex Properties	Effects on Flats to be built at Orchard Park that are above the Noise Barriers	Highways England has provided a response to this point at paragraph 32.5.10 of its response to the written representation received by King Hedges Investments Limited (see Section 32 of Highways England's response to written representations, Comments on Written Representations Report 6 - Non Statutory Organisations and Businesses (application reference HE/A14/EX/54, examination reference REP4-16)).
Steven Walsh: Unex Properties	Negotiations regarding Land Acquisition at Orchard Park	Highways England had previously made contact with Unex Properties as part of the diligent enquiry process for identifying adjacent landowners. Highways England also confirms that no detailed liaison has taken place with Unex Properties. There was no intention to undertake works outside of the highway boundary at this location. The assumed position of the highway boundary (at this location) was used as the extents of the Land Registry search. Due to a discrepancy between the assumed highway boundary position and the Land Registry data, this has indicated the requirement for narrow strips of plots 28/5 and 28/6 to be acquired permanently. Highways England confirms that this is an error on the land plans and that no permanent land acquisition is required from plots 28/5 or 28/6. Some screening planting is proposed to the south of the A14 at this location; however this work would

² http://www.theunexgroup.co.uk/projects/kings_hedges.htm

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		<p>be undertaken wholly within the existing highway land.</p> <p>King's Hedges Investments Limited's Written Representation included an objection to the NMU path indicated to the south of the A14 on Sheet 10 of 11 of Figure 3.3 of the Environmental Statement (document reference 6.2, examination reference APP-362). In Highways England's Comments on the Written Representation – Report 5: Land Interests (refer to page 255 application reference HE/A14/EX/53, examination reference REP4-015), Highways England confirmed that there is no proposal to provide an NMU path at this location.</p> <p>Subsequent to the Open Floor Hearing held at Bar Hill at 09:30 on 14 July 2015, Highways England has contacted Stephen Walsh of Unex Properties to explain that it is not intended to permanently acquire this land and that this would be confirmed in writing. Highways England will continue to discuss details of the proposed scheme in this location to confirm temporary access requirements</p>

2.3 Bar Hill Open Floor Hearing: Afternoon Session

2.3.1 Table 2.3 identifies the key topics raised by interested parties at the Bar Hill OFH afternoon session and sets out Highways England's response. In addition, where the issue has been responded to previously the document reference has been provided to aid navigation through the examination document.

Table 2-3: Bar Hill Open Floor Hearing: Afternoon Session

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
Roger Buissant: Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Legal View on widths of NMU Route	Please see the note prepared by Highways England on this topic appended at Appendix 1.
Howard Russell: Chairman of Dry Drayton Parish Council	Traffic and Connectivity	With regard to concerns about HGV traffic through Dry Drayton village. Highways England's traffic forecasts, based on version 3a of the Cambridge to Huntingdon A14 Roads Model (CHARM3a) indicate that, without the scheme, annual average daily traffic flows through Dry Drayton are

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		<p>forecast to increase from around 4,900 vehicles per day in 2014 to 5,900 vehicles per day in 2020 (+20%) and to 8,700 vehicles per day in 2035 (+77%). With the scheme, traffic flows would increase from 5,900 vehicles per day to 6,400 vehicles per day in 2020 (+8%) and from 8,700 vehicles per day to 11,100 vehicles per day in 2035 (+27%). HGVs account for approximately 3-4% of the traffic on this route, which is a small proportion of the total flow.</p> <p>The higher flows through Dry Drayton are not the result of reassignment. They are primarily the result of the additional development at Northstowe that would be unlocked by the A14 scheme. Consequently, it is included in the 'with scheme' forecasts but not in the 'without scheme' forecasts. If the growth in traffic associated with Northstowe Phase 2 is excluded, traffic flows through Dry Drayton are only forecast to increase from 8,700 to 9,600 vehicles per day as a result of the scheme (+10%), which is comparable with the level of growth forecast in 2020.</p>
<p>Mr H Russell: Chairman of Dry Drayton Parish Council</p>	<p>Noise Barriers</p>	<p>Mitigation measures integrated into the scheme in the area of Dry Drayton include low noise surfacing. Further sustainable noise mitigation was investigated along the A14 and provided where the Environmental Statement identified a likely significant adverse noise effect (please refer to Appendix 14.3 of the Environmental Statement Appendices (document reference 6.3, examination reference APP-707), which included consideration of Important Areas as defined by the Government's Noise Action Plan for Roads. Sheet 14 of figure 14.7 of the Environmental Statement Figures (document reference 6.2, examination reference APP-416) shows the Important Areas and noise fence barriers in the Dry Drayton area.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1, examination reference APP-345), the assessment and the design of the proposed scheme are in line with Government noise policy. To this end, the scheme avoids any significant adverse effect on health and quality of life and minimises adverse effects on health and quality of life as far as sustainable. Adverse effects are minimised by the provision of low noise surfacing and localised barriers at Important Areas in the Dry Drayton area. It would not be sustainable to provide further mitigation to protect an individual property because the costs of additional mitigation, such as the provision of a noise barrier, would outweigh the benefit.</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		<p>The provision of noise fence barriers at the Important Areas reduces noise levels in line with aim 3 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks 5.195³. This was welcomed in the <i>A14 Cambridge To Huntingdon Improvement Scheme – Joint Local Impact Report – Submission to PINS v.1</i> and the Local Authorities are not seeking further mitigation in this area.</p> <p>The main community at Dry Drayton is located, at its closest point, over 800m from the A14. Highways England comments on the Relevant Representations made by Interested Parties (TR010018 HE/A14/EX/25 Response to Relevant Representations June 2015, examination reference REP1-035), explained that noise barriers (as either fences or landscaped bunds) will not provide any benefit over distances in the order 600 metres or greater from the road.</p> <p>Highways England's response to the Examining Authority's question 1.10.12 (Response to ExA's First Written Questions, Report 10: Noise and Vibration, application reference HE/A14/EX/37, examination reference REP2-011) also provides relevant information concerning noise barrier design and the principal factors affecting noise attenuation.</p>
Howard Russell: Chairman of Dry Drayton Parish Council	Flood Risk	<p>Highway England's response to Fen Drayton Parish Council in section 4.5.1 of Report 2 Parish Council (application reference HE/A14/EX/50, examination reference REP4-012) states that Measures will be included to ensure there is no change to existing levels of flood risk. Runoff from the new A14 road will drain to attenuation ponds where it will be stored and released at a controlled rate to the receiving watercourse. The outfall rate from these attenuation ponds will be limited to greenfield rates to mimic the response of the natural (undeveloped) catchment. The ponds have been designed to store the volume that would be generated from a storm predicted to occur once every one hundred years plus an allowance for climate change. Consequently there will no change to existing flows up to and including such an event in accordance with Environment Agency guidance to support the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>

³ The National Networks National Policy Statement (paragraph 5.195) requires the proposed scheme to “meet, the following aims, within the context of Government policy on sustainable development: 1) avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as a result of the new development; 2) mitigate and minimise other adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise from the new development; and 3) contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effective management and control of noise, where possible.”

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
Andrew Munro: Cambridgeshire County Council	Legal View on widths of NMU Route	Please see the note prepared by Highways England on this topic appended at Appendix 1
Andrew Munro: Cambridgeshire County Council	Legal Definition of Highways	
Andrew Munro: Cambridgeshire County Council	Public Rights of Way and Access Plans	
Andrew Munro: Cambridgeshire County Council	Flood Risk	The National Planning Policy Framework and National Policy Statement for National Networks do not require the scheme to mitigate pre-existing flooding issues. Measures are included to provide mitigation for the impact of the proposed scheme and will ensure that it would not worsen or contribute to existing flooding issues. However they do not provide direct mitigation for the pre-existing flooding issues. It is not necessary to mitigate those separate issues in order to make the application acceptable in planning terms (please refer to section 5.103 of the National Policy Statement).

2.4 Brampton Open Floor Hearing: Evening Session

2.4.1 Table 2.3 identifies the key topics raised by interested parties at the Brampton OFH evening session and sets out Highways England's response. In addition, where the issue has been responded to previously the document reference has been provided to aid navigation through the examination document.

Table 2-4: Brampton Open Floor Hearing: Evening Session

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
Keith Anderson	Air Quality Effects of the Scheme	Air quality is predicted to improve in Brampton Air Quality Management Area and improvements or negligible changes are predicted elsewhere. Details of the air quality impacts from the scheme in Brampton have been assessed within the Environmental Statement chapter 8 (document reference

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		<p>6.1, examination reference APP-339). As stated in paragraph 8.5.26 no significant impacts are predicted as a result of the scheme in Brampton. A response to written question 1.1.11 is set out in page 29 of Highways England's comments on responses to the ExA's First Written Questions (application reference HE/A14/EX/28, examination reference REP2-002) and provides details of the scheme's impacts on the Brampton AQMA which is predicted to improve as a result of the scheme. The assessment has used UK Air Quality Standards which are based on EU air quality directives. These standards are based on accumulated information from observed health effects of air pollutants based on a range of studies and are designed to maintain pollutant concentrations below levels known to cause an impact on human health or where the impact would be very small.</p> <p>The assessment included sensitivity testing of future emission factors therefore the concentration of pollution has not been under predicted.</p> <p>The House of Commons, Environmental Audit Committee (Action on Air Quality, sixth report of session 2014-15) report states schools and other sensitive receptors should not be built near major road intersections or pollution hotspots. The assessment carried out in Chapter 8 section 8.8.9 of the Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1, examination reference APP- 339) for this scheme identified there would no significant affects as result of the scheme. Changes in pollution concentrations at Brampton Primary school would be negligible and remain below the UK air quality objectives.</p>
Ian Bennett: Buckden Parish Council	Assessment of Scheme Options	<p>The history of the development of the Scheme is detailed in Section 4 of the Case for the Scheme document (document reference 7.1, examination reference APP-755). The reasons for consideration and iterative assessment of options are explained as the scheme has been developed over time.</p> <p>The current scheme emerged as a result of the Department for Transport (DfT) study carried out in 2011 and 2012 which put forward six options which were presented through a public consultation in September and October 2013, together with a seventh option which comprised a combination of options 3 and 5. The supporting document, A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Technical Review of Options, included a comparison of options with comparison of estimated costs.</p> <p>Option 5 retained the existing A14 as a trunk road through Huntingdon together with retention of the viaduct, although in combination with a dual two lane southern bypass.</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		<p>The retention of the existing A14 as a trunk road, together with a two lane bypass, was not progressed as this did not support the following objectives of the scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Combat congestion: whilst the new bypass would provide a reliable route between Swavesey and Ellington which would be uninterrupted by junctions, it is expected that a significant proportion of people would continue to use the existing A14 and that this would increase over time as the level of traffic on the road network increases, with an expected need to widen the viaduct in order to cope with demand. As a consequence, congestion would remain an issue, notably at Spittals Junction and Bar Hill. - Connect people: retention of the viaduct would prevent connection of the A14 with the link roads within Huntingdon. Access would remain as existing; from Spittals Interchange to the West and the Godmanchester Junction to the East. A proportion of heavy goods vehicles would continue to use the existing route. It is expected that the level of traffic would be such that environmental benefits, such as reduced CO2 and NO2 emissions would not be realised and that speed restrictions may be required in future years to avoid exceedances. - Create a positive legacy: in addition to high levels of pollution resulting from the volume of traffic, the viaduct causes severance within Huntingdon which conflicts with the town's growth objectives as articulated by Huntingdonshire District Council in its West Area Action Plan. <p>Highways England's response to the Examining Authority's question 1.5.6 page 14 of Highways England's Response to the First Written Questions Report 5, application reference HE/A14/EX/32, examination reference REP2-006) addresses the question of the removal of the viaduct in Huntingdon. It confirms that structural repairs have been carried out in order to extend the physical life of the viaduct into the foreseeable future, subject to annual maintenance costs in the order of £342,000. However, as a consequence of projected increases in traffic, it is considered that the economic life of the viaduct would be no longer than ten years, requiring widening (and in practical terms rebuilding) beyond this time.</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
Ian Bennett: Buckden Parish Council	Congestion around Hinchingsbrooke	<p>As Traffic Modelling Update report, (application reference HE/A14/EX/44, examination reference REP2-018) with regard to traffic forecasts around Hinchingsbrooke and as recently reported in the Traffic Modelling Update Report the main differences between version 3 of the A14 traffic model (CHARM3a) and version 2 of the A14 traffic model (CHARM2) relate to the A1123 and Brampton Road. On Brampton Road both models forecast a reduction in flows; however the magnitude of that reduction is much smaller in CHARM3a. This change is mainly due to a reduction in the volume of traffic forecast to use Brampton Road without the scheme. This is a result of the lower External to External growth assumptions in CHARM3a, which means that there is more capacity on the Strategic Road Network for local traffic than there is in CHARM2. Consequently, some traffic that is forecast to use Brampton Road in CHARM2 is predicted to transfer on to the A14 in CHARM3a.</p> <p>Consequently, traffic projections on Brampton Road in the AM Peak Hour in 2020 are 1,550 vehicles per hour (vph) without the scheme, compared to 1,450 vph with the scheme (-6%). In the PM Peak Hour traffic projections on Brampton Road in 2020 are 1,750 vph without the scheme, compared to 1,600 vph with the scheme (-9%).</p> <p>Traffic projections on Brampton Road in the AM Peak Hour in 2035 are 1,700 vph without the scheme, compared to 1,350 vph with the scheme (-21%). In the PM Peak Hour traffic projections on Brampton Road in 2020 are 1,850 vph without the scheme, compared to 1,550 vph with the scheme (-16%)</p> <p>These reductions are all lower than previously reported in CHARM2.</p> <p>These traffic forecasts are derived from a traffic model that makes a future prediction based on an accurate representation of what happens today and a set of growth assumptions which takes account of development proposals and national and regional population and employment forecasts. This is a standard procedure and has been approved by Highways England Traffic Appraisal, Modelling and Economics (TAME) team. Highways England considers the forecasts produced to be a valid prediction of the future.</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
Ray Bowers	Traffic Modelling	<p>With regards to traffic counts as detailed in section 3 of the Transport Assessment, (document reference 7.2, examination reference APP-756). With regard to traffic counts. The following data have been collected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobile phone tracking data for a two week period in February 2014; • Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) surveys between six sites to record through trips – 6 February 2014; • One-day classified turning counts at 12 major junctions on the A14 and A1 – 4 and 5 February 2014; • Two-week automatic traffic counts (ATCs) on the approach roads to the 12 junctions – 1– 13 February 2014; • Two week ATCs to record the turning movements at the intersection between the A14, M11 and Huntingdon Road – 1– 13 February 2014; • Short-period ATCs to record traffic flows on twenty roads mainly between the A14 and A428 – ten roads 1 – 13 February 2014, and ten roads 2 – 8 June 2014; and • Journey time data for five routes in neutral months of 2013 collected from TomTom. <p>Data have also been made available from other sources including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic flows from the Highways Agency's Traffic Information System (HATRIS) TRADS database; • Turning counts at 12 junctions in the vicinity of Longstanton, undertaken in connection with the proposed Northstowe development (25 February 2014); and • Routine traffic counts undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council <p>Table 2.3 of the Traffic Modelling Update Report (application reference HE/A14/EX/44, examination reference REP2-018) summarises the CHARM3a screenline performance for the AM peak, Interpeak and PM peak hours. In the AM, Interpeak and PM peak hours, 100%, 94% and 81% of screenlines meet WebTAG flow validation criteria (against WebTAG acceptability guidelines of 85%). The main reason for screenline performance of 81% in the PM peak hour is a slight</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		<p>deterioration in model performance at Screenline 5 (to the north of the Cambridge Northern Bypass) in the northbound direction, where the modelled flows are 6% lower than the counts. Hence, this falls marginally outside of WebTAG guidance which is based on flows across a screenline being within 5% of the counts</p> <p>With regards to the operational assessments: As set out in Highways England's Response to written representations, Report 7: Local Community/Public (document reference HE/A14/EX/55, examination reference REP4-017) updated operational assessments based on traffic forecasts produced using version 3a of the Cambridge to Huntingdon A14 Roads Model (CHARM3a) are reported in the Traffic Modelling Update Report (application reference HE/A14/EX/44, examination reference REP2-018) 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> <p>Huntingdonshire District Council have aspirations for a new link from the Parkway to Spittals interchange which would provide an alternative route from the hospital to the de-trunked A14 similar to that suggested by Mr Bowers but for use by the general public as well, rather than just emergency vehicles. Please refer to Item 7(1) on page 17 in Section 5.2 of Statement of Common Ground with Huntingdonshire District Council dated 8 June 2015. The proposed scheme would not preclude the addition of this link at a later date. As a new local road, it would be for Cambridgeshire</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		County Council and the District Council to promote and develop.
Jean Ritchie	Pathfinder Link	The points raised by Mrs Ritchie have been answered by Highways England in its response to Ms Ritchie's Written Representation – please see paragraph 29.2 of Report 5: Land Interests (examination reference REP4-015, application reference HE/A14/EX/53)
Mark Williams: Buckden Marina Residents Association	Land Ownership at Buckden Marina	<p>None of the land belonging to the properties at Buckden Marina falls within the scheme red line boundary which defines the land to be acquired, temporarily possessed or which will be subject to rights to be taken by Highways England.</p> <p>Highways England is in discussions with Mr Williams about the effect of the Scheme on the Marina. The results of these discussions will be outlined in the Statement of Common Ground proposed to be agreed with the Buckden Marina Residents Association which will be issued w/c 27 July 2015.</p>
Mark Williams: Buckden Marina Residents Association	Noise Data	<p>A meeting was held with Highways England and Mr Williams on 20 July 2015 to discuss noise issues. At that meeting, Highways England agreed to hold a further meeting to run through the noise model with Mr Williams and his appointed noise consultant.</p> <p>Highways England is working with Mr Williams and Buckden Marina Residents in the preparation of a SoCG and will continue to engage in further discussions to move forward any issues of disagreement.</p>
Mark Williams: Buckden Marina Residents Association	Noise Model	<p>With reference to Highways England's comment on the Written Representations Report 5: Land Interests (application reference HE/A14/EX/53, examination reference REP4-0015) at paragraphs 65.6.2 and 65.6.3 it is explained modelling of noise has been undertaken using a computer package that applies the Government's Calculation of Road Traffic Noise method in line with the National Networks National Policy Statement (5.191). It continues to explain that noise levels were calculated under downwind conditions taking into account the topography of the area and the vertical and horizontal alignment of the scheme.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the noise model does take into account ground cover. In acoustic terms that is either acoustically soft absorptive ground, e.g. open grassland and acoustically hard reflective surfaces, e.g. water in the case of the area to the north of Buckden Marina (refer to Highways England's comment on the Written Representations Report 6: Non-statutory</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		<p>Organisations and Businesses (application reference HE/A14/EX/54, examination reference REP4-016) at paragraph 11.3.10).</p> <p>As noted above, noise issues were discussed with Mr Williams at a meeting held on 20 July 2015, and a SoCG is being progressed.</p>
<p>Mark Williams: Buckden Marina Residents Association</p>	<p>Buckden Bypass</p>	<p>The design of the proposed road layout in the Brampton area and the Brampton Interchange would not preclude the future provision of a Buckden Bypass.</p> <p>As part of its Roads Investment Strategy, the Department for Transport has committed to undertaking studies on the upgrading of the A1 in the East of England, including the section between the M25 and Peterborough and this would include consideration of the A1 in the Buckden area (page 50 of Roads Investment Strategy: Investment Plan, Department for Transport December 2014).</p>
<p>Mr M Williams: Buckden Marina Residents Association</p>	<p>Passing Train Noise</p>	<p>A meeting was held with Highways England and Mr Williams on 20 July 2015 to discuss noise issues (including this issue). At that meeting, Highways England agreed to hold a further meeting to run through the noise model with Mr Williams and his appointed noise consultant, and to progress a SoCG.</p>
<p>Mark Williams: Buckden Marina Residents Association</p>	<p>A428 Diversion Route</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. Work has commenced on looking at options for improving this section of the A428. Assuming the scheme offers value for money and allowing 2 -3 years for construction, it is possible that a scheme could be open to traffic by the mid 2020's.</p> <p>Further consideration of alternatives associated with the A428 are set out in page 29-31 of Highways England's comments on the Written Representations, Report 7: Local Community/Public (application reference HE/A14/EX/55, examination reference REP4-017).</p> <p>A meeting with Buckden Marina Residents will be offered once the draft SoCG has been sent back to the stakeholder so that issues they identify for further discussion can move forward.</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
Mark Williams: Buckden Marina Residents Association	Beautiful Roads Announcement	<p>As set out in Highways England's response to Mr Williams' written representation (Report 6: Non Statutory Organisations, (examination reference REP4-016, application reference HE/A14/EX/54) and the Examining Authority's question 1.9.6 (application reference HE/A14/EX/36, examination reference REP2-010), the 'Making roads beautiful' announcement was delivered after the Development Consent Order (DCO) submission of the A14 scheme, and therefore it is not possible to address all the points made in the speech retrospectively. That said, the design of the scheme and consultation on design options has adhered to Highways England guidance and industry best practice in place during the period of its development and meets the requirement of the Planning Act 2008. Notably the environmental design is based upon the principles set out in DMRB Volume 10: Environmental Design - Good Roads Guide (DfT, 1992). This will continue through detailed design.</p> <p>Furthermore, as set out in Highways England's response to the Campaign for Better Transport's written representation (also in Report 6), Highways England is committed to establishing a nationwide Design Panel. Highways England will seek advice from the Design Panel as to how it can best inform the development of the Scheme. Notwithstanding this, Highways England has responded to the Examining Authority on the matter of good design in question 1.9.6</p> <p>A meeting with Buckden Marina Residents will be offered once the draft SoCG has been sent back to the stakeholder so that issues they identify for further discussion can move forward.</p>
Jackie Homan	Non-Motorised Users	<p>The proposed Non Motorised User facilities at Brampton serve a complex need and are designed to link various facilities and routes in the area. The route of the original bridleway 28/19 extended in a straight line from one side of the A1 to the other but was severed when the A1 was made a dual carriageway – to re-join it via a bridge in this manner would have required extensive approach embankments and a long crossing, and would not have fulfilled other functions (such as links to Brampton services). As requested at the hearing, Highways England will engage with Ms Homan on the proposals at this location.</p>
Paul Spencer	Congestion around Hitchingbrooke and Common Link	<p>The Views Common Link is a key component of the scheme, providing a link from the de-trunked A14 to the local road network in Huntingdon. The link provides enhanced access to Huntingdon Town Centre and in particular the Hinchingbrooke area from the A14 to the west and the A1 to the north. The Views Common Link also facilitates a through route through Huntingdon for local traffic that does not wish to use the new A14, for instance agricultural vehicles.</p> <p>As set out in Highways England's comments on the Written Representations Report 6: Non-</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		<p>Statutory Organisations and Businesses (application reference HE/A14/EX/54, examination reference REP4-016), there is forecast to be limited change in traffic flows on Hinchingsbrooke Park Road to the west of the Views Common Link as a result of the scheme. Some increase in traffic is forecast on Hinchingsbrooke Park Road further to the east. This is as a result of additional traffic accessing Huntingdon via the Views Common Link, although this is partially offset by the transfer of westbound traffic from Hinchingsbrooke Park Road on to the underpass from Brampton Road.</p> <p>The forecast increase in traffic using this part of the local road network has been taken in to account in the design of the Hinchingsbrooke Park Road / Views Common Link and Brampton Road / Hinchingsbrooke Park Road junctions. The results of the operational assessments of these two junctions are reported in Appendix A of the Traffic Modelling Update Report (application reference HE/A14/EX/44, examination reference REP2-018) submitted at Deadline 2 of the DCO Examination. The results indicate that both junctions have been designed with sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast traffic flows, operating with a maximum degree of saturation of 76% and 63% respectively.</p> <p>Safe and appropriate provisions for non-motorised users are a key part of the proposed scheme for Huntingdon Town Centre. In the Hinchingsbrooke area, provision for the very high non-motorised user (NMU) flows at the start and end of the school day is essential. Therefore, the design of the junctions is a balance between the needs of non-motorised and motorised users.</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 NMU 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>These new crossings would be integrated into the new signal controlled junctions and, wherever possible, the crossings would be arranged so that they run with other non-conflicting traffic</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
		<p>movements. This ensures that the effect that the new crossings have on traffic flow in this area is limited as much as possible.</p>
Liz Olding	Flood Risk	<p>Highways England Written Response to the Environment Agency states that 'Measures are included to provide mitigation for the impact of the proposed scheme and will ensure that it would not worsen or contribute to existing flooding issues.' (Para 2.5.3, Highways England's Response to Written Representations, Report 3 Environmental Statutory Bodies, application reference HE/A14/EX/51, examination reference REP4-013).</p> <p>The borrow pits are excavations below ground level and therefore would not increase flooding as rainwater filling the excavations would not contribute to and may reduce flooding and rainwater falling onto the borrow pits when full would flow overland in the same manner and along the same routes as it does at present.</p>
Eddie Baker	Noise barriers	<p>Sustainable mitigation measures designed into the scheme in the area to the east of Alconbury to minimise noise impacts during operation include: careful design of the alignment and cuttings; the use of low noise road surfacing and noise fence barriers.</p> <p>The assessment also takes account of the 'Important Area' at Alconbury identified in Government's 2014 Noise Action Plan for Roads to the west of the A1.</p> <p>The scheme includes the improvement of the existing noise barriers through Alconbury (see section 14.5, of chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1, examination reference APP-345). Taking account of the improved barriers section 14.6 of Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1, examination reference APP-345) and sheet 2 of Figure 14.7 of the Environmental Statement Figures (document reference 6.2, examination reference APP-416) show that no significant adverse effects from noise are likely to occur from the operation of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>Highways England's response to the Examining Authority's question 1.10.12 (Response to ExA's First Written Questions, Report 10: Noise and Vibration, application reference HE/A14/EX/37, examination reference REP2-011) also provides relevant information concerning noise barrier design and the principal factors affecting noise attenuation.</p>

Interested Party	Key Topic	Highways England Response
Eddie Baker	Flood Risk	<p>Highways England Written Response to the Environment Agency states that 'Measures are included to provide mitigation for the impact of the proposed scheme and will ensure that it would not worsen or contribute to existing flooding issues.' (Para 2.5.3, Highways England's Response to Written Representations, Report 3 Environmental Statutory Bodies, application reference HE/A14/EX/51, examination reference REP4-013).</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework and National Policy Statement for National Networks do not require the scheme to mitigate pre-existing flooding issues. It is not necessary to mitigate those separate issues in order to make the application acceptable in planning terms (please refer to section 5.103 of the National Policy Statement).'</p>

APPENDIX 1

Response to Submissions of Cambridgeshire County Council and Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum at Bar Hill Afternoon Open Floor Hearing and Deadline 4

Both Cambridgeshire County Council and the Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum expressed concern that:

- i) the widths of Rights of Way proposed to be created and diverted should be set out within the DCO or on the Rights of Way and Access Plans, as required by the Public Path Orders Regulations 1993.*
- ii) the route of Rights of Way and Non-Motorised User facilities within the highway boundary should be shown on the Rights of Way and Access Plans, particularly with reference to the new Non-Motorised User provision to be built alongside the Local Access Road.*

These concerns were based on fears that the Development Consent Order and Rights of Way and Access Plans would not be suitable for the Definitive Map that would detail the legally definitive route of the Right of Way/Non-Motorised User provision, and thus Cambridgeshire County Council's maintenance obligations.

Response

Widths of rights of way

1. As set out in Highways England's *Response to written representations (examination reference REP4-11, application reference HE/A14/EX/49 paragraphs 4.5.13 to 4.5.15)* it is Highways England's view that it is not legally required to show the widths of rights of way on the Rights of Way and Access Plans, and neither is it usual practice to do so. In addition, given the sequencing of the development consent process and the design process for the scheme, Highways England is of the view that it would not be practically desirable to specify such matters in the Development Consent Order and/or the Rights of Way and Access Plans.
2. Outside of the Planning Act 2008 regime, part VIII of the Highways Act 1980 ("**HA80**") deals with the stopping up and diversions of footpaths, bridleways, and restricted byways, primarily through section 118 (stopping up) and section 119 (diversions). Section 26 deals with the creation of footpaths, bridleways and restricted byways.
3. All three of these sections make reference to the fact that such creation, stopping up, or diversions cannot take place unless either a public path creation order, public path diversion order or public path extinguishment order (as the case may be) is made and confirmed by the Council (or in the case of an opposed Order, confirmed by the Secretary of State). All three sections set out that such Orders must be in "*such form as may be prescribed by regulations made by the Secretary of State*".
4. Such regulations were made by the Secretary of State and these are the Public Path Orders Regulations 1993 ("**Regulations**"). The relevant provisions within the Regulations are set out below:
 - 4.1 The pre-*amble* to the Regulations sets out that they were made by the Secretary of State for the Environment in exercise of the powers conferred on him by sections 26, 28(2), 118 and 119 of, and paragraphs 1, 3 and 4 of Schedule 6 to, the Highways Act 1980 and section 32 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981.
 - 4.2 Regulation 2 of the Regulations sets out that "*an order shall be in the appropriate form set out in Schedule 1 to these Regulations, or in a form substantially to the like effect*".

- 4.3 The forms of order within Schedule 1 of the Regulations include reference to the need for a description of the position, length and width of the Right of Way which is proposed to be created, diverted or stopped up.
- 4.4 Regulation 1 of these Regulations defines an 'order' for the purposes of these Regulations as *"a public path creation order, a public path diversion order, a public path extinguishment order or an acquisition extinguishment order, and includes an order revoking or varying any such order"*.
- 4.5 As noted above, HA80 uses these terms within s.26, s.118 and s.119; however, the relationship between these sections and the Regulations is made clear by Regulation 1, which further defines a public path creation order, a public path diversion order, and a public path extinguishment order as orders made by reference to the above-mentioned sections of the Highways Act.
5. The position is similar in respect of a local authority's duties under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 ("**WCA81**"): parallel provisions in the form of the Wildlife and Countryside (Definitive Maps and Statements) Regulations 1993 also prescribe a mechanism by which a local authority may maintain the Definitive Map and Statement for its area.
6. Returning to the Public Path Orders Regulations 1993, however, which Cambridgeshire County Council suggests should apply to the draft Development Consent Order for the Scheme, it is clear from the preamble to those Regulations that they only apply to Orders made under the Highways Act 1980 or the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 ("**ALA81**"). There is no reference to the Planning Act 2008 within these Regulations.
7. It should also be noted that the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as amended) do not require the widths of rights of way to be provided for within the Rights of Way and Access Plans.
8. In summary therefore, the Regulations apply only to orders made under the HA80 and ALA81, and not to orders such as the draft DCO which (if made) would be made under the Planning Act 2008. There is therefore no legal obligation for a draft DCO to comply with these Regulations.
9. Highways England's research also shows that it is not usual practice within the Planning Act 2008 regime for widths of rights of way or non-motorised user facilities to be provided in development consent orders ("Orders") or related plans/drawings.
 - 9.1 Of the 39 Orders made under the PA08 a total of 33 grant consent for a right of way and/or non-motorised user facilities ("**Relevant Provision**").
 - 9.2 Out of these 33 Orders; 30 do not prescribe the width of the Relevant Provision and 3 Orders do so prescribe.
 - 9.3 In two of the three Orders that do prescribe the width of a Relevant Provision (Morpeth Northern Bypass and Heysham M6 Link Road); the Relevant Provision is contained within the highway boundary. The implications and necessity of this are addressed below.
 - 9.4 The remaining Order that prescribes the width of a Relevant Provision is the Knottingley Power Plant Order 2015 ("the Knottingley Order"). The Relevant Provision can be found in Schedule 1 (Authorised Development) and is comprised in Work No.9 *"alternative private track/temporary bridleway along the southern boundary of Work no. 1 from Blackburn Lane to Southmoor Lane, at least five metres wide and being gated at either end."*

- 9.5 The prescription of the width of the Relevant Provision in the Knottingley Order can be distinguished from that being suggested by Cambridgeshire County Council. In the Knottingley Order the prescription was recommended by the Examining Authority for that Order on the basis that it would overcome specific objections relating to access to agricultural land surrounding that site by farm vehicles in the circumstances of that Order. As such, the particular circumstances relating to the treatment of the Relevant Provision in the Knottingley Order are not of general application. Highways England notes that Cambridgeshire County Council's written representation does not rely on those circumstances and that Cambridgeshire County Council's request for the Development Consent Order for the Scheme to specify the widths of non-motorised user routes and rights of way is made with the objective of enabling Cambridgeshire County Council to update the Definitive Map and Statement in accordance with its statutory obligations as a local highway authority.
- 9.6 This review shows that the usual practice (30 out of 33 made Orders containing a Relevant Provision) for Orders made under the PA08 is to not prescribe the width of any Relevant Provision.
10. Finally, the exact specification of the right of way provision will be informed by the detailed design process, and Highways England considers that it is reasonable for this to be the case. Together, the Development Consent Order and Rights of Way and Access Plans inform the Examining Authority of the rights of way and non-motorised user provision which is proposed to be created by the Development Consent Order (based on the proposed linear routes of non-motorised user/rights of way provision). Rights of way/non-motorised user provision forms part of the works which would be authorised if the Development Consent Order was made by the Secretary of State. It is not the function of the Development Consent Order to prescribe the exact design details of the rights of way/non-motorised user provision that is proposed to be created or diverted. It is therefore accepted that matters such as the specification of the widths of rights of way/non-motorised user provision are beyond the scope of the Development Consent Order and Rights of Way and Access Plans.
11. In conclusion therefore, as set out in Highways England's response to Cambridgeshire County Council's written representation, there is no legal, practical or best practice obligation upon Highways England to specify the width of rights of way within the Development Consent Order or the Rights of Way and Access Plans for the scheme.

Routes of non-motorised user facilities within the highway boundary

12. Rights of way shown on the Rights of Way and Access Plans terminate at the highway boundary. The Rights of Way and Access Plans therefore show the full extent of the proposed route of these rights of way.
13. Once these rights of way meet the highway boundary – shown on the Rights of Way and Access Plans as 'proposed side road boundary' or 'proposed trunk road boundary' the Rights of Way provision will (in many cases) continue within the highway boundary in the form of the non-motorised user facilities which are proposed to be provided by Highways England within the highway boundary. To clarify, this means that within the highway boundary the Rights of Way and Access Plans do not show separate rights of way provision, as the non-motorised user facilities will form part of the highway – the non-motorised user facilities are not separate rights of way.
14. Together, the Development Consent Order and Rights of Way and Access Plans inform the Examining Authority that the non-motorised user provision is proposed to be created within the highway boundary. If the Development Consent Order is made, the non-motorised user provision within the highway boundary would form part of the works authorised by the Development Consent Order. However, it is not the function of the Development Consent Order to prescribe the exact design details of what is contained within the highway boundary. There is also no requirement in the

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as amended) that sets out that the details of such non-motorised user facilities should be shown within the Plans.

15. Section 53(3)(a) of the WCA81 makes clear that modifications to the Definitive Map must be completed by the surveying authority after a statutory instrument (such as a development consent order) is made, and such modifications must be in compliance with the Wildlife and Countryside (Definitive Maps and Statements) Regulations 1993 (as amended). The Rights of Way and Access Plans are part of the application for the Development Consent Order and are not submitted under these Regulations, but are required to comply with the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009.
16. It is therefore Cambridgeshire County Council's duty to modify the Definitive Map and Statement. The Development Consent Order and Rights of Way and Access Plans do not modify the Definitive Map, and therefore do not need to show the level of detail requested by Cambridgeshire County Council.

Further discussion

17. As stated in Highways England's Response to Cambridgeshire County Council's written representation, Highways England will discuss with Cambridgeshire County Council an appropriate mechanism for confirming the details of the widths of rights of way in order to enable Cambridgeshire County Council to fulfil its statutory duty to maintain an accurate records of rights of way in the Definitive Map and Statement, and will share detailed plans with Cambridgeshire County Council at the detailed design stage to enable the Council to determine the routes of non-motorised user provision within the highway boundary and to agree the design of the rights of way.