Design Issues

Q2.6.6: At paragraph 5.7 of HEs written submission (REP5-028) the applicant comments that ‘except to the extent already covered by the proposed requirements... detailed design issues such as the River Great Ouse crossing including its structures, were intended to be approved by the applicant itself.’ Do Interested Parties wish to comment?

BCG response: We consider this interpretation of Highways England (HE) powers is deeply flawed and likely to result in grave social injustice. In the case of the A14 scheme, were HE to be the arbiter of its own designs this would offer HE carte blanche to ignore legitimate concerns raised at public consultations, refute reasoned objections/alternative proposals without substantiated evidence or proper examination/justification and proceed to develop a virtually unchanged version of the outdated and hugely costly A14 scheme it has been proposing since 2001 - regardless of current Government transport, environment and health policy or the guiding principles of sustainable development (NPPF) – see DEFRA definition below (p2) and DfT transport appraisal policy (pp7-8).

Visual intrusion

Q2.9.3 (extract) In order to further assess the effect of the proposed scheme on the crossing of the River Great Ouse and East Coast Main Line how would the applicant demonstrate to the ExA, using physical features, the height and alignment of the proposed A14.....This should be in addition to any photo-montages which the applicant may wish to prepare to show the likely visual effects of the proposals in this location.

BCG response:

1. We note that the ExA are seeking a physical representation of the proposed Great Ouse crossing over the ECML near Buckden Marina, which is contiguous with the southern end of the Brampton A1/A14 Interchange. We respectfully request that the whole area of the Interchange, and proposed A1/A14 NMU crossing, also be included in this question.

2. The scheme at Brampton is too large and too complex to visualise from 2-D drawings. BCG consider that an architectural/engineering scale model of the Brampton Interchange, including nearby residential properties and the village school, would be helpful. This could also be extended to include the crossing over the ECML and Great Ouse near Buckden Marina – a key area of the route.

3. We also find it difficult to visualise the scheme during the construction stage when it is further complicated by borrow pits (sand and gravel quarries) on both sides of the Interchange, a cement works (size and specification unknown) at an unspecified location on one of the quarrying sites, plus accommodation and admin facilities for hundreds of construction workers at Brampton Hut. We hope these details can also be indicated on the model. We consider the scale model should be produced for public viewing prior to the issue-specific hearings at Brampton Racecourse in September and have written to Arup/HE accordingly.
Extract from information on DEFRA website:

What is sustainable development?
A widely-used and accepted international definition of sustainable development is: ‘development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ - Globally we are not even meeting the needs of the present let alone considering the needs of future generations.

Guiding principles of sustainable development
The UK Government, Scottish Executive, Welsh Assembly Government and the Northern Ireland Administration have agreed upon a set of principles that provide a basis for sustainable development policy in the UK. For a policy to be sustainable, it must respect all five principles.

Shared UK principles of sustainable development
This page sets out the shared UK principles of sustainable development in the UK. They apply to the UK Government, Scottish Executive, Welsh Assembly Government and the Northern Ireland Administration. For a policy to be sustainable, it must respect all five principles. We want to live within environmental limits and achieve a just society, and we will do so by means of sustainable economy, good governance, and sound science.

Living Within Environmental Limits
Respecting the limits of the planet’s environment, resources and biodiversity - to improve our environment and ensure that the natural resources needed for life are unimpaired and remain so for future generations.

Ensuring a Strong, Healthy & Just Society
Meeting the diverse needs of all people in existing and future communities, promoting personal wellbeing, social cohesion and inclusion, and creating equal opportunity for all.

Achieving a Sustainable Economy
Building a strong, stable and sustainable economy which provides prosperity and opportunities for all, and in which environmental and social costs fall on those who impose them (Polluter Pays), and efficient resource use is incentivised.

Using Sound Science Responsibly
Ensuring policy is developed and implemented on the basis of strong scientific evidence, whilst taking into account scientific uncertainty (through the Precautionary Principle) as well as public attitudes and values.

Promoting Good Governance
Actively promoting effective, participative systems of governance in all levels of society - engaging people’s creativity, energy, and diversity.
Value for Money

Q2.7.2: In view of reduced costs for specific items of works, what would be the effect of excluding the removal of the existing A14 Huntingdon viaduct and the associated road works from the scheme on its overall cost, the economic appraisal for the scheme and the projected benefit to cost ratio?

Statement of Common Ground (SoCG)

Q2.14.4: Please provide an update on progress with each of the Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) submitted in response to Deadline 3. This to confirm which SoCGs are now finalised and which SoCG are still in discussion. It is the ExAs expectation that all SoCGs will be finalised by Deadline 8. If the applicant or other interested parties foresee difficulties in meeting this deadline, they are requested to advise the ExA accordingly of the additional steps that are being taken to secure agreement.

1. BCG wish to respond to Q2.14.4 (SoCG) and Q2.7.2 (Value for Money) together in the context of seeking to agree a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with HE against the background of our alternative A14 scheme. Please see correspondence with Arup below plus associated Annexes A-E. These provide details of steps taken to date to take our alternative scheme forward, itemise key elements of our scheme and identify current funding availability. A request for a scale model of the HE scheme from Brampton Hut to the new viaduct over the ECML and Great Ouse near Buckden Marina is also included.

2. We have been asking HE to draw up our alternative A14 scheme and seeking to find common ground with elements of the proposed HE scheme (notably the improvement of the existing A14 between Huntingdon and Cambridge) but this is proving difficult. Part of the problem is that our key advisers are not currently available for a meeting owing to work commitments/annual leave. To save time we have tried to take matters forward by exchange of emails with Arup/HE but to date this has not produced any promising results.

3. BCG are very concerned by the negative stance of HE, who have made no progress in drawing up and assessing our alternative scheme – nor any consequent re-examination of the value for money of the HE scheme (Q2.7.2). This work has now been outstanding for over five years. The Highways Agency (now HE) agreed to draw up our alternative scheme at the Public Inquiry Pre-Meeting in May 2010 and submit it for public consultation before July 2010. HE now state that no work at all was undertaken at that time or since. Previous HE responses to earlier ExA questions even denied the existence of our alternative scheme and key elements (completing and upgrading the A428-A421-M1 route) have been included in other HE road projects as announced in December 2014. We would be grateful for any assistance the ExA might be able to provide to resolve this impasse.

Eileen Collier (Cllr)
Brampton A14 Campaign group (BCG) 17 August 2015
Recent email correspondence with Arup/HE

From: Jade Tilley (Arup)  
12/08/2015

Dear Eileen
Thank you for the additional data which is useful in helping us to understand your proposed alternative. In principle we understand your proposal to be to avoid building parts of the currently proposed scheme and instead upgrade the current road to a higher standard; expressway with active traffic management providing a local track/road system to pick up agricultural traffic. An assessment of such an option would be primarily based on the traffic and economic benefits and would not require plans to be produced.

As you say, the A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet scheme is now in the Highways England programme of schemes. We don’t yet have any drawings of a scheme for the A428 as this is at an early stage of preparation. However, we have tested the traffic model developed for the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon scheme with an improvement on the A428 as proposed in the new Route Investment Strategy (RIS) programme. The impact on traffic movement on the A14 was small and would not change the level of requirement for the improvement scheme.

Recommendations for multi-modal improvements were included in the CHUMMS report, and these recommendations, which also included the current A14 scheme, have now been largely implemented.

Unfortunately time is running out for us to agree a SoCG and it would be useful to meet with you soon in order to lay out the basis for such an agreement. We look forward to hearing from you.
Kind Regards
Jade Tilley

From: Eileen Collier  
14/08/2015
To: Jade Tilley    Cc: John Border, Davenport, Rob, Bonny Pailing, Katy Sutton, Jonathan Wallace, Evans, Mike

Good afternoon Jade

Thank you for your email. Please find attached a comprehensive response to the points raised and associated Annexes A-E.

I hope Arup/HE find this helpful in taking forward our SoCG and further development of our alternative scheme.

Regards
Eileen Collier (Cllr)  
Brampton A14 Campaign Group (BCG)

[NB: Letter to Arup appended below – pp5-6]
Dear Jade

Thank you for your email of 12 August 2015.

We are surprised that Arup/Highways England (HE) do not consider it necessary to draw up and assess our alternative A14 scheme. This was agreed by the Highways Agency (now HE) in May 2010 at the Public Inquiry Pre-meeting. The BCG scheme was supposed to have been drawn up, agreed by BCG and submitted for public consultation by July 2010 – see extract from official notes (Annex A).

We consider that drawing up our alternative scheme would help to clarify where BCG and HE might find areas of agreement for our Statement of Common Ground - see first draft (Annex B)

We would be particularly interested in seeing how upgrading the existing A14 to Expressway standard would meld with improvements along the whole Huntingdon-Cambridge route which have already been developed as part of the HE scheme.

We also consider that the recently-proposed Oxford to Cambridge Expressway study does not negate the requirement to draw up the A428-A421-M1 part of our A14 scheme. Instead it strengthens the case for doing so, as this route improvement would benefit both schemes and presumably be even better value for money.

We would be pleased to see the work already done by HE/Arup on testing traffic modelling of improvements to the A428 as part of the current HE A14 scheme. Could you specify these improvements please and forward the test data and reports for our perusal?

HE A14 scheme – Huntingdon Southern Bypass (HSB) - visual intrusion

Apart from noise and air pollution issues associated with the HE A14 scheme, which we have previously documented, we are also concerned about visual intrusion. Our key concern is the Huntingdon Southern Bypass (HSB) – particularly the Brampton Interchange, which is too large in scale and too complicated in detail to be easily envisaged in relation to the scale of nearby homes/school/farms. This is further complicated by huge borrow pits (sand and gravel quarries) on both sides of the Interchange, a cement works (size and specification unknown) at an unspecified location on one of the quarrying sites, plus accommodation and admin facilities for hundreds of construction workers at Brampton Hut and associated works traffic during the construction stage (2016-2020).

To assist us in envisaging the physical 3-D impact of the HSB on the Brampton/Buckden area we request that a scale model of the scheme be produced to illustrate the combined impact of these elements at Brampton and Brampton Hut. This could be extended to include Buckden Marina and the viaduct over the ECML and Great Ouse river (a key part of the HSB route).

The model should also include nearby buildings/structures for comparison of scale and assessment of proximity. It should be made available for public viewing as soon as possible – prior to the issue-specific hearings at Brampton Racecourse in September.

BCG alternative A14 scheme

The BCG alternative A14 scheme is based on dispersing A14 traffic more widely rather than concentrating it into a relatively small area in the Ouse Valley between the existing A14 and A1 trunk roads. Development of our scheme is ongoing to reflect changes in Government policy/funding availability. Recent proposed additions to the BCG scheme include a NMU crossing of the existing (four-lane) A1 at Brampton plus A1 noise mitigation measures - both would be eligible for funding under the new DfT "Green Retrofit" programme (Annex C).
DfT has also introduced the new Expressway standard for roads. Accordingly, our proposals have been similarly updated to include Expressway standard for the existing A14 Huntingdon-Cambridge route and the A428-A421-M1 route, which in our scheme also includes a new road from Caxton Gibbet direct to a grade-separated junction at the Black Cat roundabout on the A1 (part of the BCG A14 scheme since 2009).

We are also seeking the upgrade and retention of the existing A428 from Caxton Gibbet to the A1 at St Neots as a local road. We note that dualling of the A428 from Caxton Gibbet to the A1 (with a grade-separated junction at the Black Cat roundabout), is now funded as a separate road project (Annex D).

Multi-modal options – rail freight

The A428 elements of our alternative scheme are only part of the picture and do not represent our whole scheme. Rail freight and improved technology have always been central to our scheme and we remain in contact with the rail freight industry on this aspect. As advised previously, there is already funding in Network Rail Control Period 5 for further Felixstowe-Nuneaton upgrades. This will comply with DfT modal shift policy and help to reduce congestion on the A14 corridor. We are currently awaiting further advice/information on this from our rail freight experts.

Value for Money – Transport appraisal

We hope HE/Arup will draw up our alternative scheme without further delay so that value for money can be properly tested as required under Treasury Green Book rules and WebTAG guidance. It appears that the ‘softer options’ listed in Annex C (demand management measures and DfT ‘smarter choices’ such as improved public transport, walking and cycling) should also be included in our scheme in accordance with the advice in the DfT document “Understanding and valuing the impact of transport investment: latest technical research and next steps in transport appraisal” (2013) – extract attached (Annex E).

I hope you find this helpful.

Regards

Eileen Collier (Cllr) Brampton A14 Campaign Group (BCG)

14 August 2015

List of Annexes

A: Notes of Public Inquiry Pre-Meeting (extract) – May 2010
B: SoCG between HE and BCG – First draft
C: BCG alternative scheme – key points and funding as at July 2015
D: East of England road schemes – funding announced December 2014
E: DfT pub. 2013 (extract) – Transport appraisal - Valuing Environment and Health Impacts(appended below – pp7-8)
4. Valuing Environmental and Health Impacts

4.1 Transport has far-reaching impacts on our economy, the environment and how we live our lives every day. To ensure decision makers have the fullest possible information, transport appraisal aims to provide a comprehensive picture of the social, environmental and economic impacts of different options.

4.2 A recent comparison of practice in several countries with well-developed transport appraisal frameworks noted that many of the key developments in WebTAG over the last decade have focussed on environmental and health impacts – like monetisation of greenhouse gas and air pollutant emissions, and the physical activity benefits of walking and cycling – have ensured that our methods continue to be in line with international best practice.

4.3 Given the wide range of environmental and health impacts, there are a wide range of different methods used to value these impacts in transport appraisal. For example, noise values draw on evidence of the impact of noise on house prices; greenhouse gas emission values use prices from the EU Emissions Trading System and estimates of the costs of meeting Government carbon targets; and values of health are derived from people’s willingness-to-pay to reduce the risk of accidents, injuries and death.

4.4 As far as possible, we aim to place an evidence-based value on impacts. where this is not possible, we take an ‘environmental capital’ approach to qualitatively assess impacts on biodiversity, the water environment, heritage and other factors. This involves an assessment of the current environmental resources, features and characteristics – to establish a baseline level of environmental capital – and how this will be affected by the option being considered. This approach ensures that, although they can’t be monetised, factors like impacts on protected species or the water environment are considered and reflected in our value for money advice.

Working Together on the Methods and Values

4.5 Transport isn’t the only source of environmental impacts; we work closely with other Departments on how these impacts should be treated in appraisal and to ensure our methods are up-to-date and reflect the latest evidence.

4.6 Some of the environmental consequences of transport schemes, e.g. on air quality and noise, ultimately result in impacts on people’s health. There are many other areas where valuation of health impacts is important; in a transport context alone we look at changes in the number and severity of accidents and changes in physical activity from walking and cycling. Therefore we also work closely with Defra, the Department for Health and others across Government to develop our approach to valuing health impacts.

Recent Developments in Valuing Environmental and Health Impacts

4.7 In November 2014 we updated our guidance to include the latest Supplementary Green Book guidance, issued by DECC32, on valuing greenhouse gas emissions. And in January 2014 we introduced the ‘marginal abatement cost’ method for valuing air quality pollutants where EU limits are exceeded, in line with the method developed by Defra.
DfT (2013) “Understanding and valuing the impacts of transport investment: latest DfT technical research and next steps in transport appraisal”

Continuing our Collaborative Work

4.8 Much of the development of our guidance in recent years has focussed on broadening the scope of appraisal to monetise more **environmental and health impacts**. These effects can be either positive or negative but our comprehensive framework, which ensures that impacts that can’t be monetised are considered in **Value for Money** advice, means that decision makers are presented with a full set of information.

4.9 Our Analytical Strategy in this area is based on close joint working with others, both inside and outside of Government, to ensure that we understand developments in the evidence base and are able to reflect them in our appraisal methods and values. We will continue to work in this collaborative fashion. For example, we are working with colleagues from across Government on the latest research on the impacts of noise and to ensure approaches used across Government to value health impacts are consistent, make use of the latest methodological developments and use up-to-date evidence.
25. Alternative routes had been put forward by various interested parties. Notification of these had been due by 17 May. The Inspector confirmed that he would consider these alternative routes, but that in the interests of fairness and clarity it was necessary for all people likely to be affected by the alternative routes to be aware of them and have had the opportunity to comment on them. It was agreed that the alternative routes which had been put forward by the deadline date would be drawn up by the HA, signed off by the person or persons who had promoted them, and advertised so as to enable representations on them to be made.

26. The HA stated that some of the alternative routes could be outside the scope of the inquiry, and that they would need to take a view on these. The promoters of the alternative routes may of course take a different view to the HA which they would need to put forward at the inquiry.

27. The deadline of 17 May for the submission of alternatives was questioned, as some correspondence from objectors dating from November 2009 had only been replied to by the HA on 12 May. The Inspector confirmed that the Highways Act indicates that the Secretary of State may disregard any alternative routes put forward after 17 May. He also confirmed that any alternative routes not put forward by this date might be considered by him during the inquiry if he considered them to have substance, but against the background of not having been advertised, and of not therefore having been considered by parties who might be affected by them.

APPENDIX C

9. In all the circumstances, I conclude that I should not be justified in seeking the agreement of the Secretary of State to the variation of the commencement date for the inquiry. Unless the Secretary of State decides to suspend the arrangements for the inquiry following the application made by the Offords A14 Action Group, the inquiry will open as planned on Tuesday 20 July 2010.

28 May 2010
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1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of document

1.1.1 A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant for a Development Consent Order (DCO) and another party. It sets out matters of agreement between both parties, as well as matters where there is not an agreement and matters which are under discussion.

1.1.2 The aim of SoCGs is to provide a clear record of the issues discussed and the stage each issue is at during the discussion. The SoCG can be used as evidence of these discussions in representations to the Planning Inspectorate as part of their examination of the DCO application.

1.2 This Statement of Common Ground

1.2.1 This SoCG has been jointly prepared by Highways England, as the Applicant, and Brampton A14 Campaign Group. It refers to the application for the proposed A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme which was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 31 December 2014.

1.2.2 The proposed scheme extends for a distance of 21 miles, from the existing A14 at Ellington to the Cambridge Northern Bypass at Milton. It includes a new bypass to the south of Huntingdon, carriageway widening on the existing A14 between Swavesey and Girton, and improvements to the Cambridge Northern Bypass. It also includes junction improvements, the widening of a 4.5 mile section of the A1 trunk road between Brampton and Alconbury, and approximately 7 miles of new local access roads. In addition, it includes the de-trunking (i.e. returning to local road status) of the existing A14 trunk road between the Ellington and Swavesey junctions, and the removal of the existing road viaduct over the East Coast Mainline railway at Huntingdon.

1.3 Structure of the Statement of Common Ground

1.3.1 This SoCG comprises 5 sections:

- Section 1 – this introduction.
- Section 2 – a record of engagement undertaken, for example meetings, emails and letters related to the discussions, including a summary of each.
- Section 3 – tables recording areas which are agreed and not agreed as a result of the discussions.
- Section 4 – a table recording areas which are under discussion, and a summary of the issues related to each.
- Section 5 – signatures of the parties to indicate a true and accurate record of the discussions.
2 Previous engagement undertaken

2.1.1 The table below records the engagement undertaken between Highways England and Brampton A14 Campaign Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of engagement</th>
<th>Summary of discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 21.11.13   | Pre-application non-statutory communications | • Our alternative A14 scheme submitted on 20 October will require more emphasis on ‘softer’ measures such as DfT’s ‘smarter choices’ including Park & Ride schemes and public transport (road, rail, guided busway, trams, light rail etc); improved cycling facilities; workplace and housing development transport and travel plans; car share and car clubs; multi-occupancy vehicles (including community transport, mini-buses, taxis) and so on. Sian Berry of the Campaign for Better Transport would be able to advise further on this.  
• Multi-modal elements such as freight on rail and coastal shipping (EU Motorways of the Sea) and technological solutions to road traffic congestion, such as ITS, should also be fully considered.  
• In addition, carbon emissions from road transport are also a problem and should be carefully assessed in view of tightening carbon reduction targets. |
| 21.11.13   | Pre-application non-statutory communications | • Letter setting out objections to the scheme.                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 15.6.14    | Pre-application non-statutory communications | • Detailed consultation responses across 5 documents with accompanying maps.                                                                                                                                           |
| 12.3.15    | Pre-examination Relevant Representation | • Please see 2.1.5 below.                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 7.5.15     | On-going Correspondence Post-Application | • Correspondence re: 13th May preliminary meeting and interested parties.  
• I wish to add a further item to my list of issues affecting Brampton - namely (demolition of) the Huntingdon A14 viaduct. Brampton is not alone in seeking retention of the viaduct which we consider should be included in issue specific open floor hearings (evenings). Retention of the viaduct and existing A14 |
capacity is central to our alternative A14 scheme (development ongoing), which was submitted to the Highways Agency in October 2013. This is an updated version of our original alternative A14 scheme submitted to the Public Inquiry in 2010. It includes upgrading the A14/M11-A428-A421 route to the M1 as an alternative Huntingdon Southern Bypass and 'smarter choices' options (including rail freight and improved public transport) in compliance with DfT policy.

2.1.2 It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the meetings and key correspondence between Highways England and Brampton A14 Campaign Group.

2.1.3 There is ongoing discussion between the parties.

2.1.4 The relevant representation forms the basis for the discussion, as per the summary set out below.

2.1.5 Brampton A14 campaign Group is opposed to this Highways Agency (HA) A14 scheme. We have the following objections and observations:

a. The HA scheme is based on the outdated CHUMMS scheme (2001) and does not comply with current national and international transport, environment and health policy/ law including:

1. UN - Climate Change (scheme increases carbon emissions: flooding risks to communities; resilience of transport networks at risk);
2. UK law (Carbon emissions reduction);
3. WHO (Children’s Environment & Health Action Plan);
4. EU law (Air Quality Directives);
5. EU Health Strategy (‘unconditional protection of children’s health’);
6. UK- NPPF (sustainable development criteria & Precautionary Principle);
7. DfT policy (modal shift of freight from road to rail; ‘smarter choices’).

b. HA community engagement flawed - consultation process inadequate:

1. exhibitions - largely PR exercises promoting HA scheme;
2. information - officials at meetings/exhibitions unable to answer detailed questions;
3. written responses - consultation in 2013 showed ‘lack of support’ for Huntingdon Southern Bypass - a six-lane elevated highway across the Ouse Valley flood plain from Swavesey to Brampton – no alternative options considered.
4. HA scheme extended in 2013 to widen A1 to six lanes between Brampton and Alconbury: no detailed justification of need - 'smarter choices’ such as workplace travel plans, car clubs or rail options (passenger and freight) to service Alconbury Local Enterprise Zone not considered.

c. Value for money: Less costly alternative scheme submitted by Brampton in 2010 and 2013; HA scheme costs now £1.5 billion – £60 million per mile;
Planning Inspector at A14 Public Inquiry in May 2010 instructed HA to draw up and assess alternative schemes. HA scheme cancelled in October 2010 on cost grounds.

d. Huntingdon Southern Bypass - local impacts

1. air, noise and light pollution from ten lanes of traffic at Brampton Interchange - 200 metres from family homes and near village school:
2. road traffic air pollution biggest risk to public health:
1. lung development of children impaired up to 500 metres from similar road schemes (Gauderman report- Lancet 2007);
2. fine particulates significant risk to public health (DEFRA);
3. Brampton west of Interchange in path of prevailing westerly winds.
3. Borrowpits – cumulative effects of air and noise pollution from several sources:
1. borrow pits on both sides of Brampton Interchange for extraction of 2 million tons of sand and gravel for road construction;
2. thousands of lorry movements plus noise, dust and fumes from quarrying activities and cement plant.
4. visual intrusion - effects on local landscape character;
5. loss of tranquility Ouse Valley Way; impact on proposed Ouse Valley AONB;

6. impact on cultural heritage - listed buildings and historic waymarker at Brampton
7. Impact on SSSIs and nature conservation sites and wildlife; impact on hydrology of Brampton Wood SSSI (ancient woodland);
8. increased flooding risk to communities in the Ouse valley;
9. loss of high quality arable farmland;
10. demolition of cottages – nearby tree with TPO at risk
11. property blight.
3 Matters agreed and matters not agreed

3.1 Matters agreed
3.1.1 The table below shows the areas where Highways England and Brampton A14 Campaign Group are in agreement, the record of agreement refers to the source document in which the agreement has been noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Matters agreed</th>
<th>Record of agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Matters not agreed
3.2.1 The table below shows the areas where Highways England and Brampton A14 Campaign Group are not in agreement, the record of non-agreement refers to the source document in which the confirmed disagreement has been noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Matters not agreed</th>
<th>Record of non-agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Record of areas still under discussion

4.1.1 The table below provides a summary of the matters which are still under discussion between Highways England and Brampton A14 Campaign Group. The record of agreement refers to the source document in which the original point of discussion has been noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Matters under discussion</th>
<th>Record of discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Agreement on this SoCG

This Statement of Common Ground has been jointly prepared and agreed by:

Name: 

Signature: 

Position: 

On behalf of: Highways England

Date: 

Name: Brampton A14 Campaign Group

Signature: 

On behalf of: Brampton A14 Campaign Group

Date: 


Updated BCG alternative scheme - key points and funding as at July 2015

Potential A14 scheme cost savings in red; agreed A428 funding in blue

Note: BCG A14 scheme is multi-modal in accordance with EU/UK transport policy:

ROAD ELEMENTS

Removing the Huntingdon Southern Bypass (HSB) from the HE A14 scheme) Cost saving
Removing widening A1 Brampton Hut to Alconbury from the HE A14 scheme) £600 million +

Retaining Huntingdon Viaduct & A14 EU TEN-T freight route - Cost saving?) see Q.25.1
Removing associated A14 link roads in & around Huntingdon - Cost saving?)

• Upgrading existing A14 to Expressway standard – Cost TBC (A14 funding 2013)

• Upgrading A428-A421-M1 route (alternative HSB) – Cost TBC (funded 2014)
  • Building new offline section from Caxton Gibbet (A428) to a grade-separated junction with the A1 & A421 at the Black Cat roundabout; (part funded 2014)
  • Dualling A428 from Caxton Gibbet to A1 (St Neots) as local road (funded 2014)

• Installing improved technology - Active Traffic Management (ATM) on Expressways as required – Cost TBC (A14 funding 2013);

• Providing roads/tracks for agricultural traffic & access to farms (A14 funding 2013).

ADDITIONAL ROAD PROPOSALS (BCG SCHEME)

DfT ‘Green Retrofit’ Programme (new funding 2015)

• A1 - installing noise mitigation measures on the existing A1 at Brampton (none previously provided);
• A1 - installing NMU crossing at Brampton to reinstate direct access from West End to Brampton Wood (historic community severance from public assets);

DfT demand management measures including:

• more Park & Ride sites on A14 corridor (A14 funding 2013);
• improved public transport (rail and road);
• extension of guided bus routes;
• express commuter coaches

DfT ‘smarter choices’ such as:

• workplace travel plans;
• community transport;
• car share;
• safe cycle routes;
• improved facilities for cyclists at rail stations/other destinations

EC- BCG - 4Aug2015
East of England (extract): A14/A1 scheme and A428-A421-M1 route to M1

*Links to infographics and images* will be available to download from 09.00am on Monday December 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme name</th>
<th>Scheme Description</th>
<th>Announced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon</td>
<td>A14 Junction 20 (Ellington) to Junction 33 (Milton): major upgrade between the A1 and A10 at Milton, widening to dual three lanes, creating a bypass for Huntingdon and new distributor roads for local traffic and remodelling key junctions.</td>
<td>2013 Estimated cost £1.5 billion (c. £60 million per mile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet</td>
<td>A428: dualling of remaining single carriageway section between Caxton Gibbet west of Cambridge and the M1, including a grade separated junction at the A1 Black Cat roundabout.</td>
<td>Autumn Statement 2014 Estimated cost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford to Cambridge Expressway Study</td>
<td>Study of the potential to link Oxford, Milton Keynes and Cambridge, making use of existing roads where possible and considering the case for filling missing links.</td>
<td>Autumn Statement 2014 Estimated cost of study? Cost limit for scheme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A428-A421 route to M1 and beyond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>