

**From:** Spencer Claire [<mailto:Claire.Spencer@scambs.gov.uk>]  
**Sent:** 02 September 2015 10:02  
**To:** A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon  
**Subject:** A14 DCO Examination - Deadline 8

Dear Ms Fernandes,

This email provides the response to the matters addressed in Deadline 8 on behalf of South Cambridgeshire District Council (Reference 10030865), to the Examination into the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme DCO Application.

### Comments on Responses to ExA's Second Round of Written Questions

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

### Statement of Common Ground

The Council submitted an updated Statement of Common Ground with Highways England at Deadline 7 - this version reflects the latest position. A copy is attached for your convenience.

### Local Impact Report

The Local Impact Report has been prepared jointly with Cambridgeshire County Council, Huntingdonshire District Council, and Cambridge City Council and was submitted at Deadline 2. The joint Local Impact Report has been updated and Cambridgeshire County Council is submitting the updated report on behalf of all the local authorities.

### Hearings

South Cambridgeshire District Council does not wish to appear at the issue specific hearings.

Kind regards

**Claire Spencer** | Senior Planning Policy Officer



South Cambridgeshire Hall | Cambourne Business Park | Cambourne | Cambridge | CB23 6EA  
t: 01954 713418 | e: [claire.spencer@scambs.gov.uk](mailto:claire.spencer@scambs.gov.uk)  
[www.scambs.gov.uk](http://www.scambs.gov.uk) | [facebook.com/south-cambridgeshire](https://facebook.com/south-cambridgeshire) | [twitter.com/SouthCambs](https://twitter.com/SouthCambs)



**A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme  
Development Consent Order**

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

**2 September 2015**



<b>Question Reference:</b>	Q2.1.9
<b>Question:</b>	
What progress has been made in discussions between the applicant and SCDC about the PM <sub>10</sub> data from the Impington monitoring station. (Ref Q1.1.1 REP2-002).	
<b>SCDC Initial Response (19 August 2015):</b>	
<p>The Statement of Common Ground has been updated to reflect the disagreement between Highways England and SCDC over the need for post scheme air quality monitoring.</p> <p>HE have made it clear it does not propose to undertake monitoring during the operational phase as there are no predicted exceedances of air quality objectives or limit values or any significant effects identified across the scheme.</p> <p>Given the Council's view that operational monitoring is required, it is necessary to agree a baseline position. An appropriate baseline is essential to be able to determine if there has been any change in air quality as a result of the scheme compared to what is predicted. The Council considers that it should be possible to agree a suitable baseline position as new monitoring equipment for PM<sub>10</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> has been installed, which meets HE's requirements; they were installed in March and October 2014 respectively. With the DEFRA annual cycle of data being January to December, and the need to ratify the data, it should be possible to reach agreement on a new baseline when the next available full year of ratified data from the Impington monitoring station is available (by February / March 2016).</p> <p>Therefore no further progress has been made on this issue.</p>	
<b>Highways England (HE) Response (19 August 2015):</b>	
<p>No further progress has been made between Highways England and South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) regarding the reliability of PM<sub>10</sub> monitoring data from the Impington site. In order to continue to progress this issue with the council, Highways England has continued to analyse the Impington monitoring data.</p> <p>Highways England's position with respect to the monitoring data from the Impington monitoring station is set out fully in response to question 1.1.1 and the accompanying appendix to question 1.1.1 (<i>Response to First Written Questions, Report 1: Air Quality and Carbon Emissions</i> (Applicant reference HE/A14/EX/28, PINS reference REP2-002)).</p> <p>Since the response to question 1.1.1 at Deadline 2, Highways England has analysed a full 12 month period from the Impington monitoring site since the change of equipment (the monitoring equipment was replaced in March 2014, as explained in the response to question 1.1.1). An updated technical report has been prepared and has been attached to this response as part of Appendix 1.</p> <p>Highways England believes that the results from the new equipment are representative of the area as they correlate well with other nearby roadside monitoring sites and are consistent with concentrations measured at other similar locations in the UK.</p> <p>Previously SCDC felt that they had insufficient data available to form an opinion</p>	

about the new data as they reported a data capture of 57%. As more data is now available from the monitoring equipment (including a period of 12 months from July 2014 when data capture was 89.4%), Highways England has asked SCDC again to review the most recent results and provide an opinion whether the data recorded from April 2014 now best represents PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations in the area. SCDC has been content to report data for Local Air Quality Management (LAQM) purposes below the recommended data capture using annualised results in past reports.

Attached as at Appendix 1 to this response are copies of: the most recent letter to SCDC and technical report, along with a record of other correspondence that together demonstrates Highways England's attempts to reach agreement with SCDC based on the available evidence.

**SCDC Comment on HE Response:**

SCDC is reassured that HE accepts that the results from the new equipment at the Impington monitoring station form the basis for agreement of a baseline position, which can then be used to determine if there has been any change in air quality as a result of the scheme, compared to what is predicted by HE.

SCDC is of the view that discussions with HE over historical data from the Impington monitoring station, pre installation of the new equipment in March and October 2014, are of no relevance for the purposes of agreeing a baseline position.

HE has proposed use of data recorded by the new equipment from April 2014, specifically the 12 month period from July 2014, which, in their opinion, best represents PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations in the area.

SCDC is unable to agree with HE's proposal as there were a number of data rejection issues during the commissioning of the new equipment, including during the 12 month period from July 2014.

As the new equipment has now been successfully commissioned, SCDC takes the view that the accepted DEFRA annual data cycle January – December, which SCDC has always reported, should be used to determine PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations in the area. The next available full year of ratified data from the Impington monitoring station will be available February / March 2016.

SCDC has no record of having received the HE letter dated 31<sup>st</sup> July 2015, which accompanied the HE's response to the Inspector's questions. SCDC will however be formally responding to the letter in an effort to understand why the HE is unable to accept the full year of ratified data from the Impington monitoring station January – December 2015, which will be available February / March 2016, as the basis for agreeing a baseline position.

# **A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme**

## **Statement of Common Ground**

**between**

**Highways England**

**and**

**South Cambridgeshire District  
Council**

**Date: 19 August 2015**  
**Reference: HE/A14/EX/xxx/LA04**

**Version: Examination Deadline 7**

## **Table of Contents**

<b>1</b>	Introduction	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	Overview of the scheme	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	Overview of previous engagement undertaken	<b>4</b>
<b>4</b>	Topics contained within this SoCG	<b>6</b>
<b>5</b>	Matters agreed and matters not agreed	<b>7</b>
<b>6</b>	Record of areas still under discussion	<b>21</b>
<b>7</b>	Agreement of this SoCG	<b>27</b>

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Purpose of the document

- 1.1.1 This document is submitted to the Secretary of State through the Planning Inspectorate (as responsible agency) in relation to the application by Highways England for development consent under the Planning Act 2008 for the proposed A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme. 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 Hut 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.
- 1.1.2 The Application was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 31 December 2014 with acceptance of the Application on 27 January 2015.
- 1.1.3 This SoCG has been prepared in respect of the Scheme. Guidance about the purpose and possible content of SoCGs is given in paragraphs 58-65 of the Department for Communities and Local Government's "Planning Act 2008: examination of applications for development consent" (March 2015). Paragraph 58, copied below, confirms the basic function of SoCGs:
- 1.1.4 *"A statement of common ground is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree. As well as identifying matters which are not in real dispute, it is also useful if a statement identifies those areas where agreement has not been reached. The statement should include references to show where those matters are dealt with in the written representations or other documentary evidence."*
- 1.1.5 The context for SoCGs is set out by the Examining Authority in the Notice of Preliminary Meeting (Rule 6 Letter, Annex G) dated 17 April 2015.
- 1.1.6 SoCGs therefore are a useful and established means of ensuring that the evidence at the post-application examination focuses on the material differences between the main parties, and so aim to help facilitate a more efficient examination process.

## 1.2. Parties to this SoCG

- 1.2.1. This SoCG has been prepared in respect of the scheme by Highways England, as the Applicant, and South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- 1.2.2. Highways England is a government owned company responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network in England. The network is made up of England's motorways and all-purpose trunk roads (the major "A" roads). The A14 is part of the trunk road network for which Highways England is responsible. Following the Scheme being constructed, Highways England will be responsible for operating, maintaining the improved A14.
- 1.2.3. South Cambridgeshire District Council is a Tier 1 Local Authority and a Statutory Consultee. The A14 is a key route for the local and regional commuter, business



and freight traffic. The scheme is considered vital to the area and supports development.

- 1.2.4. It is agreed that any matters not specifically referred to in Sections 5 and 6 of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to South Cambridgeshire District Council, and therefore have not been the subject of any discussions between the parties. As such, those matters can be read as agreed, only to the extent that they are either not of material interest or not of relevance to South Cambridgeshire District Council.

### **1.3. Structure of the SoCG**

- 1.3.1. This SoCG has been structured to reflect matters and topics of interest to South Cambridgeshire District Council in relation to the proposed scheme.
- 1.3.2. Section 2 of this SoCG provides an overview of the proposed scheme.
- 1.3.3. Section 3 provides an overview of consultation to date between Highways England and South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- 1.3.4. Section 4 provides a summary of the main areas and topics covered by this SoCG.
- 1.3.5. Section 5 provides a summary of areas that have been agreed and areas that have not been agreed.
- 1.3.6. Section 6 provides a record of areas still under discussion.
- 1.3.7. Section 7 provides a succinct summary of the matters contained within this SoCG.

## 2 Overview of the scheme

### 2.1 The proposed scheme

- 2.1.1 The proposed scheme comprises:
- 2.1.2 Widening of the A1 between Brampton Hut and Alconbury over a length of approximately 4.5 miles, from the existing two lane dual carriageway to a three lane dual carriageway. This would be achieved between Brampton and Brampton Hut by constructing a new road to the west of the existing A1, with the existing A1 road becoming part of the new A14 Huntingdon Southern Bypass;
- 2.1.3 A new Huntingdon Southern Bypass of approximately 12½ miles in length, which would provide a two lane dual carriageway between Ellington and the A1 at Brampton and a three lane dual carriageway between Brampton and Swavesey; this would remove a large proportion of traffic from the section of the existing A14 between Huntingdon and Swavesey as well as Brampton Hut and Spittals interchange. The new bypass would include a raised viaduct section of road running across the river Great Ouse and a bridge over the East Coast Mainline railway. It would include junctions with the A1 at Brampton and with the A1198 at Godmanchester;
- 2.1.4 Downgrading the existing A14 trunk road (de-trunking to county road status) over approximately 12 miles between Brampton Hut and Swavesey, as well as between Alconbury and Spittals interchange;
- 2.1.5 Huntingdon Town Centre improvements, to include the demolition of the A14 viaduct over the East Coast Mainline railway and Brampton Road in Huntingdon. A new link would improve accessibility into Huntingdon: from the south and east by connecting the old A14 directly with Huntingdon Ring Road near the bus station, with Brampton road adjacent to the railway station and from the north and west by constructing a new link road from Brampton Road to connect with the A14 to the west. A through route for light vehicles would be maintained;
- 2.1.6 Widening of the existing A14 over approximately 5½ miles to provide three lanes in each direction between Swavesey and Bar Hill and to four lanes in each direction between Bar Hill and Girton;
- 2.1.7 Widening of a 1½ mile section of the Cambridge Northern Bypass between Histon and Milton;
- 2.1.8 Improvement of existing A14 junctions at Swavesey, Bar Hill and Girton; to improve the capacity of the road, ensure compatibility with adjacent proposed developments such as Northstowe, and connections for non-motorised users; and
- 2.1.9 A new local access road, approximately five miles in length, to be constructed as a dual carriageway between Fen Drayton and Swavesey and as a single carriageway between Swavesey and Girton. The road would provide a route for local traffic between Cambridge and Huntingdon as well as providing access to properties and businesses along the corridor.

## 3 Overview of previous engagement undertaken

**3.1** A summary of the key meetings (including meeting notes) and correspondence that has taken place between Highways England and South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) is outlined in the table below.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Form of Contact or Type of Correspondence</b>	<b>Summary of that Contact and Key Outcomes and Points of Discussion</b>
02/12/2013	Meeting	A14 kick-off meeting.
16/12/2013	Workshop	Discussion of potential legacy opportunities of the A14.
09/01/2014	LA forum	LA forum – outline and update on process and programme.
16/01/2014	Workshop	Scheme design workshop.
21/01/2014	Meeting	Traffic modelling meeting to discuss Northstowe.
29/01/2014	Workshop	Environmental stakeholders workshop – update on A14 scheme and discussion of environmental issues.
13/02/2014	LA forum	Approach to creating a positive legacy for the A14 and discussion of potential legacy themes.
14/02/2014	Members presentation	Provided Members with an overview of the proposed scheme, need for the scheme, outcomes from options consultation, design development, DCO process, A14 legacy and timelines.
12/03/2014	Meeting	A14 Landscape Mitigation discussion with Local Authority Landscape Officers.
18/03/2014	LA forum	LA forum – outline and update on process and programme.
12/05/2014	Presentation	Presentation to the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee.
19/05/2014	LA forum	Progress meeting with Tier 1 Local Authorities.
22/05/2014	LA forum	To provide an update of the scheme and discuss potential environmental issues.
24/06/2014	Workshop	Borrow pits workshop that covered excavation, logistics and restoration.
30/06/2014	Workshop	Topics covered were SoCG within the DCO process, timeframes, areas for discussion and next steps.
16/07/2014	Meeting	Meeting on landscape liaison.
29/07/2014	LA Forum	Environmental forum.
18/08/2014	Presentation	Design Freeze 4 Presentation.
19/08/2014	Meeting	A14 update and meeting with promoters of Darwin Green.
09/09/2014	LA meeting	To present the new traffic model and discuss traffic

		matters.
11/09/2014	Workshop	Code of Construction Practice workshop to discuss background and contents of CoCP.
20/10/2014	LAs and Statutory bodies presentation	Presentation of Environmental Statement key findings.
24/10/2014	Meeting	CH2 Traffic Regulation Orders discussion.
20/11/2014	Members presentation	Traffic forecasts presentation.
03/12/2014	Members presentation	Environmental presentation to members.
26/01/2015	Meeting	SoCG progress meeting to discuss matters agreed and matters still under discussion.
27/01/2015	Correspondence	Email from T. Lees to C. Spencer and J. Dixon providing award drains information extracted from Draft DCO.
02/02/2015	Correspondence	Email from T. Lees to C. Spencer regarding the existing drainage on the A1307.
13/02/2015	Conference call	SoCG call to discuss noise barriers at orchard park, drainage outfalls/ ownership and A428/M11 connection.
24/03/2015	Correspondence	Email from G. Kearney to D. Hiller, T. Lees, M. Evans and T. Darcy regarding summary comments to be provided for the Local Impact Report by SCDC.
08/05/2015	Correspondence	Response to draft SoCG v4 with legacy queries from Claire Spencer.
11/05/2015	Correspondence	Response to queries from G Kearney received on March 24 <sup>th</sup> 2015.
11/05/2015	Correspondence	Issue draft SoCG v5 to Claire Spencer and Jonathan Dixon for review.
14/05/2015	Meeting	Discussion about noise concerns with Colin Cobbing and Peter Mumford (J2A).
03/06/2015	Meeting	SoCG progress meeting: discussion about matters agreed and request for additional information on matters still under discussion.
22/07/2015	Meeting	Discussion about noise concerns with Colin Cobbing and Peter Mumford (J2A).

**3.2** It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and key correspondence between Highways England and South Cambridgeshire District Council in relation to the matters recorded in Section 4.

**3.3** There is ongoing discussion between the parties in relation to the matters in section 5 of this SoCG.

## 4 Topics contained within this SoCG

4.1 The below provides a summary of the topics that have been considered within this SoCG and provide a structure as to topics and matters of relevance that have been the subject of correspondence and contact to date between Highways England and South Cambridgeshire District Council.

- Scheme elements: case for the scheme, local access road, Girton Interchange, A1198 junction.
- Non-motorised user provision: design, routes, local access road, materials used.
- Planned development: Northstowe, working with developers.
- Landscape: mitigation, vegetation, specific design queries.
- Lighting: impact on landscape, flora & fauna, impact on people.
- Cultural Heritage: Listed milestones, Lolworth Church.
- Ecology: habitat, mitigation.
- Noise and vibration: baseline, assessment, mitigation, construction and operation impact, Orchard Park noise barrier.
- Air quality: monitoring, baseline, Impington monitoring station.
- Flooding and Drainage: maintenance access strip, construction (culverts), flood mitigation.
- Materials/Minerals and waste: borrow pit operation and restoration, reuse of materials, aftercare.
- Traffic assessment: modelling.
- Cumulative effects: reference to ES Chapter 10
- Legacy issues: detail.
- Requirements and processes

## 5 Matters agreed and matters not agreed

### 5.1 Matters agreed

Ref	Description	Matters Agreed	Record of agreement
<b>Scheme elements</b>			
1	Principles of the scheme	Improvements to the A14 are necessary in order to deliver the local growth agenda, and improve journey times and road safety for the travelling public. The A14 between Cambridge and Huntingdon is a vital route of international, national, regional, and local importance, and SCDC support its improvement and agree in principle to the scheme. The Council agrees that the proposed new trunk road, supported by slip roads and connector roads, are on an appropriate route.	Pre-application consultation response  Written Representation (paras 9-19 )
2	Adequacy of consultation	The Council accepts that consultation, including the pre-application consultation, has been extensive and appropriate across all sections of the community within the A14 corridor. Highways England fully met their commitments in this respect which were outlined by the Statement of Community Consultation.	Pre-application consultation response, and  Adequacy of consultation statement
3	Agreement of the proposed route	The Council agrees to the alignment of the proposed route, supports the inclusion of a local access road and reduction of the number of junctions on the A14.	Pre-application consultation response  Written Representation (para 21)
4	Major scheme elements	The Council accepts the proposed scheme does not provide additional movements at the Girton Interchange. This will be considered as part of Highways England A428 Route Based strategy Express Way.  The Council supports provision of west facing slips at the A1198 junction.	Written Representation (paras 22 & 23)
<b>Non-Motorised User (NMU) provision.</b>			
5	NMU provision (local access road)	The Council supports the provision of a NMU route (suitable for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians) alongside the local access road. The Council supports the proposed NMU facility between Fenstanton and Girton.	Pre-application consultation response  Written Representation (paras 24 - 28)

Ref	Description	Matters Agreed	Record of agreement
		<p>The Council has highlighted the importance of this route and the need for high quality provision. As per the Environmental Statement the NMU provision will be at a high standard, similar to that on the existing guided bus way.</p> <p>The Council requests consultation during the detailed design period, and will be seeking the inclusion of solar studs.</p>	
6	NMU provision	<p>The Council supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The placement of the NMU route in front of Swavesey Travelodge on the eastbound side of the existing A14. This is not shown in the DCO as it is a minor change that is agreed in principle by Highways England.</li> <li>• Reinstatement of routes previously severed by the original A14.</li> <li>• The surface of Girton route (bridleway 6) will have a compacted loose surface.</li> <li>• Links to the cycle route on A1307 Huntingdon Road, upgrades to footpaths Girton 4, and Girton 5, and the planned toucan crossing point in the vicinity of North West Cambridge.</li> <li>• The provision of two new bridges at Swavesey and Bar Hill junctions</li> </ul>	<p>Pre-application consultation response</p> <p>Written Representation (paras 29 - 34)</p>
7	Bar Hill junction	<p>Following further clarification from Highways England, the Council agrees with the proposed crossings and revised alignment of the NMU route between the A14 overbridge and B1050 (which will be towards the base of the embankment, not as shown on the DCO plans), subject to being involved in the detailed design.</p>	<p>Written Representation (para 35)</p>
8	Crossing Oakington Road roundabout	<p><b>Arrangements for crossing the Oakington Road roundabout, as General Arrangement Regulation 5 (2) (o) Sheet 18 of 24 shows a break in the route, where as for other junctions crossing arrangements are shown.</b></p> <p><b>Highways England clarified that the NMU facility will continue across the southern arm of the Dry Drayton southern roundabout. The Council agree with the clarification (moved to</b></p>	<p><b>Written Representation (para 30)</b></p> <p><b>Highways England Response HE/A14/EX/49 (para 6.3.3, REP4-011)</b></p>



Ref	Description	Matters Agreed	Record of agreement
		<a href="#">matters agreed 07/08/2015).</a>	
<b>Planned development</b>			
9	Northstowe	The Council supports the agreed limit of the A14 scheme. Improvements to the Bar Hill junction will accommodate Phase 1 and 2 of the Northstowe development with provision (oversized bridge, local access road and junction layouts) for future upgrades to accommodate Phase 3.	Written Representation (para 39)
10	Working with developers	The Council acknowledges that Highways England has worked with the Northstowe developer and seeks a commitment from Highways England to work with developers through the detailed design and delivery of other planned developments along the route.	Written Representation (paras 42 & 43)
11	Northstowe	<p><b>The Council requests detailed modelling data for the Bar Hill junction, including AM and PM peak vehicle link flows by direction for the High Growth scenario that includes Northstowe Phase 3. The tables provided to date give the Ratio of Flow to capacity only.</b></p> <p><b>The Council request a copy of the future design of Bar Hill junction with the High Growth scenario for all of Northstowe. The Ratios of Flow to capacity in Table 5 of the TN059 technical note are lower for some links in the High Growth scenario suggesting that there is a revised design has been modelled. The Council requests information on associated flows, junction design and model results.</b></p> <p><b>Highways England shared the modelling data with the Council. The Council confirmed that concerns are now addressed (email 11<sup>th</sup> August 2015).</b></p>	Written Representation (para 41)
<b>Landscape</b>			
12	Landscape - mitigation	In principle the Council supports the scheme and the proposals to include extensive landscape mitigation and landscape legacy areas. The Council requests consultation in the detailed design stage and supports the requirement for this (Schedule 2, part 1-section 6 of the DCO).	Written Representation (para 44)



Ref	Description	Matters Agreed	Record of agreement
13	Impact of noise barriers	The Council requests the careful design of the noise barriers to minimise impact on landscape.	Written Representation (paras 50 & 51)
14	Loss of vegetation	<p>The Council is concerned there will be a permanent loss of mature vegetation, including trees with tree preservation order (TPO) status, particularly the area around Lolworth and Grange Farm.</p> <p>The Council seek to reduce the impact on trees generally and especially the loss of TPO trees. The Council considers that it should be possible to lessen the impact on trees generally and TPO trees in particular through the detailed design process, which shall be informed by the outcome of the detailed BS 5837: 2012 tree survey work. The Council accepts Highways England response (moved to matters agreed 07/08/2015).</p> <p>Highways England: The precise extent of vegetation loss would be subject to detailed design. Vegetation loss would occur where it essential to accommodate the proposed alignment and construction of the scheme, and including where the successful long term retention of the vegetation is prevented by proximity to the works or by operational health and safety considerations. Detailed design after (if the application is granted) the DCO is made may allow for more vegetation and trees to be retained.</p>	<p>Written Representation (para 47)</p> <p>Highways England response HE/A14/EX/49 (paras 6.5.1 - 6.5.3, REP4-011)</p>
<b>Lighting</b>			
15	Impacts on landscape, flora and fauna	The Council agree that the impact of lighting on landscape (visual) and flora and fauna has been considered with suitable mitigation proposed to minimise impact.	Written Representation (para 56)
16	Impacts on people.	The Council feels there is not enough information on the impacts of artificial lighting on humans and living conditions. Need to consider existing baseline artificial lighting conditions, potential impact during construction and mitigation measures. The Council understands this will be addressed through the detailed design and requests	Written Representation (paras 53 – 62)

Ref	Description	Matters Agreed	Record of agreement
		to be consulted.	
<b>Cultural heritage</b>			
17	Listed milestones	The Council acknowledges that appropriate surveying and assessment will be undertaken of the listed milestones along the A14 mainline and these will be reinstated appropriately close to their original location.	Written Representation (para 70)
<b>Ecology</b>			
18	Habitat	The Council supports the approach Highways England has taken in utilising 'avoidance of impact' as the first principal of mitigation. The ES makes reference to overall net gain in habitat creation which is supported if this is permanent rather than temporary.	Written Representation (para 71)
19	Pre-construction surveying of habitats	<p><b>The Council is concerned that there is no requirement to ensure that adequate pre-construction surveying of habitats is undertaken to establish whether important ecological species are present on directly affected land or nearby land which could be indirectly impacted.</b></p> <p><b>Schedule 2 Requirement 4 (Protected Species) and the requirements in the Code of Construction Practice for pre-construction surveys require that such pre-construction survey work is undertaken. A full assessment of all potential impacts on ecology has been undertaken within Environmental Statement Chapter 11 (Nature Conservation) and this has informed the pre-construction survey work that will be undertaken in accordance with the draft Development Consent Order.</b></p> <p><b>The Council agrees with the requirement (moved to matters agreed 07/08/2015).</b></p>	<p><b>Written Representation (para 124)</b></p> <p><b>Highways England Response HE/A14/EX/49 (para 6.4.22, REP4-011)</b></p>
<b>Noise and vibration</b>			
20	Baseline	The Council recognises and supports that many properties along the existing A14 will experience a significant improvement in noise, particularly on the mainline route where it is detrunked near Huntingdon. (However, the Council has some concerns	Draft Written Representation (paras 73 & 74)

Ref	Description	Matters Agreed	Record of agreement
		about the assessment undertaken – see Ref 5, matters under discussion).	
21	Mitigation measures along the Cambridge Northern Bypass.	<p>The Council accepts that Highways England need to demonstrate the scheme will mitigate noise impacts.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire local plan seeks environmental noise attenuation in the form of landscaped earth mounds / bunds rather than noise barrier fencing, recognising the impacts on the Green Belt setting of the historic city of Cambridge.</p> <p>Highways England have committed to working with the developers through the detailed design and delivery (Ref 10, matters agreed).</p>	<p>Pre-application consultation response</p> <p>Meeting 14th May 2015</p> <p>Written Representation (para 43)</p>
22	Construction impact	<p>The Council agrees that it is likely that any construction effects should be mitigated effectively by the implementation of a robust Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and proposed local environmental action plans (LEMPs).</p> <p><b>The Council also raised concerns that the noise section of the draft CoCP was unacceptable, that the significance of impact noise and vibration noise levels used in the CoCP for Borrow pits was not adequate. As some of the borrow pits are large and located close to rural villages a greater level of control is justified.</b></p> <p><b>Highways England has clarified to the Council the status of the submitted Code of Construction Practice and National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance on mineral operations and noise standards.</b></p> <p><b>The Council have reviewed a Borrow Pit Technical Assessment note (Ref D01-SP) and are now satisfied that the mitigation approach proposed is acceptable for both borrow pit related activities and actual road construction works.</b></p> <p><b>The Council and Highways England also agree that the borrow pits are an intrinsic part of the DCO and would fall under the definition of construction type works under the Control of</b></p>	<p>Written Representation (paras 81 – 84 and 130 - 131)</p> <p><b>Meeting on 22 July 2015.</b></p> <p><b>Borrow Pit Technical Assessment note (ARUP - 13 July 2015, Job No/Ref D01-SP).</b></p> <p><b>Comments on revised draft DCO (Rev 1) (Rep5-016)</b></p>

Ref	Description	Matters Agreed	Record of agreement
		<p><b>Pollution Act 1974. The CoCP is in accordance with national and industry best practice. It commits the contractor to seek formal prior consent for its construction working methods and the use of best practicable means steps to minimise noise from the works from the local authority under s.61 of Control of Pollution Act 1974.</b></p> <p><b>These consents would secure mitigation (such as the increased boundary screening) and best practical control measures to minimise noise and vibration as far as it would be reasonably practicable to do so.</b></p> <p><b>However, it remains the Council’s view that a requirement is imposed to ensure that no development shall commence until the Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMPs) and Local Environmental Management Plans (LEMPs) as referred to in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) have been prepared in consultation with the relevant planning authority, and submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State. (see Ref 12 matters under discussion)</b></p> <p><b>The CEMPs and LEMPs can only be provided, once detailed construction programmes are finalised when more detail is available including construction timetables, methods and activities.</b></p> <p><b>The Council’s local knowledge and input is required to ensure local receptors are adequately considered and protected.</b></p>	
23	Quality of life and Environmental Statement - noise	<p><b>The Council queried that for the previous Environmental Statement for the proposed scheme operational noise was modelled to heights of 1.5m and at 4m, depending on receptor floor level (4m representative of 1<sup>st</sup> floor and above).</b></p> <p><b>This is particularly relevant for Orchard Park where many of the properties are apartments with 3 or 4 floor levels. For</b></p>	Meeting on 22 July 2015.

Ref	Description	Matters Agreed	Record of agreement
		<p>the DCO scheme the ES Figures, Volume 6.0 – 6.2, Ch14 Figs 14.4 to 14.7 Operational Noise Contour Maps are detailed for Free-Field noise levels at 1.5m above ground level. The Council was concerned that this would not adequately reflect impacts at first floor level and above and in particular at night, as noise barriers or similar would not be as effective at these heights.</p> <p>It is not clear from the ES at what heights noise levels are predicted /calculated.</p> <p>Highways England has confirmed that the ES Noise Contour Map Figures 14.4 to 14.7 have been modelled for Free-Field noise levels at 1.5m above ground level to represent noise outside. The actual Operational, noise assessments for the base and mitigated schemes (Appendix 14.5 and 14.6) and impacts / effects were calculated at 4m above ground at the assessment locations. For the receptor impacts what is relevant is the typical worst-case scenario, so an assumed 1<sup>st</sup> floor bedroom window height of 4m has been undertaken and reported, where screening is likely to be less than at lower level.</p> <p>The Council agree this is a robust and acceptable approach.</p>	
<b>Air quality</b>			
24	Air quality monitoring	<p>The Council supports the proposals to undertake post implementation monitoring.</p> <p>The Council requests confirmation that the post implementation air quality monitoring strategy will be agreed with officers following consultation.</p>	Written Representation (paras 92 - 94)
25	Impington monitoring station relocation	<p>The Council agrees and support the relocation of Impington monitoring station. The Council seeks reimbursement for reasonable costs associated with the move.</p> <p>Highways England has confirmed it is agreeable to cover the reasonable cost associated with the move of the Impington monitor.</p>	<p>Written Representation (para 95)</p> <p>Highways England Response HE/A14/EX/49 (para 6.4.15, REP4-011)</p>

Ref	Description	Matters Agreed	Record of agreement
<b>Flooding and drainage</b>			
26	Road drainage	The Council supports that a self-cleansing V-type roadside / central reservation drainage channels (similar to that along the A428) are provided along the scheme.	Pre-application consultation response
27	Detailed design	The Council requests consultation during the detailed design period to refine a number of measures including the 5m maintenance strip.	Written Representation (para 96)
28	Flooding	The Council acknowledges that flood mitigation measures appropriately address the impacts of the scheme. (However, opportunities to reduce existing flood risk have not been taken - see Ref 9, matters under discussion).	Written Representation (paras 98 & 99)
29	Access track	A balancing pond is proposed to the east of the Histon junction with an access track which links to the Mere Way. Highways England has assured the Council (subject to seeing the detailed design) this access will be gated to ensure no public access.	Written Representation (para 102)
30	Maintenance access strip	<p><b>The Council is concerned that a 5m maintenance strip should be retained along award drains, and appropriate access is provided. The Council's land drainage byelaws require a 5 metre maintenance access strip along all the award drains so that mechanised maintenance works may be undertaken. The Council notes at paragraph 3.9.5 of the ES that there appears to be provision for maintenance access for drains. The Council seek confirmation and further access detail. The Council request consultation at detailed design as this matter will require Council approval.</b></p> <p><b>Highways England has confirmed that maintenance access will be provided in accordance with the regulations applied by each maintaining organisation and will consult with the various parties at the detailed design stage.</b></p> <p><b>A maintenance access strip would be provided along one bank of any watercourse affected by the works. The width of access strip would vary</b></p>	<p><b>Written Representation (para 96)</b></p> <p><b>Highways England Response HE/A14/EX/49 (paras 6.8.8 – 6.8.9, REP4-011)</b></p>

Ref	Description	Matters Agreed	Record of agreement
		<p>according to watercourse classification and the regulations applied by each maintaining organisation. Consequently, watercourses designated as main river would have a 9m access strip, ordinary watercourse would have a 5m access strip and IDB/Award drains would have an access strip varying between 5m and 9m dependent on the byelaws of the maintaining Authority.</p> <p>The Council agrees with Highways England response (moved to matters agreed 07/08/2015).</p>	
31	Culvert	<p>The Council is concerned that any culvert (that runs under the A14) should not be altered in diameter. The Council supports retention of the culvert in Oakington as the downstream watercourse is unable to take increased flow.</p> <p>The Council would like confirmation that there are no additional connections that would add to the flow into the Covell's drain watercourse near Fen Drayton.</p> <p>Highways England has confirmed (HE/A14/EX/49) the existing culverts on the Oakington and Longstanton Brooks will be extended to accommodate the widening of the A14. The existing element of these culverts will not be altered. Adequate attenuation will be provided throughout the scheme to ensure flows to watercourses from highway drainage will not increase.</p>	<p>Written Representation (paras 100 &amp; 101)</p> <p>Highways England Response HE/A14/EX/49 (paras 6.8.2 - 6.8.6, REP4-011)</p>
<b>Materials/Minerals and Waste</b>			
32	Borrow pits	The Council supports the inclusion of borrow pits within the scheme and accepts that these broadly align with the Cambridgeshire minerals and waste plan.	Written Representation (para 104)
33	Reuse of materials	The Council notes and supports the commitment from Highways England (ES paragraph 13.5.6) to reuse suitable materials from development sites, including Northstowe, wherever possible.	Written Representation (para 105)
34	Restoration of borrow pits	The Council welcomes the proposals to restore borrow pit areas 5 and 6.	Written Representation



Ref	Description	Matters Agreed	Record of agreement
		<p>The Council requested further information to ensure that restoration will contribute to agriculture, amenity and the landscape legacy. Conditions will be requested by the Council to cover detailed restoration proposals within the borrow pit areas.</p> <p>Highways England response: It is proposed that top soil and sub-soil will be stripped and stored from these specific sites in accordance with best practice to ensure that restoration of the sites as much as practicable to productive agricultural use is successful. The slopes and drainage on the sites will be designed to ensure that the proposed after use to agricultural land is achievable. These are all matters that will be addressed further as part of the detailed design phase after the development consent order (if the application is granted) is made when the detailed configuration and phasing of excavation works at the borrow pit sites will be finalised.</p> <p>However, the Council still has concerns that the restoration of the borrow pit must contribute to the landscape legacy, including provision of a minimum of 15 years management programme. (See Ref 11 matters under discussion and Ref 1 matters not agreed).</p> <p>Highways England response: Highways England will restore the borrow pit sites to a standard comparable to that which would be expected for a commercial mineral operation. Highways England proposes to extend the aftercare arrangements for borrow pit sites from 5 to 10 years. An aftercare management strategy for each borrow pit will be prepared during the examination period. The partner authorities will be consulted on the content of the aftercare strategies as they are developed. The restoration and aftercare of the borrow pits would be secured by a requirement in Schedule 2 to the DCO.</p>	<p>(paras 108 - 110)</p> <p>Highways England Response HE/A14/EX/49 (paras 6.9.6 – 6.9.8, REP4-011)</p>



Ref	Description	Matters Agreed	Record of agreement
35	Operation of borrow pits	<p>The Council had concerns that borrow pits will have associated environmental impacts during their operation which need to be carefully assessed and mitigated. The assessment undertaken by Highways England did not adequately address noise and amenity impacts.</p> <p>Highways England's Borrow Pit Technical Paper (ARUP - 13 July 2015, Job No/Ref D01-SP) addresses the Council's concerns about noise and vibration from the operation of borrow pit 5 and 6 and the mitigation thereof.</p>	<p>Written Representation (para 107)</p> <p>Meeting on 22 July 2015.</p> <p>Borrow Pit Technical Assessment Note (ARUP - 13 July 2015, Job No/Ref D01-SP)</p>
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>			
36	ES Chapter 18	<p>There are a number of inconsistencies within ES Chapter 18 – not all planned development sites along the route are addressed, despite the acknowledgement in other parts of the ES. These include Darwin Green 2 and Cambridge Northern Fringe East.</p> <p>Errors are also present in Fig 2.2 (sheets 5 &amp; 6 of 7) which incorrectly show a number of existing and planned development sites in the green belt. Highways England has noted on page 36 of the Errata Report (HE/A14/EX/10 <i>Development Consent Order Application Errata Report, Revision 0, May 2015</i>) that there were errors in relation to the representation on Figure 2.2. The error was the result of an out-dated Geographical Information System (GIS) layer being used but it is not considered to make a material difference to the assessment.</p> <p>Highways England has reassured the Council that the errors are presentational rather than matters of substance. The Council agrees with Highways England response (moved to matters agreed 07/08/2015).</p>	<p>Draft Written Representation (paras 114 &amp; 115)</p> <p>Highways England Response HE/A14/EX/49 (paras 6.2.1 – 6.2.12, REP4-011) and Errata report (page 36, APP-773)</p>
<b>Legacy</b>			
37	Detail	<p>The Council has concerns about the apparent lack of detail in relation to legacy of the scheme, particularly in terms of long term ownership,</p>	<p>Written Representation (paras 116 &amp; 117)</p>

Ref	Description	Matters Agreed	Record of agreement
		<p><b>maintenance and replacement of infrastructure.</b></p> <p><b>The Council continues to work with Highways England to address and secure scheme legacy. This includes setting up a Legacy Partnership between Highways England, the local authorities, Local Enterprise Partnership and delivery partners. The partners are considering signing up to a Legacy Charter and form an A14 Strategic Stakeholder Board to deliver a shared vision. This arrangement will seek to address the Council's concerns (moved to matters agreed 07/08/2015).</b></p>	
<b>Traffic assessment</b>			
38	Modelling	<p>The Council is taking advice from Cambridgeshire County Council, as the local highway authority, on traffic modelling issues. The Council agrees that the traffic model takes into consideration planned development within adopted and emerging development plans.</p> <p>The Council may have further comment when additional work is completed.</p>	Written Representation (paras 112 & 113)
<b>Open space</b>			
39	Existing open spaces (Examining Authority)	<p>The land in question (SoR paras 11.11 to 11.17) is part of the Menzies Hotel Golf Course at Bar Hill.</p> <p>The Council agrees this land meets Section 131(5) of the Planning Act (2008) as it is required partly for the widening and partly for the drainage of the highway.</p>	

## 5.2 Matters not agreed

Ref	Description	Matters not agreed	Record of discussion
<b>Ecology</b>			
1	Ecology and landscape mitigation/after care of borrow pits	<p>The Council has concerns over permanence of some of the landscaping, including general landscaping and mitigation areas. General landscaping requires at least <b>ten years</b> to fully establish itself. Temporary borrow pits require a longer term management beyond five years. The Council considers this should be over a period of <b>fifteen years</b> to enable habitats and species to establish. This is the standard applied by the District Council on planning applications.</p> <p>Highways England 05/06/2015: The aftercare period for the borrow pits for the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme shall be <b>ten years</b> and not five years, as previously detailed in the DCO application documentation.</p>	<p>Written Representation (paras 72, 111 and 123)</p> <p>1.2.8 in <i>Report 2: Biodiversity and Ecological Conservation</i> (document reference HE/A14/EX/29)</p>
<b>Air Quality</b>			
2	Baseline for future monitoring	<p><b>The Council considers it important to undertake post scheme monitoring of air quality to validate the predictions in the Environmental Statement. To this end, the Council request that an appropriate baseline for future air quality monitoring of PM<sub>10</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> pollutants at Impington is agreed with Highways England.</b></p> <p><b>Highways England does not propose to undertake monitoring during the operational phase as there are no predicted exceedances of air quality objectives or limit values or any significant effects identified across the scheme, as stated in Chapter 8: Air Quality of the ES.</b></p>	<p><b>Written Representation (para 94)</b></p> <p><b>Highways England Response HE/A14/EX/49 (para 6.4.14, REP4-011)</b></p>

## 6 Record of areas still under discussion

Ref	Description	Matters under discussion	Record of discussion
<b>Non-motorised users</b>			
1	Separation for NMU	<p>The Council is concerned that proposed separation between NMU and the carriageway alongside the local access road is not adequate. The Council propose a hedge to aid separation, <b>improve visual appearance and the user experience. It should be possible to provide a hedge of suitable species that would not grow too large and/or transparent style leaving some gaps, to achieve a balance between user safety and user experience.</b></p> <p><b>Highways England response: The running carriageway of the local access road would be separated from the non-motorised user track by a 1 metre wide hard strip and a 0.8 metre wide grassed strip, in accordance with current Highways England design standards. At the rear of the non-motorised user track would be a 2 metre wide verge which equestrians can use.</b></p> <p><b>It is not planned to provide a hedge between the local access road traffic and the non-motorised user track because the height required to provide effective screening for cyclists and equestrians from vehicles could isolate users, with detrimental effect on personal safety, particularly for pedestrians. It would also create a significant maintenance burden. However, at the detailed design stage after the development consent order (if the application is granted) is made, solar-powered road studs, which have been suggested by Cambridgeshire County Council, would be considered in unlit areas of the NMU route adjacent to the local access road, to provide guidance for users, particularly cyclists.</b></p> <p><b>A visibility screen would be provided between the main carriageway of A14 and the local access road.</b></p> <p><b>As the Local Access Road and NMU route will be adopted by Cambridgeshire County Council. Highways England will consult</b></p>	<p>Written Representation (para 52)</p> <p><b>Highways England Response HE/A14/EX/49 (paras 6.3.6 – 6.3.8, REP4-011)</b></p>

Ref	Description	Matters under discussion	Record of discussion
		<p>with them at the detailed design stage, taking into consideration the maintainability and safety. The Council would like to opportunity to be involved in such discussions.</p>	
<b>Landscape</b>			
2	Histon junction to Milton junction	<p>The Council would like to see further landscape treatments proposed including planting to the retaining wall adjacent to Orchard park. <b>The original planting along the A14 at Orchard Park failed and was never replaced. The Council considers that trees and shrubs should be provided wherever space permits along the base of the structure and at the top, behind the noise barrier.</b></p> <p><b>Highways England response: In this section of the scheme the extent of the environmental mitigation on the south side has been proposed in light of the balance between limiting the land take required for the scheme and mitigating the scheme's environmental impacts. Nevertheless, it has been possible through the scheme design to retain existing vegetation in the eastern section up to Milton junction and to accommodate new planting in the western section up to the Histon junction. New mitigation planting would also be provided on the north side of the road although the land available here is also locally constrained. The layout of the mitigation is shown in Sheets 23 and 24 of Figure 3.2 of the ES.</b></p>	<p>Written Representation (para 49)</p> <p><b>Highways England Response HE/A14/EX/49 (paras 6.5.4 – 6.5.9)</b></p>
<b>Cultural heritage</b>			
3	Lolworth Church	<p>The approach to Lolworth and All Saints Church (Grade II* Listed) will be significantly changed. A landscape mitigation scheme will be required to reduce the adverse impacts on the Church and its setting. Landscape proposals should consider the existing views to and from Lolworth and the 'parkland' landscape to the east of the village.</p>	<p>Written Representation (paras 63 - 69)</p>
<b>Noise and vibration</b>			

Ref	Description	Matters under discussion	Record of discussion
4	Orchard Park	<p>The Council is seeking clarification if the existing noise barrier at Orchard Park will be improved or replaced <b>having regard to final impact assessments</b>. The DCO submission shows it will be retained (Figure 14.7) however the draft scheme (2014) showed (Sheet 22) that the noise barrier would be replaced. <b>Highways England state that it is likely that the barrier is to be retained as existing and will not be dismantled and re-erected as previously suggested.</b></p> <p><b>However this will not be finalised until the requirements outlined within Highways Agency DMRB INTERIM ADVICE NOTE 185/15- January 2015 “Updated traffic, air quality and noise advice” assessment has been undertaken and reported for the Cambridge Northern Bypass and the Histon and Girton junctions, in the vicinity of the Orchard Park noise barrier.</b></p>	<p>Written Representation (paras 86 &amp; 87)</p> <p><b>Await the results of the IAN 185/15 assessment.</b></p> <p><b>Meeting on 22 July 2015.</b></p> <p><b>Highways England response to ExA First Written Questions: Report 10 Noise and Vibration (HE-A14-EX-37).</b></p>
5	Assessment	<p>The Council is seeking clarification about the noise assessment undertaken by the applicant to understand whether it complies with the DMRB reporting guidance for night-time noise.</p> <p><b>Highways England have clarified that this query does not relate to the night noise assessment methodology and approach. It relates to summary night time reporting requirements. It is agreed with the Council that concern does not relate to the night noise assessment methodology and approach.</b></p> <p><b>The Council is seeking additional information about the night noise assessment. It is confirmed that the information requested will be provided.</b></p>	<p>Meetings on May 14<sup>th</sup> 2015 and 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2015.</p>
6	Mitigation	<p>The Council notes that the location and replacement of proposed noise barriers is indicative. The detailed design, location, length, height, acoustic performance specifications will require consultation with the Council as per the requirements of the DCO.</p> <p><b>This is reflected in Council comments and suggested amendments to draft Highways England requirement for details of proposed noise mitigation in respect of</b></p>	<p>Written Representation (paras 78 - 80)</p> <p>Comments on revised draft DCO (Rev 1) (Rep5-016)</p>

Ref	Description	Matters under discussion	Record of discussion
		<p><b>the use and operation to be approved.</b> (Note: the Council also has concerns about the noise barrier at Orchard Park – see Ref 4, matters under discussion).</p> <p><b>There are also ongoing discussions between the Council and Highways England on various potential mitigation measures and effectiveness. The outcome will be reported when concluded (by the end of the examination process).</b></p>	
7	Noise monitoring	The Council recommends appropriate monitoring of noise and vibration is undertaken post implementation of the scheme. This is necessary and standard practice to ensure that the modelled noise levels are achieved and ensure that there are no unexpected and unacceptable adverse impacts which require further mitigation consideration.	<p>Written Representation (para 85)</p> <p><b>Highways England Response HE/A14/EX/49 (paras 6.6.6 – 6.6.12, REP4-011)</b></p>
8	Construction impacts on Blackwells traveller site	<p><b>The Council requests clarification to provide a construction noise and vibration impact and likely significant effect assessment for Blackwells traveller site (location is 10008 - diagonally opposite Orchard Park) and the nature of properties there i.e. caravans and mobile homes.</b></p> <p><b>SCDC propose a requirement for a Non-statutory Construction Noise Impacts / Effects Off-site Mitigation and Compensation Policy for approximately 400 affected properties in Orchard Park in addition to Blackwell site who are likely to be similarly affected e.g. significant adverse impact requiring noise insulation scheme.</b></p> <p><b>Highways England: discussions ongoing.</b></p>	<p><b>SoCG meeting 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2015</b></p> <p><b>SCDC email 11<sup>th</sup> August 2015</b></p>
<b>Flooding and drainage</b>			
9	Flooding legacy	<p>The Council requests additional measures to <b>provide betterment to existing flooding issues in settlements along the A14 (e.g. Girton, Bar Hill, Histon and Impington)</b> as a contribution to positive legacy of the scheme.</p> <p><b>Highways England response: The National Planning Policy Framework and National Policy Statement on National Networks do not require the scheme to</b></p>	<p>Written Representation (para 99)</p> <p><b>Highways England Response HE/A14/EX/49 (paras 6.8.1)</b></p>



Ref	Description	Matters under discussion	Record of discussion
		<p>mitigate pre-existing flooding issues. Mitigation is included 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 NPS).</p>	
<b>Materials/Minerals and Waste</b>			
10	Importing materials	<p>The Applicant should investigate the potential use of the Chesterton rail sidings on the northern edge of Cambridge to supply aggregate that cannot be sourced locally, including the possibility of providing a temporary access directly to the A14. At the same time, however, consideration needs to be given to local amenity impacts, including any implications of night-time operation.</p> <p><b>Highways England: Due consideration has been given to the use of Chesterton rail sidings during the construction phase of the scheme. Chesterton rail sidings would provide a potential opportunity for sourcing concrete, asphalt and dry aggregates from the sidings which could be used by the contractor for the construction of the A14 scheme. A temporary access to the sidings may prove to be beneficial to gain direct access to and from the A14.</b></p> <p><b>Of the seven sidings in total at Chesterton, only two are currently in service. The main freight operator – ‘Lafarge’ has concrete and asphalt batching plants adjacent to the premises. The rail sidings and surrounding area are due for re-development; a new commuter station is to be constructed along with access arrangements that could impact the viability of using the sidings.</b></p> <p><b>It is assumed that Lafarge would remain in their current location and keep their sidings operational throughout construction and thereafter. The quantities of material Lafarge are capable of supplying for the construction of A14</b></p>	Written Representation (para 106)



Ref	Description	Matters under discussion	Record of discussion
		<p>scheme have already been analysed and compared against the demands of the project.</p> <p>Further consultation with Network Rail would be undertaken to determine whether identified vacant land capacity at Chesterton rail head could be utilised by the contractor for additional freight material sourcing in order to increase the supply of construction material from the rail sidings, which would bring efficiencies to the construction programme.</p> <p>Any use of this site would be subject to local authority consent and conditions, which would be obtained at detailed design stage, after the making of the Development Consent Order.</p>	
<b>Requirements / Processes</b>			
11	Requirements	<p>The Council is concerned about the way the Part 1 Requirements are drafted. The requirements, as drafted, are not sufficiently detailed.</p> <p>Landscaping – aftercare and management strategy needed as well as longer aftercare.</p> <p>Borrow Pits – detailed plans needed for each borrow pit and longer aftercare.</p>	<p>Written Representation (paras 118 - 124)</p> <p><b>Comments on revised draft DCO (Rev 1) (Rep5-016)</b></p>
12	Processes	<p>Detailed design – The Council has concerns about the procedure for agreeing such matters which relate to the detailed design of the scheme, but which are not covered within the scope of the DCO documentation.</p> <p>Code of Construction Practice &amp; Local Environmental Management Plans – the Council would like to be consulted on their content.</p> <p>Common law nuisance and statutory nuisance – must be considered and duly addressed.</p> <p>Contaminated land and groundwater – ensure robust mechanisms in place for dealing with any contaminated land and groundwater discovered during construction, including submission of a Risk Assessment.</p>	<p>Written Representation (paras 125 - 138)</p> <p><b>Comments on revised draft DCO (Rev 1) (Rep5-016)</b></p>

## 7 Agreement of this SoCG

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

**Name:**

---

**Signature:**

---

**Position:**

---

**On behalf of:**

Highways England

---

**Date:**

---

**Name:**

---

**Signature:**

---

**Position:**

---

**On behalf of:**

South Cambridgeshire District Council

---

**Date:**

---