Section / Paragraph	Change	Reason
Summary table 2.5.1	Remove text: Landscape ~~Lack of 10 year aftercare programme and additional rights of way at Borrow Pits means that the potential for new and publicly accessible resources for nature conservation and passive recreation are being ignored – to the detriment of the local community.~~	Highways England has produced revised proposals for a 10 year aftercare strategy for borrow pit sites.
Summary table 2.5.1	Remove text: Ecology ~~During construction~~ ~~Insufficient evidence to demonstrate no adverse hydrological impact at Fenstanton Lakes County Wildlife Site (CWS) as a result of proposed works associated with BP3.~~	CCC Responses to the Ex.A 2nd Round of written questions: The County Council notes in paragraphs 4.11.1 to 4.11.6 of REP4-011 that Highways England have obtained more information on groundwater and will consider the matter of de-watering in detailed design (see also paragraphs 4.12.4 to 4.12.7 of REP4-011). The County Council is content with this response.
Summary table 2.5.1	Remove text: Ecology ~~Inadequate assessment of impact on Fenstanton Gravel Pits County Wildlife Site (CWS).~~	As above.
Summary table 2.5.1	Remove text: ~~*During construction*~~ ~~Concern over assessment of hydrological impacts on Brampton Wood SSSI from BP1 and Fenstanton Gravel Pits CWS from BP3.~~	As above.
Summary table 2.5.1	Remove text: ~~*During construction*~~ ~~Concern over possible noise impacts at Borrow Pits due to fact noise impacts assessed using criteria appropriate for road construction and not for mineral extraction. Further consideration is requested in relation to these operations to ensure that noise impacts will be appropriately mitigated in relation to the borrow pits.~~	CCC Responses to the Ex.A 2nd Round of written questions: Highways England has provided papers on the matter of noise assessment from the borrow pits that demonstrate equivalence of noise calculations to the NPPF and

		the Code of Construction Practice, and where there are differences these will be mitigated. The County Council is therefore satisfied that the Code of Construction Practice provides for adequate control measures.
Traffic Chapter 8	Inserted chapter on Local Traffic Impacts	CCC commissioned consultants to examine the traffic impacts on the local roads. This section was omitted from the last version of the LIR and has been inserted for version 2 Deadline 8.
Cultural Heritage / 9.2.6	Add text: **The compaction and distortion of archaeological deposits do not only occur in alluvium or peat, as has been recently evidenced at the excavations for Astra Zeneca's headquarters building at the Addenbrookes Bio-Medical campus, where funerary urns and burial remains were shattered and distorted, having lain beneath the former hospital car parks and then beneath spoil mounds. If the applicant's intention is to properly mitigate these areas through a programme of archaeological work, this will be acceptable, but this is not currently present or clear in the mitigation strategy.**	CCC has requested more detail on the possible impact and necessity of appropriate mitigation strategy.
Cultural Heritage / 9.2.15	Amend text - "The construction impacts of the six borrow pits will be major upon buried archaeological remains, requiring a robust approach to the archaeological investigation of these large landscape areas. However, we are not yet able to agree to the mitigation strategy as it does not include all borrow pit areas (borrow pit 5 is omitted from the WSI) nor how they would be specifically examined, or what the research objectives of examination would be. Consequently, the WSI is not in compliance with policy CS36. **Assurances need to be provided that the borrow pits will be appropriately examined through prior evaluation in order to design the proportionate mitigation strategies needed at these sites.**	Archaeology Written Statement of Investigation (WSI) and Environmental Statement (ES) must present well-specified identified mitigation strategies for these large excavation areas.
Ecology / 9.3.7	Remove text: "there will be a total habitat loss of 1,030ha during construction of which 87% will be arable habitat. Arable land is considered to be of relatively low ecological value and is abundant widespread in the local area, thus the loss will not be considered significant. In addition there will be a loss of 20.1km of linear habitat including species	Clearer statement.

	poor hedges and wet and dry ditches." Add text: **"Although there would be semi natural habitat losses of 133.9ha in the short term associated with site clearance and construction, there would be a net gain in the long term of 271ha of semi natural habitats created as a result of the scheme by the creation of 404.9ha of habitat. These would be better connected than the existing habitats for movement of wildlife through the landscape. Highways England agrees that this loss of arable land (which has no significant ecological value) is not significant."**	
Ecology / 9.3.8	Remove text: ~~The following habitat losses would occur during construction:~~ ~~• broadleaved woodland semi-natural 5.3ha;~~ ~~• broadleaved woodland plantation 18ha;~~ ~~• trees <1ha;~~ ~~• hedge (intact including with trees) 7.8km;~~ ~~• running water <1ha;~~ ~~• standing water 3.9ha;~~ ~~• wet ditches 3.6km; and~~ ~~• swamp and marginal and inundation 0.3ha.~~ Add text: "**Following the completion of the proposal and the implementation of the scheme of restoration there would be a net loss of the following specific woodland habitats:** **• broadleaved woodland semi-natural -4.1ha;** **• broadleaved woodland plantation -13.3ha;** **• trees - 0.1ha;** **The total amount of net gain of mixed woodland would be 83.1ha – therefore there is an overall gain in all woodland types across the scheme following completion and restoration of 65.6ha.** **Following the completion of the proposal and the implementation of the scheme of restoration there would be a net loss of these specific habitats within the scheme (excluding the borrow pits) :** **• species rich hedge 27.9km;** **• running water - 0.2ha;** **• standing water - 1.5ha;** **The total amount of new open water habitat provided as compensation through the**	Correct figures.

	extensive creation of open water habitats in the borrow pits is as follows: **• wet ditches 4.51km; and** **• swamp and marginal and inundation 0.11ha."**	
Ecology / 9.3.11	Add text*:* **"Highways England have stated that habitats within the CWS will be surveyed and quality identified to inform plans for restoration of the area".**	Further information from Highways England.
Ecology / 9.3.11	Add text: **"The County Council remains concerned with the pre-application assessment work at Buckden Gravel Pits. However, at 4.3.19 of REP4-011 Highways England has agreed to rectify the deficiency by carrying out detailed surveys during detailed design. The County Council is therefore content that the deficiency has been recognised by Highways England and the impact will be assessed and mitigated."**	CCC Responses to the Ex.A 2nd Round of written questions.
Ecology / 9.3.12	Remove text~~: Insufficient assessment of impact on Fenstanton Lakes County Wildlife Site Insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that there will be no adverse hydrological impact on Fenstanton Lakes County Wildlife Site (CWS) as a result of the proposed works associated with Borrow Pit 3. Therefore, we conclude that the scheme has the potential to result in an adverse impact on this County Wildlife Site~~.	CCC Responses to the Ex.A 2nd Round of written questions: The County Council notes in paragraphs 4.11.1 to 4.11.6 of REP4-011 that Highways England has obtained more information on groundwater and will consider the matter of de-watering in detailed design (see also paragraphs 4.12.4 to 4.12.7 of REP4-011). The County Council is content with this response.
Ecology / 9.3.14	Add text**: "Effects on bat roosts are subject to licensing from Natural England (NE). Draft mitigation licence applications are currently being considered by NE. No licence would be issued unless it was demonstrated there would be no adverse effect on the conservation status of bats.** **The register of environmental actions and commitments includes a commitment to enhance the corridor between Brampton Woods and the scheme to provide better habitat for a range of species including bats and dormice."**	Further information from Highways England.
Ecology / 9.3.16	Remove text:. ~~"Whilst the restoration of borrow pits has the potential to provide positive benefits in terms of habitat creation, there is no commitment to their long-term management".~~ Remove text: ~~The proposed 5 year management of the borrow pits is considered~~	Further information from Highways England. Highways England has confirmed that the revised proposals include a 10 year aftercare strategy for borrow pit sites

	~~inadequate to achieve any long-term net gain in biodiversity. This is a wasted opportunity and significantly diminished the ability of the scheme to achieve any long-term biodiversity gain.~~	
Noise / 9.4.11	Amend text: **"At Cambridge City Crematorium a noise barrier will be introduced to screen noise from the A14"** ~~the grounds will be screened from the A14 by a noise barrier and a minor beneficial impact has been identified based upon the change in the airborne noise level which is likely to result in a reduction in disruption to visitors".~~	Consistency.
Noise / 9.4.15	Remove text: "~~Residential dwellings within the Cambridge City boundary are forecast to experience minor to negligible impacts resulting from the proposed A14 scheme. However, the specifics are not known.~~" Add text **"All impacts from operational noise within the Cambridge City boundary are negligible and the specifics of the assessment are known and reported in Chapter 14 of the ES. As set out in Highways England Traffic Modelling Update Report (document reference HE-A14-EX-44)"**	Further information from Highways England.
Noise / 9.4.21	Remove text: Assessment of noise from borrow pits does not follow policy ~~There is concern that the CoCP significance of impact noise and vibration noise levels has been used to assess the impact of, and the control noise impact from, the Borrow Pits. Whilst the extraction of material from borrow pits is indirectly related to construction of the scheme they are effectively a separate minerals and waste activity for which Planning Policy Guidance operational noise limits are lower than for traditional construction noise. As some of the Borrow Pits are large and close to rural villages where A14 traffic noise is less of an impact the construction impact approach taken in the CoCP should not be applicable to such pits and greater control is required.~~	CCC Responses to the Ex.A 2nd Round of written questions: Highways England has provided papers on the matter of noise assessment from the borrow pits that demonstrate equivalence of noise calculations to the NPPF and the Code of Construction Practice, and where there are differences these will be mitigated. The County Council is therefore satisfied that the Code of Construction Practice provides for adequate control measures.
Noise / 9.4.36	Remove text: ~~"The scheme includes a 3m absorptive barrier for properties at 1 -6 Catchall Farm, Crouchfield Villa and Westdene at Hackers Fruit Farm, Huntingdon Road, Lolworth. There will still be significant residual negative noise impacts at these locations. The residual noise levels would be a reduction on existing noise levels at this location close to~~	Points of clarification.

	~~the A14, however the noise levels would remain a significant observed adverse effect at these locations."~~ Add text: **The scheme includes a 3m absorptive barrier (reference M22) which would provide major beneficial noise reductions at Crouchfield Villa and Westdene at Hackers Fruit Farm (Important Area 5139). There will still be significant residual negative noise impacts at these locations. The residual noise levels would be a reduction on existing noise levels at this location close to the A14, however the noise levels would remain a significant observed adverse effect at these locations."** **The proposed 3m absorptive noise barrier (reference M23) would provide major (approx. -7dB) beneficial noise reductions at 1 to 6 Catchall Farm (Important Area 5138). With reference to Assessment Location 752 the residual noise levels would still be a significant observed adverse effect.** **The dwellings at Bar Hill and Dry Drayton with residual significant observed adverse effects (following major beneficial reductions in noise level) would not qualify for noise insulation under the Government's Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 as the regulations on apply where there is a noise increase resulting from the scheme.**	
Noise / 9.4.37	Add text: **The proposed 3m reflective barrier (reference M21), would provide major beneficial noise reductions at Rhadegund Cottages (Important Area 5140). With reference to Assessment Location 15936, the residual noise levels would still be a significant observed adverse effect.** **The dwellings at Bar Hill with residual significant observed adverse effects (following major beneficial reductions in noise level) would not qualify for noise insulation under the Government's Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 as the regulations on apply where there is a noise increase resulting from the scheme**.	Points of clarification.
Noise / 9.4.42	Remove text: ~~Residential dwellings within the Cambridge City boundary are forecast to experience minor to negligible impacts resulting from the proposed A14 scheme.~~ Add text: **Residential dwellings within the Cambridge City boundary are forecast to**	HE state that all impacts from operational noise within the Cambridge City boundary are negligible and the specifics of the assessment are known and reported

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>experience negligible noise impacts resulting from the proposed A14 scheme.</td><td>in Chapter 14 of the ES.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Noise</td><td>Amend table:

Table 20: Direct adverse effects from construction noise on residential Communities

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">Direct adverse effects from construction noise on residential Communities</td></tr>
<tr><td>Location</td><td>Construction activities</td><td>Duration</td></tr>
<tr><td>Approx. 10 dwellings at the south west corner of RAF Brampton base</td><td>Operation of borrow pits and soil storage compounds with monthly noise levels of approximately 67dB$L_{pAeq,12hr}$</td><td><s>42 months (day time)</s></td></tr>
</table>

The duration of the construction activities at this location should read <u>“4-6 months”</u></td><td>Highways England has identified an error in the Environmental Statement. The significant temporary construction noise effect at the dwellings on the south west corner of the RAF Brampton base should be for duration of 4 to 6 months, rather than 42 months. The source of the adverse effects is site establishment only which is for a period of approximately 4-6 months.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Noise / 9.4.43</td><td><u>Table 22: Residential areas where a significant observed adverse effect from noise, as a result of the Scheme, would be experienced post mitigation:</u>
<table>
<tr><td>Location</td><td>Effect with scheme</td><td>Mitigation</td><td>Residual effect</td></tr>
<tr><td><s>Dwellings in the vicinity of Great North Road, Manor Lane, Hillfield, Ash End, Beech End, Maple End, Willow End, School Lane, Sharps Lane, Rusts Lane, High Street, Field Close and Frumetty Lane in Alconbury</s></td><td><s>Indirect effect as a result of airborne noise increase in road traffic noise.</s></td><td><s>The scheme would significantly enhance the existing noise mitigation measures in this location, replacing the current noise fence barrier with a new taller fence barrier.</s></td><td><s>No likely significant negative effects</s></td></tr>
<tr><td>Stewart Close, western edge of Brampton (minor)</td><td>Predicted increase in noise from road traffic which is</td><td>no specific mitigation proposed</td><td>Minor adverse effect on the acoustic character</td></tr>
</table></td><td>Amend table to show only locations where a significant observed effect would be present post-mitigation.</td></tr>
</table>

			likely to cause a minor adverse effect		of the area around the closest properties.		
		Western edge of RAF Brampton (minor)	Predicted increase in noise from road traffic which is likely to cause a minor adverse effect	no specific mitigation proposed	Minor adverse effect on the acoustic character of the area around the closest properties.		
		~~Rectory Farm Great North Road, Brampton~~	~~predicted to experience noise levels higher than the noise insulation trigger levels~~	~~The installation of noise insulation would avoid the significant observed adverse effect that would otherwise occur inside these dwellings~~	~~Significant observed effect would be avoided~~		
		~~Little Meadow and Woodhatch Farm, Thrapston Road, Ellington~~	~~Noise levels are currently above the threshold for a significant observed adverse effect.~~	~~3m absorptive barrier for Little Meadows and Woodhatch Farm.~~	~~current significant observed adverse effects would be avoided with the scheme in operation.~~		
		Dwellings in the vicinity of Pear Tree Close, Fenstanton	Predicted increase in noise from road traffic which is likely to cause a moderate adverse effect	no specific mitigation proposed	noise levels would remain a significant observed adverse effect		
		~~Friesland Farm, Conington~~	~~significant observed adverse effects~~	~~The installation of noise insulation would avoid the significant observed adverse effect that would otherwise occur inside these dwellings~~	~~Significant observed effect would be avoided.~~		
		~~Foxhollow, Bar Hill~~	~~significant observed~~	~~The installation of noise insulation would avoid the~~	~~Significant observed effect~~		

			~~adverse effects~~	~~significant observed adverse effect that would otherwise occur inside these dwellings~~	~~would be avoided.~~	
		1-6 Catchall Farm Cottages 13, Cambridge	significant observed adverse effect	3m absorptive barrier for Catchall Farm properties	There would be noise reductions at these location, with the scheme, and further mitigation will be introduced.	
		Crouchfield Villa and Westdene at Hackers Fruit Farm, Huntingdon Road, Lolworth	significant observed adverse effect	3m absorptive barrier for Crouchfield Villa and Westdene – Hackers Fruit Farm, Huntingdon Road		
		Rhadegund Cottages, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge	significant observed adverse effect	3m reflective barrier for Rhadegund Cottages, Huntingdon Road		
		~~Hill Farm Cottages~~	~~significant observed adverse effect~~	~~4m reflective barrier for Hill Farm Cottages.~~	~~Significant observed effect would be avoided.~~	
		~~10 dwellings on Lone Tree Avenue~~	~~significant observed adverse effect~~	~~The installation of noise insulation would avoid the significant observed adverse effect that would otherwise occur inside these dwellings~~	~~Significant observed effect would be avoided.~~	
		~~30 residential dwellings at Blackwell Caravan Park~~	~~significant observed adverse effect~~	~~The installation of noise insulation would avoid the significant observed adverse effect that would otherwise occur inside these dwellings~~	~~Significant observed effect would be avoided.~~	
Noise / 9.4.44	Remove text: There will be residual negative noise impacts in the following residential locations: • Stewart Close, western edge of Brampton • Western edge of RAF Brampton • Dwellings in the vicinity of Pear Tree Close, Fenstanton • ~~1-6 Catchall Farm Cottages, Cambridge~~ • ~~Crouchfield Villa and Westdene at Hackers Fruit Farm, Huntingdon~~					The following receptors: • 1-6 Catchall Farm Cottages, Cambridge; • Crouchfield Villa and Westdene at Hackers Fruit Farm, Huntingdon Road, Lolworth; and • Rhadegund Cottages, Huntingdon

	~~Road, Lolworth~~ • ~~Rhadegund Cottages, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge~~	Road, Cambridge, are not reported as residual negative noise impacts in the ES. They fall within three Important Areas (under the 2014 Noise Action Plan for Roads). They are reported as experiencing impacts for the 'base scheme' considered in the noise assessment reported in the ES (Vol6.1, Chapter 14, section 14.4.62). The additional noise mitigation identified in ES (Vol6.1, Chapter 14, Table 14.21) includes noise barriers at these three locations and these barriers would provide material noise reductions compared to the base scheme and the current environment (as reported in ES Volume 6.1 Chapter 14).
Noise / 9.4.45	Amend text: "The impacts at Stewart Close on the western edge of Brampton and at the Western edge of RAF Brampton are identified as minor adverse. ~~No specific mitigation has been proposed by the Applicant in these areas~~. ~~The local authorities would expect the Applicant to monitor noise levels in these locations to ensure that should they become major adverse impacts the necessary mitigation is provided~~." Add text: **The Applicant's response to the ExA's Q1.10.8 (Response to ExA's First Written Questions, Report 10: Noise and Vibration (document reference EX/37)), confirms that Highways England will add an additional requirement to the draft DCO to secure permanent noise mitigation. The new requirement secures the details of the noise mitigation for the scheme, reflecting the measures set out in the Environmental Statement.**	Highways England response to the ExA's Q1.10.8 (Response to ExA's First Written Questions, Report 10: Noise and Vibration (document reference EX/37)), confirms that Highways England will add an additional requirement to the draft DCO to secure permanent noise mitigation. The new requirement secures the details of the noise mitigation for the scheme, reflecting the measures set out in the Environmental Statement.
Noise /	Amend text :	Highways England response to the

9.4.46	"There is a moderate adverse impact on Pear Tree Close, Fenstanton. ~~The Applicant has not proposed any specific mitigation in this area. The local authorities would expect the Applicant to monitor noise levels in this location to ensure that should they major adverse impacts the necessary mitigation is provided."~~ Add text: **The applicants response to the ExA's Q1.10.8 (Response to ExA's First Written Questions, Report 10: Noise and Vibration (document reference EX/37)), confirms that Highways England will add an additional requirement to the draft DCO to secure permanent noise mitigation. The new requirement secures the details of the noise mitigation for the scheme, reflecting the measures set out in the Environmental Statement.**	ExA's Q1.10.8 (Response to ExA's First Written Questions, Report 10: Noise and Vibration (document reference EX/37)), confirms that Highways England will add an additional requirement to the draft DCO to secure permanent noise mitigation. The new requirement secures the details of the noise mitigation for the scheme, reflecting the measures set out in the Environmental Statement.
Noise / 9.4.49	Amend text: In terms of non - residential receptors the assessment has identified a moderate adverse airborne noise impact at: • Cambridgeshire Constabulary HQ, Huntingdon (moderate) • ~~St Johns Innovation Centre and Science Park – (moderate)~~ • New Close Business Park, (moderate)	St Johns Innovation Centre and Science Park is not identified in in chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1) and it is not forecast to experience a moderate adverse airborne noise impact.
Air Quality / 9.5.4	Amend text: The areas affected by dust during the construction phase are likely to be areas near to the borrow pits and soil storage areas. ~~The residential areas of Brampton are in close proximity to borrow pit sites and further assessment of the dust impacts will be required to ensure that the mitigation proposed in the Applicant's Code of Construction Practice[1] are appropriate in reducing the negative impact on this areas.~~ Add text: **Highways England's Response to ExA's Written Questions, Report 1: Air Quality**	Highways England's Response to ExA's Written Questions, Report 1: Air Quality and Carbon Emissions, question 1.1.4 (document reference EX-28) sets out how the contractor employed to carry out work on the borrow pits would be required to follow measures set out in the Code of Construction Practice (appendix 20.2 of the Environmental Statement, document reference

[1] Code of Construction Practice, Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme, DCO Submission, Highways Agency (2014)

	and Carbon Emissions, question 1.1.4 (document reference EX-28) sets out how the contractor employed to carry out work on the borrow pits would be required to follow measures set out in the Code of Construction Practice (appendix 20.2 of the Environmental Statement, document reference 6.3). Measures used to mitigate dust impacts will reduce effects to negligible levels. **Further consideration of potential dust impacts will be undertaken by the Applicant at detailed design stage, after the development consent order (assuming the application is granted) is made. This will include the production of Construction Environmental Management Plans and Local Environmental Management Plans through consultation with the Local Authorities.**	6.3). Measures used to mitigate dust impacts will reduce effects to negligible levels. Further consideration of potential dust impacts would be undertaken at detailed design stage, after the development consent order (assuming the application is granted) is made. This would include the production of Construction Environmental Management Plans and Local Environmental Management Plans through consultation with the Local Authorities."
Economy / 9.6.5	Amend text: "The scheme is forecast to deliver significant economic benefits associated with reduced travel times together with greater journey time reliability and wider impacts associated with economic activity and business growth. ~~combined monetised value of these benefits is forecast to be £1.039 billion over a 60 year period from opening."~~ Add text: **The latest economic case, presented in the Traffic Modelling Update Report (2015) indicates that the economic business user benefits and the journey time reliability and wider impacts the economic benefits are £1.305 billion.**	Amended figures in the Traffic Modelling Update Report – based on the Charm 3A model outputs.
Economy / 9.6.7	Amend text: ~~"The monetised value of greater journey time reliability for business users and transport service providers is forecast to be **£435 million**[106] over a 60-year appraisal period."~~ Add text:	Amended figures in the Traffic Modelling Update Report – based on the Charm 3A model outputs

	In the Traffic Modelling Update Report (reference HE-A14-EX-44) the Charm 3a monetised value of greater journey time reliability is reported as £480 million.	
Minerals and Waste / 9.9.11	Remove text: ~~"There is no certainty that a beneficial afteruse / aftercare scheme will be achieved and maintained or that the site will be worked and restored in phased manner. This means the substantial legacy that could be delivered to the local community and the environment e.g. through creation of priority habitat and / or public access and amenity will not be delivered."~~	Highways England has produced revised proposals for a 10 year aftercare strategy for borrow pit sites. Post construction, Highways England will offer the borrow pit sites back to the original owners of the land and legal covenants will apply to the sale of land to ensure that the sites are maintained and is managed in accordance with the agreed aftercare arrangements, thus ensuring long term community and environmental gain in accordance with the terms of the restoration and aftercare proposals.
Social and Community matters / 10.1.10	Add text: **The Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and the landowner includes and alternative arrangement which reduces the impact on the car park to a loss of 4-5 spaces.** **Chapter 14 section 14.4.22 of the Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1) "The Highways Agency would continue to engage with the owners and operators of all the non-residential receptors to establish sensitivity of the receptors and develop additional mitigation where necessary and practicable as required by the Code of Construction Practice. Specific mitigation would be included, where needed, in the relevant final local environmental management plan (Code of Construction Practice (Appendix 20.2)). " Further, the Code of Construction Practice (document reference 6.3) requires the main contractors to seek and obtain prior consents from the relevant local authority under section 61 of**	Chapter 14 section 14.4.22 of the Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1) "The Highways Agency (Highways England) would continue to engage with the owners and operators of all the non-residential receptors to establish sensitivity of the receptors and develop additional mitigation where necessary and practicable as required by the Code of Construction Practice. Specific mitigation would be included, where needed, in the relevant final local environmental management plan

	the Control of Pollution Act 1974 for the works. The site-specific controls must therefore be agreed with and consented by the relevant local authority before the works can start. To secure consent the contractor will have to provide evidence that through their proposed construction method and associated mitigation, best practicable means to minimise noise and vibration will be in place (for further information please refer to the Applicant's response to ExA question 1.10.3 (Response to ExA's First Written Questions, Report 10: Noise and Vibration (document reference EX/37)).	(Code of Construction Practice (Appendix 20.2))." Further, the Code of Construction Practice (document reference 6.3) requires the main contractors to seek and obtain prior consents from the relevant local authority under section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 for the works. The site-specific controls must therefore be agreed with and consented by the relevant local authority before the works can start. To secure consent the contractor will have to provide evidence that through their proposed construction method and associated mitigation, best practicable means to minimise noise and vibration will be in place (for further information please refer to the Applicant's response to ExA question 1.10.3 (Response to ExA's First Written Questions, Report 10: Noise and Vibration (document reference EX/37)).
Social and Community Matters / 10.1.13	Add text: **The assessment reported in the Environmental Statement, considers forecast noise levels with regard to the 2012 Education Funding Agency's Acoustics Performance Standards for schools. These performance standards have since been confirmed in the updated Building Bulletin 93. The 50 $^{dB\ L_{pAeq,T}}$ criterion identified in Table 14.8 of the ES (document reference 6.1) applies to outdoor teaching spaces and there is no impact on outdoor spaces are exposed to lower levels. Further as noted in the Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1), significant construction noise effects on non-residential receptors such as schools have been identified on a cautious, worst case basis, assuming that occupied rooms or otherwise sensitive**	Additional clarification from Highways England.

	facilities are located at the closest facades of the building to the scheme and that windows are open. Taking account of the (worst case) increase of 4.8 dB and assuming the arrangement and design of the school means that internal teaching spaces are the most vulnerable they could be to changes in external noise levels, no impact or significant effect on the primary school is likely. This is because the 'end state' noise level (48.2 dB LpAeq,t) is lower than the relevant design guidance for new schools.	
Legacy / 11.1.19	Add text: **"Highways England's have confirmed that the revised proposals include a 10 year aftercare strategy for borrow pit sites. Highways England would offer the borrow pit sites back to the original owners of the land and legal covenants would apply to the sale of land to ensure that the sites are maintained in accordance with the agreed aftercare arrangements."**	Confirmation from Highways England.
Legacy / 11.1.24	Remove text: ~~"The Applicant has only committed to 5 year management of the borrow pits resulting in the loss of long-term ecological compensation sites as well as the loss of a potential overall net gains in biodiversity value as part of the scheme. This does not accord with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan, which seeks to secure biodiversity gains. At the very least the local authorities expect 10 years management of minerals and waste sites that result in the loss of significant biodiversity value, as per the example of Whitemoor Marshalling Yard County Wildlife Site in Fenland."~~	Confirmation from Highways England.
Legacy / 11.1.22	Add text: **The archaeological works related to the scheme, provide an opportunity to support both the cultural heritage and education agenda within the local community. Highways England has established the Strategic Stakeholder Board with a membership comprising local authorities and the Local Enterprise Partnership as driving the agenda for community initiatives to be delivered through the lifetime of the scheme and is committed to working with stakeholders to establish the best solution to publicise and display archaeological finds.**	Confirmation from Highways England.
Legacy / 11.1.25	Amend /Add text: "The opportunity to enhance the environment for species of County Importance, such as	Confirmation from Highways England that Priority and UK BAP

	Cetti's Warbler **is being** ~~could be~~ taken through the development of priority habitats." **The County Council welcome the proposal to create priority habitats for species of County Importance, within the landscape and ecological mitigation and borrow pit restoration proposals for species including Cetti's and grasshopper warblers and barbastelle bat.**	habitats that would be created within the landscape and ecological mitigation and borrow pit restoration proposals are: standing open waters; hedgerows; lowland mixed deciduous woodland including some wet woodland; lowland meadows; and reedbeds. These would be maintained in the long term and would provide enhancements for a range of species of County importance, including Cetti's and grasshopper warblers and barbastelle bat.
Legacy / 11.1.42	Add text: **As part of the commitment to support wider legacy objectives, Highways England have commissioned further technical assessment work to look into the possibility of including additional off-site flood attenuation using the borrow pit voids. However they have indicated that If any works were to be taken further on this, they would be progressed independently of the current application as those works are not necessary to address any impacts resulting from the current application.**	New information from Highways England.