

## Application by Highways England for the A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down

### The Examining Authority's first Written Questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

**Issued on 11 April 2019**

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) first Written Questions and requests for information - ExQ1. If necessary, the Examination Timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of Written Questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ2.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the **Initial Assessment of Principal Issues (update)** provided as **Annex C** to the Rule 8 letter dated 11 April 2019<sup>1</sup>. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word format is available on request from the Case Team: please contact [A303Stonehenge@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:A303Stonehenge@planninginspectorate.gov.uk).

Responses are due by **Deadline 2** (3 May 2019) in the Examination Timetable at **Annex A** to the Rule 8 letter.

---

<sup>1</sup> Available here: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/TR010025-000561>

## **Abbreviations used**

A list of the abbreviations used in this document is provided at **Annex A**.

## **The Examination Library**

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be viewed at the following link:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-west/a303-stonehenge/?ipcsection=docs>

The Examination Library will be updated at regular intervals as the Examination progresses.

## **Citation of questions**

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

*Topic identifier: ExQ round: question number*

eg 'LV.1.1' refers to the first question in the first round of questions relating to landscape and visual impacts.

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>G.1</b>	<b>General and cross-topic questions</b>	
G.1.1	Applicant	<p>Document 7.1 - Case for the scheme and National Policy Statement (NPS) accordance, paragraph 7.1.1, recognises that under section 104(3) of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008) the Secretary of State must decide the application in accordance with the relevant NPS, except where the Secretary of State is satisfied, amongst other things, that to do so would lead to the United Kingdom (UK) being in breach of its international obligations. The Relevant Representation (RR) from Mark Bush [RR-2209] questions whether to grant consent for the scheme would place the UK in breach of Articles 4, 5 and 6 of the World Heritage Convention 1972.</p> <p>Please provide a further and detailed explanation to justify the Applicant's assertion that the scheme would not have that consequence.</p>
G.1.2	Applicant	<p>Document 7.1 - Case for the scheme and NPS accordance, paragraph 7.2.5, states that the Applicant is not aware of any respect in which deciding the application in accordance with the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) would be unlawful. The RR of the Stonehenge Alliance [RR-1898] submits that the approval of the scheme would be contrary to The Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (85/337/EEC); The Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC); The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (Habitats</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Regulations) in respect of the Salisbury Plain SPA and River Avon SAC; The Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Habitats; The Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) in respect of Annex I species; The Aarhus Convention, in respect of genuine public participation in environmental decision-making; The European Convention on the protection of the Archaeological Heritage; The European Landscape Convention; The SEA Directive (European Directive 2001/42/EC); The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (Statutory Instrument 2004, no. 1633) on the environmental impacts of the planned A303/A358 corridor improvements programme alone and in combination; and the World Heritage Convention.</p> <p>Please respond to the specific points raised in relation to the potential breach of these directions, regulations and conventions.</p>
G.1.3	Applicant	<p>Document 7.1 - Case for the scheme and NPS accordence, Appendix A, explains that the scheme forms part of a package of proposals for the A303/A30/A358 corridor.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. To what degree has the assessment of need and economic benefits relied upon the different schemes within the overall package coming to fruition?</li> <li>ii. How does the Environmental Statement (ES) economic assessment distinguish between the economic benefits that would directly result from this scheme and the package as a whole?</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		iii. What reliance can be placed upon all eight identified improvement schemes proceeding and what is the current position as regards the inclusion of all these schemes within a Road Investment Strategy (RIS)?
G.1.4	Wiltshire Council	Document 7.1 - Case for the scheme and NPS accordane, makes an assessment of the scheme's accordane with the NPSNN and identifies the need for the scheme. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Does Wiltshire Council accept that the need case for the project, as set out therein, is made out?</li> <li>ii. Has the Applicant satisfactorily addressed all aspects of the scheme's accordane with the NPSNN?</li> <li>iii. If not, please identify any aspects with which the Council disagrees.</li> </ul>
G.1.5	Wiltshire Council	Document 7.1 - Case for the scheme and NPS accordane, paragraph 7.3.14, identifies the relevant plans which comprise the development plan for the area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Does that comprise a complete list?</li> <li>ii. Does the Council agree that the scheme would conform with relevant policies of the development plan?</li> <li>iii. If not, please indicate any areas of disagreement with Appendix B.2 – 7.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
G.1.6	Applicant	<p>Document 7.1 - Case for the scheme and NPS accordane, Appendix B.1, states that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was revised in 2018, but that the specific requirements which are relevant to major project infrastructures are addressed within the NPSNN.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please confirm that the ES has taken account of the 2018 NPPF revision.</li> <li>ii. What is the Applicant's view as to the relevance of the NPPF to the consideration of this project?</li> <li>iii. Explain further with reference to relevant NPPF paragraphs why the project can be regarded as sustainable development?</li> </ul>
G.1.7	Applicant	<p>Document 7.1 - Case for the scheme and NPS accordane, Appendix B.2 - 7, considers conformity of the scheme with local planning policies.</p> <p>Please provide complete copies of the various plans that comprise the development plan.</p>
G.1.8	Applicant	<p>There has been concern raised by Interested Parties in relation to the risk of radon gas contamination from the phosphatic chalk spoil that would be excavated from the proposed tunnel and portals, affecting the environment and bio-diversity of the WHS and potentially the River Avon (see RRs of John Callow and Mark Bush).</p> <p>Please indicate where this matter has been considered by the ES and respond to these concerns.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
G.1.9	Wiltshire Council	<p>The ES Chapter 15: Assessment of cumulative effects, paragraph 15.2.12, makes reference to consultation with Wiltshire Council as regards the compilation of the long list of identified development, followed by the circulation of a short list and the final check.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please confirm that the Applicant's methodology and identification of other development for the purposes of the cumulative assessment is agreed?</li> <li>ii. Please confirm that the list of nine developments set out in paragraph 15.2.20 is agreed?</li> <li>iii. Are there any other proposed developments relevant to the consideration of cumulative impact?</li> </ul>
G.1.10	Applicant	<p>The ES Chapter 15: Assessment of cumulative effects, paragraphs 15.2.20 and 15.4.4, makes reference to the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) on Byways AMES 11 and 12.</p> <p>Please explain further the position as regards the ETRO and the reliance placed upon it in the cumulative assessment.</p>
<b>Ag.1</b>	<b>Agriculture</b>	
Ag.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural Land Classification</b></p> <p>The NPSNN requires that account is taken of the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>3a of the Agricultural Land Classification) and that applicants should seek to use poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality.</p> <p>The Agricultural Land Classification Plan [APP-179] indicates that a significant portion of the land within the proposed Order Limits are grades 1, 2 and 3a.</p> <p>In addition to the information provided in [APP-294], what regard was had to the requirements of the NPS in respect of the use of agricultural land in considering the route alignment and particularly aspects of the scheme which are not directly dependent on the road alignment (such as the depositing of the tunnel arisings and provision of construction compounds)?</p>
Ag.1.2	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Agricultural Land Classification</b></p> <p>In respect of Agricultural Land Classification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide any Policies (and supporting text) within the adopted development plan relevant to this issue; and</li> <li>ii. the Council's assessment of the Proposed Development against these policies.</li> </ul>
Ag.1.3	Applicant	<p><b>Construction compound (effect on agricultural land)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. How will the effect of the construction compounds on agricultural land be minimised?</li> </ul>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. What measures and working practices will be introduced to avoid contamination of the compound areas and adjacent land, and how will this be secured as part of the DCO?</li> <li>iii. Would any treatment of waste soils and other material be carried out in the compounds and, if so, what measures would be secured to control and mitigate the potential effects of these operations?</li> <li>iv. How will the restoration of the compound sites and condition monitoring of these and adjacent land be secured as part of the DCO?</li> <li>v. What would trigger remedial works and how would this be secured/verified?</li> </ul>
Ag.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (access)</b></p> <p>A number of RRs, including that from the National Farmers' Union [RR-2252] raise concerns and queries in respect of the effect of the use of existing and proposed rights of way on agricultural land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide a detailed justification for proposed creation of each new public right of way which would affect existing agricultural land?</li> <li>ii. What consideration has been given to prevent any improper use of the existing and proposed Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network (including fly tipping, hare coursing, parking and camping) and how would any measures be secured as part of the DCO?</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. What arrangements would be put in place for the maintenance (including future responsibilities) of any new PRow including associated infrastructure such as fencing and barriers?</li> <li>iv. The scheme includes the creation of a new restricted byway open to agricultural vehicles along part of the existing A303. How will the surfacing, gates, and other barriers be designed and secured to ensure it is appropriate to allow for access and use by agricultural vehicles?</li> </ul>
Ag.1.5	Fowler Fortescue (on behalf of J&M Turner and Son)	<p><b>Agricultural land (access)</b></p> <p>Please provide clarity in respect of your concern about access to land at Manor Farm from the B30803. In responding please provide an annotated map indicating the location(s) of the affected land.</p>
Ag.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (access)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. With reference to [RR-1977] please provide the rationale for the indicative location of Green Bridge One.</li> <li>ii. Please also set out what alternative provision for access between the land occupied by Berwick Down Ltd to the north and south of the A303 was considered and why this was discounted.</li> <li>iii. What proposals could be put in place to minimise the effect on access between the two areas of land?</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Ag.1.7	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (access)</b></p> <p>Please provide a detailed justification for the location and scale of Green Bridge Four, including why this location, and alignment of the associated proposed restricted byway, has been chosen instead of an alignment which follows the existing A360.</p>
Ag.1.8	National Farmers' Union	<p><b>Agricultural land (access)</b></p> <p>Please explain in greater detail your concern that the proposed location of Green Bridge Four would take too much land out of agricultural production, including an assessment of the scale of impact compared to the suggested alternative of an alignment for the associated restricted byway following the existing A360?</p>
Ag.1.9	Howard Smith MRICS on behalf of Mr P J Sawkill	<p><b>Agricultural land (access)</b></p> <p>Please provide an annotated map which clarifies the access concerns with reference to the various land holdings.</p>
Ag.1.10	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (access)</b></p> <p>Please set out a response to the access concerns raised in [RR-2237].</p>
Ag.1.11	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (access)</b></p> <p>The OEMP [APP-187] provides a commitment to liaise with landowners in terms of access to land.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What measures will be put in place to ensure access to land is maintained during the construction period and to mitigate the effects on land which would be severed as part of the proposed development?</li> <li>ii. In addition, is it the intention of the applicant to allow agricultural landowners/tenants to utilise the haul roads to allow access to land?</li> </ul>
Ag.1.12	National Farmers' Union	<p><b>Agricultural land (access)</b></p> <p>As part of the development it is proposed to stop up the northern section of Allington Track with a new carriageway proposed to link Allington Track to Amesbury Road and Equinox Drive. Private means of access are proposed in new locations which would provide access to the agricultural land to the west of Allington Track and the north of the new carriageway. Please clarify what residual concerns you have that open and clear access would not be available for agricultural traffic?</p>
Ag.1.13	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (access)</b></p> <p>Concern has been raised in [RR-1980] that the proposed new restricted byway running north/south at the proposed Longbarrow Junction would result in a small triangular field which may be impracticable to farm commercially.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What consideration was given to avoiding creating small, irregularly shaped parcels of land in creating new/rerouted byways.</li> <li>ii. What alternatives would be feasible to minimise or avoid this?</li> </ul>
Ag.1.14	Applicant Howard Smith MRICS on behalf of P J Rowland & Sons (Farmers) Limited	<p><b>Agricultural land (access)</b></p> <p>In [RR-1594] a concern is raised in respect of stopping up a bridleway which has been referenced as Plot 7-19 (which is not a Plot shown on the Land Plans or in the Book of Reference).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide clarity as to which area of land, the bridleway and the MOD land refer to is located?</li> <li>ii. Can the applicant provide a response to the concerns raised?</li> </ul>
Ag.1.15	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (access)</b></p> <p>In [RR-1594] a concern is raised that there is an agricultural access in the north east corner of the field located to the south of Land Plan plot 11-09. It does not appear that a new private means of access is proposed for this land when the new proposed carriage way would be created.</p> <p>Please confirm whether an access will be provided or provide reasons why this is not proposed.</p>
Ag.1.16	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (access)</b></p> <p>Concerns have been raised in [RR-1594] in respect of access to agricultural land to the east of Solstice Park. Equinox Drive will link to a</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>new carriageway and provide a new route to access this agricultural land (with existing byways stopped up).</p> <p>What consideration has been given to any measures necessary to ensure that access to this agricultural land, for larger machinery, will not be impeded through the parking of vehicles on Equinox Drive, or the new proposed carriageways?</p>
Ag.1.17	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (drainage)</b></p> <p>How has the indicative size and locations for the drainage treatment areas/infiltration basins and other drainage infrastructure been considered to minimise the effect on operational agricultural land?</p>
Ag.1.18	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (drainage)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain how drainage during the construction phase, including for the construction compounds and haul roads will be managed to control surface water run-off and minimise the effect on adjacent agricultural land.</li> <li>ii. How will this be secured as part of the DCO?</li> </ul>
Ag.1.19	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (drainage)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain how any affected field drainage will be reinstated post construction phase.</li> <li>ii. How will this be secured as part of the DCO?</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Ag.1.20	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (liaison)</b></p> <p>A number of RRs, including the National Farmers' Union [RR-2252], raise concerns about the liaison with landowners, tenants (and their agents). The OEMP [APP-187], at page 14, identifies that a Community Liaison Manager will be appointed and this role would include responding to land owner concerns as well as any concerns raised by the wider community.</p> <p>How will you ensure that the specific, and potentially specialist, requirements of the local agricultural community will be adequately managed?</p>
Ag.1.21	National Farmers' Union	<p><b>Agricultural land (liaison)</b></p> <p>The OEMP [APP-187], at page 14, identifies that a Community Liaison Manager will be appointed, and this role would include responding to landowner and community concerns.</p> <p>Would the provision of this role be sufficient to overcome the concerns you have raised and provide an equivalent function as an Agricultural Liaison Officer which you recommend?</p>
Ag.1.22	Fowler Fortescue (on behalf of J&M Turner and Son)	<p><b>Agricultural land (severance)</b></p> <p>Please provide greater detail in respect of your concerns that the Proposed Development would result in severance of the calving operation at Foredown House and the main holding.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		In answering this question, please provide annotated maps setting out the locations of the affected land and buildings and detail the impacts this would have on the agricultural operations.
Ag.1.23	Applicant National Farmers Union' Howard Smith MRICS Fowler Fortescue Carter Jonas LLP Countryside Solutions	<b>Agricultural land (land ownership and severance)</b> Please provide information, including annotated maps, showing the agricultural land interests within, and immediately adjoining, the proposed Order limits to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. land owned and tenanted by each affected agricultural business; and</li><li>ii. highlight any areas where land would be severed by the Proposed Development.</li></ul>
Ag.1.24	National Farmers' Union (and Howard Smith MRICS, Fowler Fortescue, Carter Jonas LLP, and Countryside Solutions as relevant)	<b>Agricultural land (water supplies)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. Please highlight (including through the provision of annotated maps) which agricultural businesses rely on private boreholes for their water supplies.</li><li>ii. Please also indicate which of these rely solely or partly on such supplies.</li></ul>
Ag.1.25	Applicant	<b>Agricultural land (water supplies)</b> A number of agricultural businesses (including those referred to in [RR-1606] [RR-1980] [RR-2180] [RR-2201] [RR-2088] [RR2134] [RR-2178]



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>[RR-2220] [RR-2303]) are reliant in whole or part on private water supplies. Notwithstanding the information provided in the OEMP [APP-187], please provide clarity on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What measures would be put in place to ensure that private water supplies for agricultural businesses are not adversely affected by the Proposed Development?</li> <li>ii. What measures would be put in place to monitor any effects during the construction phase?</li> <li>iii. What measures would be put in place to monitor any effects post construction?</li> <li>iv. How would any remedial action (such an alternative supply) be provided in the event that the private supplies are adversely affected, including through supply levels and contamination?</li> </ul>
Ag.1.26	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (effect on business operations)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What consideration has been given to the effect on the health and wellbeing of animals housed or grazing close to the Proposed Development including through noise and dust?</li> <li>ii. What measures could be put in place to mitigate any impacts and how could this be secured through the DCO?</li> </ul>
Ag.1.27	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (effect on business operations)</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Land to the east of Parsonage Down National Nature Reserve (NNR) is proposed to be used for the depositing of 500,000m<sup>3</sup> of tunnel arisings. [RR-2240] and [RR-2252] indicate that this would represent around 21% of the total arable area for the affected agricultural business.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Beyond that set out in [APP-294], what consideration has been given to the economic and other implications of this for the affected business?</li> <li>ii. Please detail the Applicant's balance of considerations in terms of the benefits that may be associated with not removing the arisings for off-site disposal and the negative effect that is likely to arise for this agricultural business.</li> <li>iii. What consideration was given to the use of alternative sites close to the proposed road alignment?</li> <li>iv. What proposals could be put in place to mitigate the effects on the relevant agricultural operations?</li> </ol>
Ag.1.28	Carter Jonas LLP on behalf of M&R Hosier	<p><b>Agricultural land (effect on business operations)</b></p> <p>Please expand on your concerns that the development would result in uncertain viability of the pig enterprise with farm rotation.</p>
Ag.1.29	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (effect on business operations)</b></p> <p>With reference to [RR-2108] please provide a justification for the extent of the proposed Order limits close to Foredown House.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Ag.1.30	Fowler Fortescue (on behalf of J&M Turner and Son)	<p><b>Agricultural land (effect on business operations)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide details of the events business operated at Manor Farm Winterbourne Stoke including what links, if any, it has to the agricultural operations.</li> <li>ii. Please provide greater details as to why you consider trade would be affected by the Proposed Development.</li> </ul>
Ag.1.31	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (effect on business operations)</b></p> <p>The development would involve the provision of landscape reprofiling and the creation of permanent chalk grassland.</p> <p>Once these have been created, what, if any, ongoing maintenance requirements or restrictions on agricultural use would be necessary and how would this be secured with the landowners?</p>
Ag.1.32	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (effect on business operations)</b></p> <p>Work No.9 includes the extension of two existing substations and related electricity cabling for the provision of power to the development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please clarify whether it is envisioned that an extension to only one, or both of these substations would be required.</li> <li>ii. Please confirm whether any cabling, beyond the limits of deviation, would be required to link to the development, and if so set out the likely route and effect on agricultural land.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		iii. Please confirm what consideration has been given to conflict with existing services if additional cabling is provided beneath the road (Land Plan Plots 09-38, 09-48, 10-02).
Ag.1.33	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land (effect on business operations)</b></p> <p>Concerns have been raised in RR-1594 that the extension of one of the substations would result in the loss of an existing chemical store and wash down facility for serving the holding operated by P J Rowland &amp; Sons (Farmers) Limited.</p> <p>Can the applicant clarify the proposal for the extension of the substation and the likely effect on these facilities?</p>
Ag.1.34	Applicant Howard Smith MRICS on behalf of P J Rowland & Sons (Farmers) Limited	<p><b>Agricultural land (effect on business operations)</b></p> <p>Please provide further details setting out your concern in respect of increased light and noise pollution from Countess Roundabout on the tenanted land at Ratfyn Farm?</p>
Ag.1.35	National Farmers' Union	<p><b>Agricultural land (effect on business operations)</b></p> <p>Please expand on your concern that the development may impact on irrigation?</p>
Ag.1.36	National Farmers' Union	<p><b>Agricultural land</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide details, in terms of the names of the individual agricultural businesses, you represent?</li> <li>ii. Please also provide a cross reference to each RR made by your members (either individually or by agents representing them)?</li> </ul>
Ag.1.37	National Farmers' Union	<p><b>Agricultural land</b></p> <p>Are you aware of any agricultural land which is likely to be directly affected by the development, but where the owners or tenants are not represented by your organisation?</p>
<b>AQ.1</b>	<b>Air quality and emissions</b>	
AQ.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology</b></p> <p>Sections 2 and 3 of ES Appendix 5.2 [APP-191] state that conservative modelling of background concentrations and emissions has been adopted for both construction and operational phases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain why the modelling of background emissions is considered to be 'conservative' and how these relate to worst case scenarios for the Proposed Development?</li> <li>ii. Please provide evidence that the Gap Analysis (as discussed in paragraphs 3.1.19/20 of [APP-191]) used to predict future baseline background pollution concentration levels has been peer reviewed?</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
AQ.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology</b></p> <p>Please provide further explanation of how the adjustment factor of 2.15 and Root mean square error (RMSE) of 3.9 in [APP-191] Table 5.2.3: Verification details have been derived and how they have been applied to the predicted road NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations. For clarification, please provide a worked example for a specific receptor of the calculation described in [APP-191] Paragraph 3.7.2.</p> <p>For clarification, please provide a worked example for a specific receptor to demonstrate the relationship between the data in the last 5 columns of [APP-191] Table 5.2.4, and the adjustment factors which have been applied to reach the 'Modelled total NO<sub>2</sub> after adjustment'.</p>
AQ.1.3	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Methodology</b></p> <p>At [APP-043] Paragraph 3.7.3 of the ES it is stated that the adjustment factors (for NO<sub>x</sub>) were also applied to the predicted road PM10 concentrations in the absence of any monitoring data within the study area within which to calculate specific verification factors for PM10.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Are you satisfied that the adjustment factors for modelled NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations can reasonably be used as a proxy for verification of modelled PM10 concentrations?</li> <li>ii. Are you content with the approach adopted by the Applicant to the assessment of compliance with the hourly average NO<sub>2</sub> objective, that is, that the hourly average NO<sub>2</sub> objective is likely to be</li> </ol>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		achieved if annual average concentrations are predicted to be less than 60µg/m <sup>3</sup> ?
AQ.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology</b></p> <p>Can the Applicant direct the ExA to the meeting note with Wiltshire Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) as referenced in paragraph 5.3.26 of the ES [APP-043] that states no specific changes to the methodology were required?</p>
AQ.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>Baseline</b></p> <p>Can the Applicant state why only 15 of the 32 diffusion tube receptor locations have been included within [APP-063] Figure 5.2?</p>
AQ.1.6	Wiltshire Council Environment Agency	<p><b>Air quality receptors</b></p> <p>Are you satisfied that all potential sensitive receptors have been taken into account in the Air Quality Assessment (AQA), and with the Applicant's identification of worst-case locations for air quality?</p>
AQ.1.7	Wiltshire Council Environment Agency	<p><b>Stonehenge Visitor Centre</b></p> <p>Do you agree that Receptor R79 represents the worst-case location along the A360 is an appropriate proxy for the assessment of effects on Stonehenge Visitor Centre?</p>
AQ.1.8	Wiltshire Council	<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Environment Agency	Are you satisfied that potential impacts of PM <sub>2.5</sub> concentrations have been fully taken into account in the ES and appropriately assessed as a fraction of PM <sub>10</sub> particulate concentrations?
AQ.1.9	Applicant	<p><b>AQ modelling</b></p> <p>The Applicant considers that use of the CURED tool would not be appropriate and instead has based the assessment on advice in IAN 179/12v3 which uplifts the modelled concentrations taking account of the trend in actual roadside monitored concentrations and builds in assumptions in relation to future performance of Euro 6/VI vehicles and their potential impact on roadside nitrogen dioxide concentrations in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. To what extent (if any) has reliance on future technological improvements been brought into question by recent legal challenges by Client Earth?</li> <li>ii. How has the assessment taken into account uncertainties which may arise from rates of progress towards the achievement of technological change?</li> </ul>
AQ.1.10	Applicant	<p><b>AQ modelling</b></p> <p>Can the Applicant provide a plan depicting the study area for the regional AQA?</p>
AQ.1.11	Wiltshire Council	<b>Approach</b>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Is the Council satisfied with the overall approach of the Applicant to dealing with air quality?</li> <li>ii. Does it have any specific criticisms it would like to make?</li> </ul>
AQ.1.12	The Applicant Wiltshire Council Environment Agency	<p><b>Tunnel and approaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. With regard to the statement in para 5.6.10 can the Applicant confirm that there is no likelihood of any exceedances of the annual mean and hourly mean NO<sub>2</sub> UK AQS objectives at either tunnel portal or within the tunnel?</li> <li>ii. What is the likelihood of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> exceedances in these locations?</li> <li>iii. Are the relevant authorities satisfied with this approach to tunnel air quality and its potential impacts on air quality in the surroundings?</li> </ul>
AQ.1.13	Applicant	<p><b>Construction traffic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Can the Applicant clarify how the "<i>construction phase traffic assessment considers the additional HGV movements introduced to the road network due to construction of the scheme, along with the effects of construction phase traffic management</i>" includes the effects of construction vehicles associated with the movement and placement of tunnel arisings during the construction phase, both along haul routes and the local highway network?</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Can the Applicant clarify whether HGV movements within the site boundary and along haul routes, (eg associated with the movement of the tunnel arisings) are included within the construction phase traffic assessment?</li> <li>iii. If so, can the Applicant state how the worst-case scenario in terms of tunnel arisings has been factored in?</li> <li>iv. If HGV movements within the site boundary have not been included within the construction phase traffic assessment, what confidence is there in the findings of the assessment and the proposed mitigation to address the likely significant effects?</li> </ul>
AQ.1.14	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Construction Phase 1</b></p> <p>Paragraphs 5.9.18 – 5.9.23 of the Air Quality Assessment set out predicted impacts during construction Phase 1. Small increases are predicted at Amesbury (R58), Shrewton and Chitterne (R34 and R35 and R22-R33), and Great Wishford (R84), as a result of traffic diversions from the A303.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Are you content that the AQA has assessed the worst-case scenarios for Construction Phase 1, and with the overall conclusions that any increase in harmful emissions from traffic during this phase would result in concentrations well within the relevant AQ standards for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>/PM<sub>2.5</sub>?</li> <li>ii. Receptor R58 Amesbury High Street (A305) is predicted to experience a temporary increase in NO<sub>2</sub> concentration of 0.9µg/m<sup>3</sup>,</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		resulting in a concentration of 20.7µg/m <sup>3</sup> , due to an increase of 1000 vehicles AADT during Phase 1. Are you satisfied that this would not result in an unacceptable air quality impact on human health?
AQ.1.15	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Construction Phase 2</b></p> <p>Paragraphs 5.9.24 – 5.9.30 of the Air Quality Assessment set out predicted impacts during construction Phase 2. Small increases are predicted at Amesbury (R58). In all other locations decreases in emissions are predicted, due to decreases in traffic once Phase 1 is completed and in operation.</p> <p>Are you content that the AQA has assessed the worst-case scenarios for Construction Phase 2, and with the overall conclusions that any increase in harmful emissions from traffic during this phase would result in concentrations well within the relevant AQ standards for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>/PM<sub>2.5</sub>?</p>
AQ.1.16	Applicant	<p><b>Construction Phase 2</b></p> <p>Please explain why a decrease of 10,400 vehicles AADT and an increase of 600 vehicles on the A36 is predicted during Construction Phase 2.</p>
AQ.1.17	Applicant	<p><b>Construction Dust Assessment</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The existing A303 road surface is located within 200m of the Stonehenge monument, and limited information or certainty is provided on the processes of turning the existing A303 into the proposed green byway.</p> <p>Please provide evidence that any potential dust emissions arising from the process of turning the of the existing A303 into a green byway will not adversely impact the unique lichen assemblage at, and visitors to the Stonehenge monument and surrounding area.</p>
AQ.1.18	Applicant	<p><b>Construction Dust Assessment</b></p> <p>Paragraph 5.9.3 of the ES lists all the sensitive receptors identified within the construction dust assessment that have potential to be significantly affected by the Proposed Development. Paragraph 5.9.7 of the ES states "<i>Site specific mitigation may be necessary to avoid significant temporary effects... in addition to the standard mitigation measures</i>".</p> <p>Can the Applicant identify which receptors could experience significant effects in the absence of effective mitigation and how the need for measures that may be necessary will be determined and delivered through the provisions in the DCO?</p>
AQ.1.19	Applicant	<p><b>Construction Dust Assessment</b></p> <p>Can the Applicant explain the predicted impacts of disposing the 500,000m<sup>3</sup> of tunnel arisings on the land east of Parsonage Down NNR with regards to the emission of NO<sub>2</sub>, dust and particulate matter that</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		would be produced during the HGV movements transporting the arisings to and from the Parsonage Down NNR?
AQ.1.20	Winterbourne Stoke Parish Council Dr Andrew Shuttleworth	<p><b>Construction Dust Assessment</b></p> <p>Please explain what is known about inhalation risks posed by radiation from particulate alpha emitters (particularly isotopes of polonium, bismuth and lead) found in phosphatic chalk, and the nature and extent of local concern?</p>
AQ.1.21	Applicant Public Health England	<p><b>Construction Dust Assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Can the Applicant provide commentary on any risks associated with particulate alpha emitters in phosphatic chalk, and explain whether and how these matters have been taken into account in the AQA, and whether any special measures would be required to mitigate any such risk to an acceptable level? How would these measures be secured through the DCO?</li> <li>ii. The ExA would also welcome submissions from Public Health England on these matters.</li> </ul>
AQ.1.22	Applicant	<p><b>Operational Phase – cumulative effects</b></p> <p>Chapter 15 of the ES states that the operational AQAs have taken into account cumulative effects through reliance on the Transport Assessment, which in turn relies on modelling that has included other developments.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. With reference to [APP-290] can the Applicant clarify which projects are accounted for in the transport model either as 'built in' to the model or as a part of the uncertainty log?</li> <li>ii. Can the Applicant clarify how the other developments shown on [APP-183] Figure 15.2 as 'Future Baseline' have been incorporated into the air quality baseline for the years 2021 and 2026, considering these other developments are not mentioned within [APP-043] Chapter 5: Air Quality section 5.7: Future baseline?</li> </ul>
AQ.1.23	Wiltshire Council Environment Agency	<p><b>Operational Phase</b></p> <p>Paragraphs 5.9.31 - 5.9.44 of the AQA set out predicted impacts during the operational phase. Small increases in NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations are predicted east of the Countess roundabout (R76), at Amesbury (R58 and R60), Upton Lovell and Codford St Mary (R-19 - R21 and R14) Deptford (R7) and Chicklade (R98 – R100) due to increases in traffic during the operational phase. A small increase in PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations is predicted at Deptford. In all other locations decreases in emissions are predicted, due to decreases in traffic once the scheme is complete and in operation.</p> <p>Are you content that the AQA has assessed the worst-case scenarios for the operational phase, and with the overall conclusions that any increase in harmful emissions from traffic during operation would result in concentrations well within the relevant AQ standards for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>/PM<sub>2.5</sub>?</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
AQ.1.24	Applicant	Please explain why increases in traffic using the A36 through Upton Lovell and Codford St Mary are predicted during the operational phase.
AQ.1.25	Applicant	<p><b>Operational Phase</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Considering that no operational dust assessment is included within [APP-043] Chapter 5: Air Quality; can the Applicant explain how the assessment that Countess Farm will be adversely impacted by dust during the operational stage of Proposed Development as stated in [APP-53] Table 15.4 was reached?</li> <li>ii. Can the Applicant provide evidence that no other sensitive receptors will be adversely affected by dust during the operation stage of the Proposed Development?</li> </ul>
AQ.1.26	Applicant	<p><b>Tunnel operation</b></p> <p>Can the Applicant state how often the tunnel ventilation system is expected to be in operation, and whether frequent use of the ventilation system will cause air quality to impact receptors further than the 200m zone of influence?</p>
AQ.1.27	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Tunnel operation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Are you content that air quality modelling during operation at the tunnel portals is not required, and with the Applicant's explanation</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>in Paragraph 5.9.48 of the ES that there are no relevant air quality receptors in the immediate vicinity of the tunnel portals?</p> <p>ii. Do you agree with the conclusion in Paragraph 5.9.49 that the impact of portal emissions typically only extends up to about 100m to 200m?</p> <p>iii. Are you satisfied that the regulatory requirements for the operation of a highway tunnel, along with European Directives that either superseded or supplement UK regulations, can be relied on to secure acceptable air quality within the tunnel for users?</p>
AQ.1.28	Applicant	<p><b>Tunnel operation</b></p> <p>The OEMP [APP-187] includes the tunnel ventilation system in Table 3.2b but makes no reference to monitoring air quality within the tunnel. Can the Applicant direct the ExA to where monitoring of air quality within tunnel is secured through the OEMP or dDCO, what pollutant levels would trigger action, and what that action would be?</p>
AQ.1.29	Applicant	<p><b>Local air quality compliance</b></p> <p>Please explain whether and how the impact the Proposed Development may have on Wiltshire Council's Air Quality Action Plan has been taken into consideration in the ES?</p>
AQ.1.30	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Local air quality compliance</b></p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Are you satisfied with the conclusion at Paragraph 5.9.60 of the ES that there are no links anticipated to be non-compliant with the limit values within the air quality study area for the scheme in either construction phase and the proposed opening year of 2026.</li> <li>ii. Are you satisfied that the scheme will not contribute to problems currently experienced in AQMAs in Salisbury and Wilton?</li> <li>iii. Are you satisfied with the conclusion at Paragraph 5.9.63 that for PM<sub>10</sub> a net benefit with a negative score is predicted for the operation of the scheme, with 671 properties expected to experience an improvement in concentrations and 615 a deterioration, and with the similar conclusion regarding NO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Paragraph 5.9.64?</li> </ul>
AQ.1.31	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Local air quality compliance</b></p> <p>Paragraph 5.3.26 of ES Chapter 5 [APP-043] states that consultation with Wiltshire County Council regarding air quality was undertaken in September 2018 and that no changes to the methodology were required. This differs from the Wiltshire County Council's RR that implies, air quality monitoring locations were not agreed. The representation continues and states that the proposed development could result in "<i>Severe adverse effects on Salisbury's AQMAs</i>" which would appear to contradict Chapter 5 of the ES, in which the Applicant concludes no significant effects are identified.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>i. Please comment on these points specifically with reference to the relevant sections of the application documents where you consider significant effects on Salisbury AQMA may arise.</p> <p>ii. Please explain the statement "<i>and the severe adverse effect on Salisbury AQMA identified in the ES</i>" in the Council's RR as the AQAs have not identified a severe adverse effect on Salisbury AQMA.</p>
AQ.1.32	Applicant	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>The mitigation measures referenced within ES Appendix 5.4 [APP-193] Tables 5.4.9 and 5.4.10 are not included within the OEMP [APP-187].</p> <p>i. Can the Applicant clarify how the measures stated in [APP-193] Appendix 5.4 Table 5.4.9 and 5.4.10 are secured with reference to relevant Requirements within the DCO or equivalent?</p> <p>The measures omitted include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures specific to trackout;</li> <li>• Preparing and maintaining the site;</li> <li>• Specific demolition measures; and</li> <li>• Measures specific to earthwork.</li> </ul> <p>ES paragraph 5.9.7[APP-043] states that "<i>Site specific mitigation measures may be necessary to avoid significant temporary effects on air</i></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><i>quality for these activities and locations, in addition to mitigation measures".</i></p> <p>ii. Can the Applicant describe the mitigation measures referred to here and state how the measures will be secured?</p>
AQ.1.33	Applicant	<p><b>Monitoring</b></p> <p>Paragraph 5.10.1 of the ES states that no significant effects have been identified for construction and therefore no monitoring measures are proposed. This contradicts the [APP-187] OEMP Table 3.2b which states air quality monitoring measures will occur during the construction phase.</p> <p>Please clarify the contradiction between paragraph [APP-043] 5.10.1 which states that no monitoring measures during construction will occur and [APP-187] Table 3.2b which outlines construction phase monitoring measures?</p>
<b>AL.1</b>	<b>Alternatives</b>	
AL.1.1	Applicant	<p>Having regard to paragraph 46 of the NPSNN, please identify all legal requirements relating to the assessment of alternatives applicable to this project.</p>
AL.1.2	Applicant	<p>Document 7.1 - Case for the scheme and NPS accordance, Appendix A, considers the scheme compliance with the NPSNN. In relation to</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>paragraph 47 of the NPSNN it identifies the consideration given to viable modal alternatives.</p> <p>Please explain in greater detail why it would be impossible for rail improvement to entirely solve the identified problems in the scheme location.</p>
AL.1.3	Environment Agency	<p>Document 7.1 - Case for the scheme and NPS accordance, Appendix A, considers the scheme compliance with the NPSNN. In relation to paragraph 46 of the NPSNN, it refers to ES Appendix 11.2 Water Framework Directive (WFD) Compliance Assessment. That assessment, paragraph 8.1.6, concludes that overall the scheme would be compliant with the requirements of the WFD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Does the EA agree that there would be no specific legal requirements within its remit with which the scheme would fail to comply? If not, please explain why?</li> <li>ii. Are there any policy requirements, for example, in relation to the flood risk sequential test that remain of concern? If so, please explain why?</li> </ul>
AL.1.4	Applicant	<p>In the light of the NPSNN, paragraph 4.27, please explain why the options appraisal carried out should be regarded as a full options appraisal and a proportionate option consideration of alternatives.</p>
AL.1.5	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, paragraph 3.1.3, refers to the Road Investment Strategy (RIS) for 2015-2020 as including proposals</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>for dualling the A303 from Amesbury to Berwick Down with a twin-bore tunnel at least 2.9km long through the WHS. In addition, Document 7.1 - Case for the scheme and NPS accordance, Appendix A, refers to the RIS December 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Does that represent the latest RIS or has the RIS referred to in those documents been superseded?</li> <li>ii. Please confirm that the project retains its status within the RIS referred to or any later one?</li> </ul>
AL.1.6	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, Table 3.1 Development of the preferred route, Stage 2, states that the three route options within Corridor D incorporating the 4.5km tunnels had costs significantly in excess of the available budget for the scheme and were therefore not considered further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please confirm that the rejection of those options was based solely on costs grounds.</li> <li>ii. Please provide full details of the costings supporting that decision including the budget for the project at that time, the status of that budget and quantify "<i>costs significantly in excess</i>" in absolute and in percentage terms in comparison to the 2.9km tunnel Corridor Route D options.</li> </ul>
AL.1.7	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, Table 3.1: Development of preferred route: Please supply layouts showing the routes of the various</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		options considered from Stage 1, and cost-benefit analyses for those options developed from Stage 2 onwards.
AL.1.8	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, Table 3.1: Development of preferred route: Stage 1 – What are the substantial harmful impacts indicated that led to the exclusion of Corridor A?
AL.1.9	Applicant	<p>Please provide evidence of a detailed evaluation which supports the conclusions in [APP – 294] Table 3.1: Conclusions from route corridor assessment, that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. There is limited scope for surface routes north of the WHS (within Corridor A) because of the proximity of Larkhill and Durrington.</li> <li>ii. This northern route corridor would also cause substantial harm to important heritage features such as Durrington Walls and the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the WHS, and so would not deliver overall heritage benefits.</li> <li>iii. There would also be significant adverse impacts on the environment and local communities.</li> </ul>
AL.1.10	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, Table 3.1: Development of preferred route: It is noted that Route F010 outperformed the other two (Corridor F) options in all the assessed cases – please explain why?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
AL.1.11	Applicant	<p>Non statutory consultation in 2017 was limited to two Route Options, as illustrated in Figure 3.6 of [APP – 294]. A concern expressed in numerous RRs is that they were not presented with a full evaluation of alternative routes which avoided the WHS altogether, particularly of a southern route to the east of Boscombe Down, and through the Woodford Valley.</p> <p>Can the Applicant point to evidence of a detailed evaluation which supports its conclusions in respect of Route F010, in particular that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The route would pass through a largely unspoilt, high quality tranquil landscape.</li> <li>ii. The route would have a much larger footprint and a greater overall impact, despite having greater benefits for the WHS.</li> <li>iii. The route would not interact effectively with the local road network.</li> <li>iv. The route would result in higher levels of rat-running traffic, adversely affecting the quality of life in local communities.</li> </ul> <p>It is also stated that the disbenefits for road users of having to use a longer route would offset lower construction costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v. To what extent is this the case, having regard to the substantially lower capital cost of building a surface route, even one that would be somewhat longer?</li> </ul>
AL.1.12	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, Table 3.1 Development of the preferred route, Stage 4, explains the process that led to the</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>rejection of option F010 being taken forward as a preferred route for consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain in detail, providing illustrative evidence, the disadvantages of Route F010.</li> <li>ii. Please provide full justification for this decision explaining the perceived greater overall environmental impact and disbenefits for road users.</li> <li>iii. How were these factors weighed in the balance against the greater benefits for the WHS that this option would have achieved?</li> </ul>
AL.1.13	Applicant	<p>Section 11.11 of the HE Technical Appraisal Report 2017 (<a href="https://highwaysengland.citizenspace.com/cip/a303-stonehenge/results/sar-volume-1.pdf">https://highwaysengland.citizenspace.com/cip/a303-stonehenge/results/sar-volume-1.pdf</a>) sets out the economic assessment conclusions in respect of the assessment of the tunnelled options and F010 (surface route through the Woodford Valley). Taking into account impacts on the WHS and the wider non-monetised landscape and environmental impacts, Table 11-17 demonstrates that there is very little if anything to choose between the tunnelled routes through the WHS and the surface route (Option F010) as regards the Benefit/Costs Ratio of the schemes. Option F010 appears to perform as well or marginally better than the tunnelled options.</p> <p>Please provide further details of the key determinants that led to the selection of the preferred route and the elimination of route Option F010</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		from further consideration including the matters identified in ES Chapter 7.1 Table 3-2.
AL.1.14	Applicant	Would F010 and other routes which avoid the WHS permit the proposed removal of motorised vehicles (apart from those using private means of access) from the route of the existing A303 through the WHS, and the perceived benefits of connectivity within the WHS?
AL.1.15	Applicant	Please provide evidence of a detailed evaluation which supports the conclusion that a route in Corridor G (south of Salisbury) would lead to substantially increased habitat loss and severance compared to other corridors, would fail to reduce journey times for use of the A303 and therefore would not meet the objectives of the scheme?
AL.1.16	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, Table 3.1 Development of the preferred route, Stage 5, explains the process for the identification of the Preferred Route in the light of the public consultation, key engineering and environmental topics, and the results of further geophysical surveys.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain and provide details of the potential harm to the attributes of the OUV of the WHS and impacts on the fabric and setting of important archaeological remains that were identified at that time as being associated with Option 1Nd.</li> <li>ii. Please provide details of the consultation responses that led to the further modification of Option 1Nd through the western part of the WHS.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		iii. Explain how the alterations that were made in response to that consultation would mitigate the anticipated impacts on archaeology, the winter solstice alignment and the Normanton Down RSPB reserve.
AL.1.17	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, paragraph 3.3.1 explains that five options remained under consideration at statutory consultation held between February 2018 and April 2018. Table 3.4: Western portal approach options compares the two options presented for the approach to the western portal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain why the grass slopes option was considered to be less preferable in terms of OUV impact with particular regard to Winterbourne Stoke crossroads barrow group.</li> <li>ii. Please explain the assumptions made in relation to visibility of signage and buildings.</li> </ul>
AL.1.18	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, Table 3.5: Western portal canopy options – please explain what buildings are proposed in association with the canopy, their size, form, location, use and relationship to the canopy and retaining walls.
AL.1.19	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, paragraph 3.3.12, explains that three changes were presented for consideration at the supplementary consultation held between 17 July and 14 August 2018

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>and decisions were subsequently made in relation to those options. In relation to the proposed modification of the Rolleston crossroads:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Explain in further detail why it would be necessary to reconfigure the junction at Rolleston Corner to accommodate the high load route.</li> <li>ii. In relation to the impact on the WHS, please explain the proposed boundary review process and why it is considered reasonable to place reliance upon that review being implemented.</li> <li>iii. Given that Option 2 would entail new land take within the WHS explain how it can be claimed that it would have a lesser impact on the integrity and authenticity of the WHS than Option 1 which entails only minor works within the WHS?</li> </ol>
AL.1.20	Applicant	<p>In relation to the proposed removal of the previously proposed link between Byways AMES 11 and AMES 12 within the WHS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain in further detail why this option was considered to be preferential.</li> <li>ii. What is the perceived impact of vehicle traffic within the WHS?</li> <li>iii. How is it anticipated that such traffic would increase disturbance of nesting stone curlew in the Normanton Down RSPB reserve?</li> <li>iv. Explain the consideration given to the needs of motorised users of the Byways in reaching this decision.</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
AL.1.21	Applicant	<p>In relation to the option to widen the green bridge proposed near the existing Longbarrow Roundabout:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain in detail why the extended 'land bridge' was considered preferential due to increased visual and physical connectivity between key barrow groups within the WHS.</li> <li>ii. How would the location and dimensions of the longer Green Bridge Four be secured by the dDCO having regard to the applicable limits of deviation (LoD) and the flexibility afforded by the submitted plans?</li> </ul>
AL.1.22	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, paragraph 3.3.28, outlines the viaduct options for the River Till crossing that were considered at design development stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain why Option 2 would have required a different alignment that would have been likely to have required land take from the Parsonage Down SSSI and why this option would have required a reduction in height from ground level to the bridge structure.</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 3.3.30 states that the decision was taken to progress Option 1 primarily on the basis of ecological and engineering considerations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. What other factors were considered to support this option and why did the ecological and engineering factors outweigh the</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		groundwater and floodplain considerations in reaching this decision?
AL.1.23	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, Table 3.11: Longbarrow junction location options, compares the three options considered for the location of the proposed new Longbarrow junction.</p> <p>Please explain in further detail why Option 1 would offer a reduced benefit to the OUV of the WHS in comparison to Option 3.</p>
AL.1.24	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, Table 3.12: Longbarrow junction layout options, compares the two options considered for the layout of the proposed new Longbarrow junction.</p> <p>Please explain in further detail why Option 1 was considered to offer greater benefits to the OUV of the WHS in comparison to Option 2.</p>
AL.1.25	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, Table 3.13: Western portal location options, compares the three options considered for the location of the proposed western portal.</p> <p>Please explain in further detail the perceived impact that Option 3 would have on the siting of monuments in relation to each other and that the physical impact that the cutting emerging from the western portal would have on a schedule monument and hence the OUV of the WHS.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
AL.1.26	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, Table 3.14: Western portal approach options compares the three options considered for the approach to the western portal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. For Option 1, please identify the heritage assets that would benefit from the provision of a 5m cutting in this location.</li> <li>ii. Please explain further the reduction in noise levels that a 5 m cutting would provide in comparison to the 2m cuttings proposed for Options 2 and 4.</li> </ul>
AL.1.27	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, Table 3.15: Eastern portal location options, compares the two options considered for the location of the proposed eastern portal.</p> <p>Please provide further details and explain the perceived benefits associated with Option 2 in terms of impact on the OUV of the WHS.</p>
AL.1.28	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, Table 3.15: Countess junction structural form options compares the four options considered for the structural form of the Countess junction.</p> <p>Please explain in greater detail why Option 1 was considered to provide a more 'natural' setting for the listed Countess farm buildings compared to Option 4?</p>
AL.1.29	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, paragraph 3.3.61, explains that in response to feedback from ICOMOS, consideration has been given</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>to extending the tunnel (longer than 3km) in a westerly direction to or beyond the western boundary of the WHS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain and provide full details of the reasoning behind the decision to reject both the extended tunnel options that were considered.</li> <li>ii. Please identify and explain the heritage benefits to the OUV of the WHS that the extended tunnel options were considered to provide.</li> <li>iii. Please provide full details of the anticipated increase in the construction period for each of the extended tunnel options that were considered and explain how that was calculated.</li> <li>iv. Please provide full details of the anticipated 'significant' increase in scheme cost for each of the extended tunnel options under consideration.</li> </ul>
AL.1.30	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 3 Assessment of alternatives, paragraph 3.3.61: Extended tunnel options: Please provide justification for the comments regarding increased costs and construction period in the form of quantitative breakdowns and cost-benefit analyses.</p>
AL.1.31	DDCMS and Applicant	<p>The 2019 response to ICOMOS 42COM7B.32 – As regards the additional construction cost of a longer bored tunnel, estimated at £540m, please provide a breakdown of costs and a cost-benefit analysis.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>		
	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
AL.1.32	DDCMS and Applicant	In relation to the possibility of covering more of the open cutting, estimated at £126m, please provide access to a breakdown of costs and a cost-benefit analysis.
AL.1.33	Historic England, the National Trust and the Stonehenge Alliance	Please develop your RRs regarding alternatives including reference to the NPSNN, paragraphs 4.26 to 4.27, identifying any legal requirements and policy requirements set out in the NPSNN relating to the assessment of alternatives with which it is considered that the Applicant has failed to comply.
<b>CH.1</b>	<b>Cultural heritage</b>	
<b>ES Chapter 6: Cultural heritage</b>		
The professional assessments of effect made in the ES are not necessarily accepted and may be questioned later in the Examination.		
CH.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.4.1(f)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. When will the further archaeological evaluation of the part of the route covered by the Winterbourne Stoke bypass and the River Till crossing be available?</li> <li>ii. How is this and the archaeological evaluation fieldwork at Countess East and Amesbury Road to be incorporated in the ES assessments?</li> </ul>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. When will all other outstanding archaeological evaluation programmes be completed and will it then be necessary to amend the assessment of effects in the ES?</li> <li>iv. The ExA understands from para 45 of Wiltshire Council's [RR-2365] that an addendum to ES Chapter will be prepared once the field evaluations are complete – can you confirm?</li> </ul>
CH.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.4(i)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. How will settlement of the surrounding ground and the effects on ground water associated with the tunnel and cutting works be monitored?</li> <li>ii. What would be the acceptable limits with regard to the effect on heritage assets, and how would these be secured in the DCO?</li> <li>iii. Please set out the measures to be taken to ensure the protection of the assets during these works, and the range of responses available to unfavourable reactions.</li> </ul>
CH.1.3	Applicant	How would the effects of vibration on heritage assets incurred during construction, either directly or arising from haulage or compound activities, be monitored and harm prevented?
CH.1.4	Applicant	<b>Para 6.5.4: HIA Study Area</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The HIA study area comprises the whole of the Stonehenge part of the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites WHS and its setting, thereby excluding parts of the overall WHS.</p> <p>How are we to judge the effect of the scheme on the WHS as a whole?</p>
CH.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.6.27 et seq</b></p> <p>What evidence is there of changes to the Neolithic population associated with immigration of the Beaker people, and how does this relate to different phases in the construction and use of Stonehenge and its monuments?</p>
CH.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.6.32 et seq</b></p> <p>The archaeological remains which might be disturbed by the construction of the new Longbarrow junction appear quite significant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What scope is there for adjusting the layout to allow greater preservation in situ?</li> <li>ii. What other means of protection are proposed?</li> </ul>
CH.1.7	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.6.62: Monument groups omitted from the assessment baseline</b></p> <p>This appears to be on the grounds of lack of intervisibility, however the setting may be dependent on non-visible factors such as cultural or historic connections.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Has this point been considered?
CH.1.8	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.6.106</b></p> <p>We are told that both Vespasian's Camp and Blick Mead fall within the Grade II* Amesbury Abbey Park (NHLE 1000469). There is a setting assessment in Appendix 6.9 for Vespasian's Camp (AG32) and separately for Amesbury Abbey Grade II* RPG (6053), but Blick Mead is included in neither, and no setting information for it appears elsewhere.</p> <p>Because of the historical and cultural importance of Blick Mead, with its Mesolithic connections to the Stonehenge complex, and the fact that it would be overlooked by the Countess flyover, does not Blick Mead deserve a setting assessment?</p>
CH.1.9	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.7.2</b></p> <p>It is noted that, for the purposes of the cultural heritage assessment, the construction phase is defined as the temporary activities involved in building the scheme and the subsequent permanent presence of the scheme once constructed [and] the operational phase comprises the situation when the scheme is being used by traffic. This is confusing. Surely the substantive division should be between the temporary effects experienced during construction and the permanent effects remaining after construction in the operational phase. This is the approach taken in the landscape and visual analysis.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Why has a different approach been taken in the cultural heritage assessment?
CH.1.10	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.8.5(c)(ii): Location of tunnel portals</b></p> <p>This para tells us that the location of the western portal has been moved westwards to avoid impacting the scheduled Wilsford G1 barrow [and] the proposed additional length of canopy up to 200m long would reduce the visibility of the portal in views from monument groups such as Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads barrows, the Diamond group and Normanton Down barrows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Does the 200m addition reflect the westward LoD set out in the DCO?</li> <li>ii. How does it relate to the position of the portal and canopy presently shown on the drawings?</li> <li>iii. Is it the Applicant's intention to build this extension?</li> <li>iv. What would determine its precise length? (See also: Appendix 6.1: HIA paras 3.5.19(5) and 9.4.22)</li> </ul>
CH.1.11	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.8.5(e): Lighting</b></p> <p>Why has no outline operational lighting strategy been produced?</p>
CH.1.12	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.8.5(f): Road signage</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The commitment to concealed, non-lit signs within the WHS noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. How is signage to be handled elsewhere within the Scheme?</li> </ul> <p>Signage visible above skylines should be avoided (See VP8 Winter).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Please provide a list of all signage, its type and location.</li> </ul>
CH.1.13	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.8.5(h): Decommissioned A303</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please clarify the nature of the bound surface remaining. Would this be coloured tarmac?</li> <li>ii. Explain the discrepancies apparent between the appearance of the decommissioned A303 in Viewpoint CH13 (ES Appendix 6.9) and page 8 of the ES Non-technical Summary.</li> </ul>
CH.1.14	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.8.10: Heritage Management Plan prepared by the Main Contractor prior to the start of construction</b></p> <p>The OEMP states that this should be prepared in consultation with the Heritage Monitoring and Advisory Group (HMAG) and Wiltshire Council Archaeological Services (WCAS). The ExA assumes the final version will be agreed with or approved by HMAG and WCAS. Please confirm.</p>
CH.1.15	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.9.13: Construction</b></p> <p>This para tells us that the principal temporary impacts of the Scheme would occur between the new Longbarrow Junction and the western portal, an active, dynamic construction site, heritage assets would</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>experience views of, and noise from, the building of the new road and the cutting. Fig 2.7C (Illustrative construction layout including compounds and haul routes) gives little indication of the means necessary to service this area, with no haul routes shown apart from that on the line of the cutting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Is this a true representation?</li> <li>ii. How would the crawler cranes and moveable piling rigs gain access and working space to construct the cutting, the green bridge, the canopy, etc?</li> <li>iii. Beyond what is noted in paras 66.9.15/16, what are the implications for heritage assets including the linear earthworks, which is shown within the red line and very close to the working area for the green bridge?</li> </ul>
CH.1.16	Applicant	Provide details of haul roads, lighting, signage and fencing to be used throughout the site during the construction period.
CH.1.17	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.9.20: Construction at Countess roundabout</b></p> <p>The ES states that the construction activity does not affect the setting of any heritage asset.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please justify this statement.</li> <li>ii. What are the implications for Blick Mead?</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CH.1.18	Applicant	<p><b>Table 6.11: Pits, Parsonage Down</b></p> <p>Re: the ESSO pipeline diversion, please provide full details of works options and effects.</p>
CH.1.19	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.9.32: Historic buildings</b></p> <p>Why is the significant effect (moderate adverse) on Stables and Barn at Countess Farm noted in Table 6.11 not described?</p>
CH.1.20	Applicant	<p><b>Para 6.9.37: Operational effects on buildings</b></p> <p>Adverse impacts are noted for the settings of several listed buildings, but these are not included in Table 6.12. Why not?</p>
CH.1.21	Applicant	<p><b>Paras 6.10.1/2: Monitoring</b></p> <p>Mention is made of archaeological mitigation being carried out in compliance with the OEMP and OAMS during the preliminary works stages. However, according to Additional Submission 2, paras 1.2.4/5, the OAMS will be superseded by the DAMS by the end of the Examination, and Site Specific Written Schemes of Investigation (SSWSIs), Heritage Management Plans (HMP), and Method Statements will be developed prior to the relevant works starting.</p> <p>This section should be clarified.</p>
CH.1.22	Applicant	<p><b>Paras 6.10.1/2</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Does 'relevant works' refer to phasing?</li> <li>ii. Please supply an outline construction programme and phasing plan, together with phase by phase assumptions regarding haul routes.</li> <li>iii. Do preliminary works overlap with main works, either within phases or across the works as a whole?</li> </ul>
CH.1.23	Applicant	<p><b>Tables 6.10-6.12</b></p> <p>Given the number of significant effects reported, why are there so few references to combined effects with regard to cultural heritage in ES Chapter 15?</p>
CH.1.24	Applicant	<p><b>ES Chapter 2, para 2.4.19</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What are the cultural heritage implications of the temporary haul bridge over the River Till, and other temporary infrastructure?</li> <li>ii. What provisions are there for the reinstatement of affected land post-construction?</li> </ul>
CH.1.25	Applicant	<p><b>DCO Schedule 2: LoD</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What assumptions have been made in the ZTVs and photomontages with regard to LoDs?</li> </ul>



ExQ1		
Question to:	Question:	
		ii. How would they be affected by the use of the maximum deviations of 200m westwards and 30m eastwards of the tunnel and canopy works, and by other LoDs?
CH.1.26	Applicant	Provide details of fencing and drainage systems, including balancing ponds, together with their implications for cultural heritage.
CH.1.27	Applicant	i. What restrictions on future archaeological research, above the tunnel route and elsewhere, are envisaged? ii. How are these justified?
CH.1.28	Applicant	How will sub-surface archaeology within the areas HE intends to purchase be protected after construction activities?
CH.1.29	Historic England National Trust	<b>ES Appendix 2.2 OEMP</b> Historic England have concerns that Table 3.2a (Specific Measures to apply to preliminary works) contains insufficient detail given the very high sensitivity of the proposal. Please provide details of additional specific measures which should be embedded in the OEMP and whether these could be contained in the DAMS.
<b>ES Appendix 6.1: Heritage Impact Assessment</b>		

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CH.1.30	Applicant HMAG	<p><b>Paras 3.6.7-12: HMAG and the Scientific Committee</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Have HMAG’s recommendations been incorporated in the Scheme?</li> <li>ii. Do HMAG have misgivings over any aspects of the Scheme?</li> <li>iii. Would HMAG and WCAS be able to contribute to the examination as groups, perhaps at hearings or preparing statements of common ground with the Applicant?</li> </ul>
CH.1.31	Applicant	<p><b>Para 5.3.2(b): Field surveys, research excavations at Blick Mead</b></p> <p>Have any modifications been made to the Scheme arising from consideration of the results of the Blick Mead excavations?</p>
CH.1.32	Applicant Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Para 5.3.16: CS Policy 59, Setting study of the WHS</b></p> <p>When is this likely to be available?</p>
CH.1.33	Applicant	<p><b>Para 5.3.31: Bare earth baseline</b></p> <p>This para tells us that the HIA excludes existing woodland cover in assessing scheme impacts on the attributes of the OUV.</p> <p>Is this also true of the general scheme assessment set out in Chapter 6?</p>
CH.1.34	Applicant	<p><b>Para 5.6.7: Life expectancy</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>This para anticipates that the 120 year life expectancy would be extended by the continual maintenance and replacement of components.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Is there an operational maintenance plan consistent with this aim?</li> <li>ii. What are the implications for the renewal of, or the execution of major works on, particular elements?</li> <li>iii. How would full or partial decommissioning be carried out, and what are the implications for heritage assets?</li> </ul>
CH.1.35	Applicant	<p><b>Para 5.10.30: Assets scoped out due to intervening topography</b></p> <p>Has consideration been given to including assets because of cultural or historical associations even though intervisibility may be absent?</p>
CH.1.36	Applicant	<p><b>Para 8.3.11: Archaeological mitigation documents</b></p> <p>This para notes that these documents (DAMS, OWSI, SSWSI) would be agreed in consultation with HMAG/WCAS. Prior to the preliminary works starting on site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What would be the process of agreement?</li> <li>ii. How would the process be secured in the DCO?</li> </ul>
CH.1.37	Applicant	<p><b>Para 10.1.1 <i>et seq</i>: Cumulative impact</b></p> <p>We are referred on to Chapter 15, which notes at para 15.3.4 that, due to the nature of the works, there are limited opportunities for mitigation</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>measures during construction. Careful programming to minimise disturbance and to limit duration of disturbance is one form of mitigation.</p> <p>Please provide evidence of phased programming designed to mitigate cumulative impact.</p>
<b>ES Appendix 6.9: Cultural heritage settings assessment</b>		
CH.1.38	Applicant	<p><b>Para 3.2.2: Selection of assets for assessment - Criteria beyond visual impact</b></p> <p>Non-visual impacts could also include historical or cultural association, the sequential effects of moving through the landscape on established routes, and cumulative effects.</p> <p>Were these considered?</p>
CH.1.39	Applicant	<p><b>Paras 3.4.4/16: Historic buildings scoped</b></p> <p>What are the solitary buildings scoped into Section 1 and Section 5 – are they the milestones?</p>
CH.1.40	Applicant	<p><b>Para 3.4.9: Assets in West Amesbury</b></p> <p>Reference is made to the River Till – should this be the River Avon?</p>
CH.1.41	Applicant	<p><b>AG03 and AG04: Winterbourne Stoke Barrows</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Have the effects on users of the footpaths along the valley been taken into account in terms of serial progression northwards under the viaduct and over the land bridge before reaching the assets?
CH.1.42	Applicant	<b>AG13: The Diamond Group</b> Would the linear earthwork feature be severed?
CH.1.43	Applicant	<b>AG19: Normanton Down Barrows and Bowl barrow south of the A303 and north west of Normanton Gorse</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Taking into account the possibility of working to the maximum LoDs in close proximity to Normanton Down barrows, please summarise the measures to be taken to ensure the stability of the assets during tunnelling and other works.</li> <li>ii. Likewise, given the proximity of the Bowl barrow to the tunnel boring face, summarise the risks should the works proceed to the maximum LoDs latitudinally, longitudinally and vertically. This exercise should be carried out for all assets close to the works.</li> </ol>
CH.1.44	Applicant	<b>AG27: The Avenue</b> How is the Avenue to be treated as it crosses the old A303 and the road north of West Amesbury currently joining the A303?
CH.1.45	Applicant	<b>AG32: Vespasian's Camp</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		See comments above on the setting of Blick Mead. Although no further land take is involved, the flyover may well affect Blick Mead visually.
CH.1.46	Applicant	<b>6061: Grey Bridge, grade II</b> Would the flyover be visible in winter, looking north?
CH.1.47	Applicant National Trust	<b>6067: Countess Farmhouse, grade II and associated buildings</b> The view of the roundabout to the south, including the new flyover, would be opened up because of the felling of mature trees to enable drainage works.  How effective as screening would be the current replanting proposals for a belt of trees within the Farmhouse land, how long would the trees take to achieve maturity, and what progress has been made towards agreement on a replanting scheme?
CH.1.48	Applicant	<b>Ratfyn Farmhouse, grade II</b> Since the flyover would be visible from the grounds above trees, is it appropriate to assess the effect of the scheme as neutral?
<b>ES Additional Submission 2: Document clarifying the relationship between the archaeological mitigation strategy documents</b>		
CH.1.49	Applicant	<b>Para 1.2.3 (See also paras 1.2.5, 1.3.1, and 1,5,1)</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Any other parties	<p>This para tells us that the DAMS will be developed in consultation with the HMAG, comprising Historic England, WCAS, the National Trust, and English Heritage. Elsewhere in the ES (See OAMS para 1.2.7, etc.), it is noted that the development and operation of the DAMS and subsequent documents will be carried out in agreement with these parties.</p> <p>The matter of agreement is a significant concern, which should be secured in the DCO.</p>
CH.1.50	Applicant	<p><b>Method statements</b></p> <p>Integration of method statements into the HMP for each phase of the works should be considered.</p>
<b>ES Appendix 6.11: Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy</b>		
CH.1.51	Applicant	<p><b>Para 1.2.2: Signing off of sites to construction</b></p> <p>Please confirm this is to happen only with the agreement of HMAGS/WCAS.</p>
CH.1.52	Applicant	<p><b>Unforeseen finds</b></p> <p>i. What would be the procedure followed to investigate and protect unforeseen cultural heritage finds made during the course of the works?</p>

ExQ1		
Question to:	Question:	
		ii. What would happen in the event of major finds fundamentally affecting the progress of the works? iii. Is this fully considered in the DAMS?
CH.1.53	Applicant	<p><b>Para 4.3.1: Post excavation assessment</b></p> <p>It is noted that post excavation assessment will commence as soon as the archaeological mitigation fieldwork has been completed. However, para 3.1.5 emphasises that the majority of data, artefact and environmental sample processing would be undertaken whilst the investigation proceeds. This is important to allow investigation and mitigation to be suitably modified whilst in train. Please comment.</p>
CH.1.54	HMAG	<p><b>Mitigation measures</b></p> <p>Please comment on the detailed mitigation measures proposed in the OAMS.</p>
<b>ES Chapter 3: Assessment of alternatives</b>		
CH.1.55	Applicant	<p><b>Stage 5</b></p> <p>Route Option 1Nd (variation of D061) is said to avoid the winter solstice sunset alignment, to mitigate impacts on archaeology, and on the RSPB reserve at Normanton Down.</p> <p>i. Please provide illustrative evidence (visual modelling) of its relationship to the winter solstice alignment, together with</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>evidence to show that headlights of cars in the cutting leading to the tunnel would not interfere with viewings of the sunset from the stones.</p> <p>ii. Also, illustrate how the Option would impact on visual relationships with Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads barrows, Normanton Down Barrows, the Diamond Group, and wider connections; and its relationship to the RSPB reserve (See also ES Chapter 6, Para 6.8.5(ii)).</p>
CH.1.56	Applicant	<p><b>Table 3.3: Green bridge options</b></p> <p>On both landscape/visual and cultural heritage, the tabulation favours option (a), location at the A360 alignment rather than option (b), 150m east of A360 alignment. However, the option of a widened bridge 150m east of the A360 has been adopted, which appears to contradict the outcome of the exercise.</p> <p>Please explain why.</p>
CH.1.57	Applicant	<p>The DCO indicates that the Limits of Deviation (LoD) for the tunnel canopy allow for a 200m extension westwards. This, with the 150m width of Green Bridge 4, would allow a significant part of the c1km cutting from the existing line of the A360 to the portal canopy to be concealed, benefitting landscape/visual and cultural heritage aspects of the Scheme.</p> <p>i. Is this alternative a serious consideration for the Applicant?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. If not, why was this LoD included in the DCO?</li> <li>iii. Has the alternative of extending the canopy still further, thus going some way towards satisfying ICOMOS's criticisms, been considered in terms of cost-benefit analysis?</li> </ul>
CH.1.58	Applicant	<p><b>Table 3.7: Rolleston Corner junction options</b></p> <p>It is noted that the WHS boundary in this area has been identified as a priority for amendment (extension) as part of a proposed boundary review.</p> <p>How far has the review progressed and what are the options for extension with regard to the WHS as a whole? This point is very relevant to consideration of route options in general.</p>
CH.1.59	Applicant	<p><b>Table 3.8: B3083 alignment options</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What knowledge do we have of archaeological remains which might be affected by Option 2 (realignment 50m west)?</li> <li>ii. Have geophysical surveys been carried out?</li> </ul>
CH.1.60	Applicant	<p><b>Table 3.13: Western portal location options</b></p> <p>Deals with the heritage comparison between Option 2 (1km east of existing junction) and Option 3 (500m east of existing junction). Option 3 notes that the portal would be located between the Winterbourne Stoke barrow group and the Diamond Group adversely affecting the siting of</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>monuments in relation to each other [and] the cutting emerging from the western portal would likely result in physical impact on a SM (prehistoric linear boundary). However, the road would take the same line in either option and so the cutting and Green Bridge 4 would remain interposed between the monuments in Option 3, affecting the siting of the monuments in relation to each other in a similar way. Also, the impact on the prehistoric linear boundary is determined by the landscape arrangement around Green Bridge 4, which would be the same in either option. The analysis also appears to conflict with ES Chapter 6, para 6.8.5(ii) which notes that the proposed additional length of canopy of up to 200m would reduce visibility of the portal in views from the monument groups.</p> <p>Please explain.</p>
<b>DDCMS responses to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee decisions</b>		
CH.1.61	Applicant DDCMS	<p><b>2018 response to ICOMOS 41COM7B.56</b></p> <p>Regarding the F10 non-tunnel bypass, it is noted that the landscape to the south is itself a very rich archaeological landscape [and] professor Sir Barry Cunliffe said that, given the high archaeological potential of the land to the south, route F10 would likely impact more heavily on significant archaeology of the Neolithic and Bronze age periods, compared to the known, low potential for significant archaeology relevant to the period of</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>OUV within the footprint of the currently proposed scheme within the WHS.</p> <p>Please provide evidence to support this view.</p>
CH.1.62	Applicant DDCMS	<p>Also regarding the F10 non-tunnel bypass, the response notes that it is almost inevitable that the current surface of the A303 through the WHS would need to remain open to traffic to provide the required connectivity between local communities and alleviate pressure on the local roads around the boundary of the property.</p> <p>Please provide evidence to support this view.</p>
CH.1.63	Applicant DDCMS	<p>Again, regarding the F10 non-tunnel bypass, it is noted that the route would have an impact on the Rivers Avon and Till Special Area of Conservation.</p> <p>Please provide evidence to support this view.</p>
CH.1.64	Applicant DDCMS	<p>Regarding longer tunnel options, the response notes that rising ground to the west of the property, known as Oatlands Hill, dictates that a tunnel continuing beyond the tunnel boundary would need to traverse the width of the hill before it could emerge where the ground begins to descend into the Till valley, east of Winterbourne Stoke. However, the existing route appears to pass north of Oatlands Hill allowing a tunnel to emerge in the dry valley north of Hill Farm.</p> <p>Please explain, using map overlays if useful.</p>

ExQ1		
De.1	Question to:	Question:
De.1	Design	
De.1.1	Applicant	<p>Despite the intentions set out in the Design and Access Statement, only basic outline information is shown on the drawings and related ES documentation regarding the design of the scheme components and the way they would relate holistically and contextually, in an integrated way, to the Scheme as a whole.</p> <p>How is the detailed design to be developed, how is it to be assessed, agreed, and approved, and how is the process to be secured in the DCO?</p>
De.1.2	Applicant	<p>In the ExA's view, a design approach document, setting out the possible routes to be followed in developing the detailed design would be helpful. This would include explorations of combinations of materials, texture, and colour in different light conditions, relationship to landscaping, ways of softening motorway architecture, and so on. The document would not prescribe a single solution but would set out interconnected themes from which the design would develop. It would be secured in the DCO as a means of guiding the detailed design and assuring well considered, high standards.</p> <p>Examples where this approach has been used include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS2 – Headhouses and Portals Design Approach, Martin Short RIBA, Technical Lead HS2 Ltd, March 2016.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wendover Dean and Small Dean Viaducts and Green Tunnel South Portal Engagement Event, September 2018.</li> <li>• Hinkley C Connection, NSIP Examination Document 8.32, Updated Appendix 2.9.26.1 (Design Approach to Site Specific Superstructure), and corresponding Requirement 38 in the DCO.</li> <li>• North Killingholme Power Project, NSIP Examination Document – Architectural Study, January 2014, and corresponding Requirement 5 in the DCO.</li> </ul>
De.1.3	Applicant	<p>Specific design related points are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The only indication of the setting out of the components within the scheme appears to be the longitudinal chainage shown at 500m intervals on the various layout drawings, following the general route of the road from west to east. There appears to be no indication of setting out laterally. It is impossible to define the intended location of the components, or to see how the LoDs, which are not shown on the drawings, would apply. Please explain.</li> <li>ii. There is some confusion between tunnel portal and canopy on the structures drawings – what is described in the ES as the canopy, comprising a lid over the cutting, is labelled as the portal on the drawings. Please explain.</li> <li>i. Please respond to Historic England’s comment in its RR 1897, regarding the absence of design and visual representations for key</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		elements within the WHS, including the western tunnel portal and its extension, the eastern tunnel portal, the articulation and form of the open cutting retaining walls, and the design, construction, form and appearance of Green Bridge 4.
Ec.1	<b>Biodiversity, ecology and biodiversity</b> (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))	
Ec.1.1	Applicant Natural England Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Cumulative and in-combination assessments</b></p> <p>The ExA notes the separate legislative requirements for EIA cumulative assessment and HRA in-combination assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Can the Applicant explain why the list of plans and projects presented in sections 2.4 of the Likely Significant Effects report [APP-265] and 3.4 of the Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment [APP-266] makes no references to the consideration of 'other developments' with the potential for cumulative impacts as presented in section 15.2.20 of ES Chapter 15 [APP-053].</li> <li>ii. Can the Applicant confirm that there are no pathways for in-combination effects between these projects identified in [APP-053] and the Proposed Development?</li> <li>iii. Can NE and Wiltshire Council comment on their satisfaction with the scope of the plans and projects identified for the purposes of the in-combination assessment as presented in sections 2.4 and 3.4 of [APP-265] and [APP-266] respectively?</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Ec.1.2	Applicant Natural England RSPB Environment Agency	<p><b>Green Bridges</b></p> <p>Para 8.8.5 of the ES refers to the use of Green Bridges to provide sheltered crossing features to reduce mortality and improve connectivity to existing habitat features to aid crossing by bats and other species. These are supplemented by having the Scheme in cutting for much of its length and by the provision of false cuttings, typically two metres or more in height, to encourage birds and bats to fly over the height of most vehicles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Is the width and design of the proposed Green Bridges sufficient to have a material effect in achieving this objective?</li> <li>ii. Are there additional design features that could be incorporated to increase the effectiveness of the Green Bridges in this regard?</li> <li>iii. How does the proposed scheme compare with the status quo in terms of fragmentation of habitats and potential for species mortality?</li> </ul>
Ec.1.3	Applicant Natural England	<p><b>Mammal underpasses</b></p> <p>With regard to para 8.8.8 [APP-046] what evidence is there of features such as mammal underpasses being used by relevant species to maintain connectivity with foraging areas?</p>
Ec.1.4	Applicant	<b>Bat hibernation features</b>



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Natural England	How would the bat hibernation features (para 8.8.9 [APP-046] effectively compensate for the loss of the underpass near the eastern portal?
Ec.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>Connectivity</b></p> <p>Given the importance of buildings in the Countess Farm complex as known bat roosts, have any measures been included to mitigate potential impacts on bats flying between the roosts and potential foraging areas south of the proposed flyover?</p>
Ec.1.6	Applicant Natural England	<p><b>Water environment</b></p> <p>The strategy for managing surface water run-off referred to in paragraph 8.8.13 appears to be of some importance to maintenance of the health of watercourses and groundwater, particularly the Rivers Till and Avon catchments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. How will these proposals be secured through the DCO?</li> <li>ii. What proposals have been included for the monitoring of water quality during the construction and operation of the scheme?</li> <li>iii. How would the proposed scheme perform in terms of water quality in comparison with the status quo?</li> <li>iv. Will the works at the eastern end of the scheme which affect the River Avon catchment be accompanied by measures to improve the quality of existing run-off through the provisions of the drainage strategy [APP-281] and if so, where is that set out?</li> </ol>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Ec.1.7	Applicant	<p><b>Habitat creation</b></p> <p>What long term management measures are incorporated in the DCO to ensure that the suggested enhancements and new habitat creation along the length of the scheme are managed to maximise gains in biodiversity and prevent scrub encroachment which could eventually degrade areas of new chalk grassland (para 8.8.18)?</p>
Ec.1.8	Natural England RSPB Environment Agency	<p><b>Habitat creation</b></p> <p>Do you agree that the proposed habitat creation east of Parsonage Down would be an effective means of complementing and enhancing the existing National Nature Reserve and improving connectivity of new and existing habitats along the length of the scheme?</p>
Ec.1.9	Natural England RSPB Environment Agency	<p><b>Construction impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Are you satisfied that the construction mitigation measures proposed in paragraph 8.8.25 of the ES can be satisfactorily secured through the draft OEMP?</li> <li>ii. Are there any other measures which should be included in the OEMP?</li> </ul>
Ec.1.10	Natural England Environment Agency	<p><b>Compensatory provision</b></p> <p>Paragraph 8.9.4 identifies the loss of a small area of Chalk Grassland at the Countess Cutting CWS.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Wiltshire Council	Do you consider that the proposed replacement area would amount to satisfactory compensation for the loss of this feature?
Ec.1.11	Applicant	<p><b>Construction impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What measures will be put in place to ensure that any potential impact on the special features of the SAC of the proposed haul route through the River Till is managed to ensure no likely significant effects?</li> <li>ii. Please quantify the estimated number of vehicle trips likely to be using the haul route.</li> <li>iii. Has the potential impact of these journeys been assessed in terms of potential environmental and biodiversity impacts?</li> <li>iv. Please point to where this information can be specifically found in the ES.</li> </ul>
Ec.1.12	Natural England	<p><b>Impact on Salisbury Plain SAC</b></p> <p>Are you satisfied that the dust suppression measures set out in the OEMP would satisfactorily address any potential for potential harmful dust deposition in those parts of the SAC that lie relatively close to the works (ie within 200 metres)?</p>
Ec.1.13	Environment Agency Natural England	<p><b>Impact on River Avon SAC</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Are you satisfied that forecast levels of NO<sub>x</sub> during the construction phase in 2021 would not exceed the critical level for vegetation except within 5m of the Countess roundabout (paragraph 8.9.24)?</li> <li>ii. Do you agree with the statement that the vegetation which is one of the reasons for the designation of the Avon SAC is phosphate limited rather than nitrogen-limited, and that NO<sub>x</sub> levels associated with the construction phase are unlikely to affect the vegetation within the SAC?</li> </ul>
Ec.1.14	Applicant	<p><b>Impact on River Avon SAC</b></p> <p>With particular reference to the issues raised in section 1.0 of the Environment Agency's RR [RR-2060], can the Applicant comment and explain how they intend to address matters in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The assessment of likely impacts of any construction dewatering that may be required in terms of HRA, and the extent to which this has been fully considered in Table 3.1, items 55) – 57) of [APP-265]; and</li> <li>ii. as a result of the above, whether the conclusion that no significant effects on the River Avon SAC are likely is still applicable in light of any further work being undertaken (noting that no information has been provided to date to inform an appropriate assessment for water quality elements of the River Avon SAC, if required).</li> </ul>
Ec.1.15	Environment Agency	<b>Stone curlew</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	<p>Natural England RSPB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Do you agree that the proposed new Stone Curlew breeding plot within Parsonage Down SSSI and NNR described in paragraph 8.9.28 of the ES would provide effective compensation for the loss of an existing permanent plot to the south of the Winterbourne Stoke bypass?</li> <li>ii. Can Natural England comment on the Applicant's proposed approach to address indirect effects on functionally linked habitat of the Salisbury Plain SPA features (namely Stone Curlew), in particular:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The proposed approach which includes 'habitat modification' within another European site (Salisbury Plain SAC). The Applicant proposes to mitigate effects within the SPA by directly altering habitat within the SAC;</li> <li>b. the acceptability of the applicant's proposed approach to habitat modification within the SAC in the light of the conservation objectives for that site; and</li> <li>c. the Applicant's conclusion of no likely significant effects on the other qualifying features of the SPA, and hence only stone curlew are presented as a feature of the site in the Applicant's integrity matrices (Appendix C, matrix 2 of [APP-266]).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The Applicant states at paragraphs 5.1.5 and 5.3.6 of [APP-266] that the locations of 'replacement' and 'additional stone curlew breeding plots have been agreed with NE and RSPB respectively. Paragraphs 5.1.7 and 5.3.8</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>also state that NE and the RSPB have agreed to take on the long-term management of these plots.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. Can NE and RSPB comment on the extent to which the location and specification and long-term management of a 'replacement' and additional' breeding plot has been agreed with the Applicant, and can the Applicant explain how these are to be secured as part of the DCO or other legal mechanism?</li> <li>iv. Can NE and the RSPB provide further commentary on what long term management of these plots entails and the extent to which the Applicant relies on the success of these measures to conclude no AEOI for the Salisbury Plain SPA?</li> <li>v. Can the Applicant explain the extent to which long term management provisions are included for within the provisions of the DCO and whether there is any potential for conflict between these provisions and any long-term management objectives that may be delivered separately by NE or the RSPB?</li> </ul>
Ec.1.16	Applicant	<p><b>Stone curlew</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. With reference to the OLEMP, HEMP, and management activities that the applicant has stated will be the responsibility of Natural England and RSPB in respect of the replacement and additional stone curlew plots, can the Applicant explain how the monitoring of vegetation would be carried out to inform future action on habitat</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>creation and management, and the extent to which the success of this monitoring has been assumed in the assessment of adverse effects on integrity for the SAC and SPA during construction and long-term operation.</p> <p>ii. Given the apparent reliance on the success of the calcareous grassland establishment in the Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment (and ongoing monitoring requirements), can the Applicant explain why specific matters such as species richness, percentage bare ground and sward height (for example) for different areas of grassland are not specified in the OLEMP and are instead to be development post-consent with the Landscape Steering Group?</p>
Ec.1.17	Applicant	<p><b>Stone curlew</b></p> <p>i. Could the Applicant specifically explain how the success of the replacement breeding plot could be affected by Work No. 8 (creation of new chalk grassland habitat from tunnel arisings) (paragraph 5.1.5 of [APP-266])?</p> <p>The Applicant explains that the replacement breeding plot will be <i>"approximately 500m from the current plot and further than that from construction of the Scheme"</i> and will be provided <i>"in advance of the loss of the existing plot"</i>, but no reference is made to DCO or other legal</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>mechanisms to ensure these specifications are met (notwithstanding a purported agreement with NE).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Can the applicant explain where in the DCO the construction scheduling seemingly relied upon above is secured by appropriate requirements or other mechanisms?</li> <li>iii. Could the Applicant provide a location plan to show the new plot sites at both Parsonage Down (in relation to the existing nesting site) and at Winterbourne Down?</li> <li>iv. In respect of the Parsonage down plot, what certainty can the ExA have that DCO Work No. 8 and associated activities would not cause spatial or temporal disturbance to the new nesting site, and what DCO provisions secure this? It is noted that these plans may need to be provided on the basis that they contain confidential information.</li> </ul>
Ec.1.18	Applicant	<p><b>Stone curlew</b></p> <p>Item PW-BIO5 and MW-BIO8 of the OEMP [APP-187] talks about sensitivity of stone curlews to human disturbance within 450m of a nest site, and mitigation design accordingly. However, the Statement to Inform an Appropriate Assessment refers to a 500m distance within which disturbance could occur (eg at paragraphs 3.6.4, 5.1.5, 5.2.2, 5.2.4, 5.3.1 and appendix B of [APP-266]). Footnote 24 of [APP-266] provides a</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>citation for a 500m distance within which stone curlew could be affected by construction, but the footnote appears to be missing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Can the applicant confirm that the stipulations of mitigation measures in PW-BIO5 and MW-BIO8 of [APP-187] should refer to 500m and not 450m?</li> <li>ii. Given that PW-BIO4 of the OEMP [APP-187] only restricts clearance within the nesting season (March to September) 'where practicable', can the Applicant explain how the mitigation proposed (if clearance is not possible outside of the bird nesting season) is effective in concluding no Adverse Effect on Integrity of the SPA ("<i>suitable nesting habitat to be removed shall be checked for nesting birds by the preliminary works contractor (ecology) or an appropriate specialist, immediately prior to its removal</i>")? In this regard, the ExA notes the assumptions made at section 3.5 of [APP-266] and that there is no temporal restriction built into the wording of PW-BIO5 [APP-266] in respect of stone curlew.</li> <li>iii. Can the applicant explain why this it not part of the wording in the OEMP?</li> </ul>
Ec.1.19	Environment Agency Natural England	<b>Stone curlew</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	RSPB	Do you agree that the scheme would not have any likely significant adverse impact on any other identified stone curlew breeding plot in the vicinity of the scheme and that the works are unlikely to result in any significant disturbance to breeding birds?
Ec.1.20	Applicant	<p><b>Impact on habitats</b></p> <p>RRs have commented that some preliminary ground investigations and works referred to in 8.9.65 have not been carried out with the care that would be expected in such a sensitive location.</p> <p>What reassurance can the Applicant give that the precautionary and mitigation measures embodied in the DCO would be strictly adhered to during the construction phase to minimise the risk of unintended adverse effects?</p>
Ec.1.21	Applicant Natural England	<p><b>Impact on habitats</b></p> <p>The Government has recently signalled its intention to mandate net gains for biodiversity on new developments in England to deliver an overall increase in biodiversity to ensure that wildlife isn't compromised in delivering necessary infrastructure and housing: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/news/spring-statement-2019-what-you-need-to-know">https://www.gov.uk/government/news/spring-statement-2019-what-you-need-to-know</a></p> <p>The Wessex Chalk Stream and Rivers Trust [RR-1032] has commented as follows: "<i>There is a legal and moral obligation to improve the conditions of the chalk stream and create resilient ecosystems for wildlife and</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>people. Although the fourth objective of Highways England's A303 Stonehenge scheme is 'to improve biodiversity (...)' we feel that is not the outcome for the water environment as much of the investigations proves 'no significant measurable impacts', i.e. allegedly preventing deterioration, but not promoting improvement. A more ambitious programme of interventions with a focus on the rivers Avon and Till in and around the scheme is needed to achieve that objective. Therefore, the Trust can only support the proposed scheme if significant changes are made to the proposal and further investments in the water environment are included."</i></p> <p>Please provide a detailed response to [RR-1032] and explain how the scheme would contribute to the objective of improving the water environment and biodiversity as a whole.</p>
Ec.1.22	Environment Agency Natural England RSPB Great Bustard Group	<p><b>Great bustard</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What information is available on the current status of the great bustard in the UK and in the local area?</li> <li>ii. How significant is the scheme as a threat to the success of the project to re-establish a sustainable breeding population of great bustard?</li> </ul>
Ec.1.23	Environment Agency Natural England	<p><b>Species conservation</b></p> <p>Are you satisfied that the ES has thoroughly assessed potential construction and operational impacts on the following groups/ species:</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	RSPB	Lichen; aquatic macro invertebrates; Desmoulin's whorl snail; terrestrial invertebrates; fish; amphibians; reptiles; birds (breeding and wintering); barn owl; stone curlew; great bustard; bats; water vole; otter; badger?
Ec.1.24	The Applicant Natural England	<p><b>Need for Habitats Regulations Assessment/Appropriate Assessment</b></p> <p>The European Court of Justice ruling in <i>People over Wind</i> determined that 'mitigation' (ie measures intended to avoid or reduce the harmful effects of the project on European sites) should not be taken into account when forming a view on likely significant effects during screening under the Habitats Regulations.</p> <p>On this basis, the applicant appears to have placed reliance on a suite of 'measures' (through project design) that have that have the effect of reducing likely significant effects on European Sites during construction and operation. Indeed, in table 3.1 (page 21, item no. 66) [APP-265] under the heading "<i>Water quality impacts during construction without an Outline Environment Management Plan</i>" implying that impacts are likely without such a plan. This is also implied by items 8) and 9) of table 3.1 of [APP-265].</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. With respect to table 3.1 and matrix 3 of [APP-265], and having regard to the People over Wind judgement, could Natural England comment on the Applicant's approach in this regard?</li> <li>ii. Section 1.2 of the Environment Agency's RR [RR-2060] highlights some concerns in respect of the Drainage Strategy and the detail regarding likely effectiveness of the treatment systems to deal with contaminants prior to discharge to ground or surface waters. Can the Environment Agency their views on the basis that the Applicant has ruled out LSE on the River Avon SAC?</li> <li>iii. Can the Applicant confirm their position that conclusions of no LSE on the River Avon SAC during construction and operation have been reached without reliance on avoidance or reduction measures?</li> </ul>
<b>CC.1</b>	<b>Climate change</b>	
CC.1.1	Applicant	Please identify how the scheme would comply with the NPSNN in relation to climate change adaptation?
CC.1.2	Applicant	The NPSNN, paragraph 4.42, advises that should a new set of UK Climate Projections become available after the preparation of any ES, the ExA should consider whether they need to request additional information from the applicant. At paragraph 4.44, it explains that any adaptation

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>measures should be based, amongst other things, upon the latest set of UK Climate Projections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Has the Applicant taken account of any new set of UK Climate projections that have become available after the preparation of the ES, including the UKCP18 released in November 2018?</li> <li>ii. Please provide an assessment of how this next generation of UK Climate Projections would affect the conclusions of Chapter 14 of the ES.</li> </ul>
CC.1.3	Applicant	<p>Please explain how the ES demonstrates that there would be no critical features of the scheme which might be seriously affected by more radical changes to the climate beyond that projected in the latest set of UK climate projections.</p> <p>If the ES fails to do so, then please provide a further explanation of this matter.</p>
CC.1.4	Applicant	<p>Please identify whether any proposed adaptation measures would themselves give rise to consequential impacts.</p>
CC.1.5	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 14, paragraph 14.3.13, recognises that identifying and quantifying the balance of what is additional greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions versus displaced with any level of certainty is challenging.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain in detail the assessment that has been made in this respect.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		ii. What degree of reliability does the Applicant assert should be placed upon the ES approach to this aspect of the GHG impact assessment?
CC.1.6	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 14, paragraph 14.8.2, states that no operational mitigation measures have been proposed and that it would not be practical to monitor GHG emissions from road users during operational phase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain further how the figures for GHG emissions set out in Table 14.15 have been derived and exactly what they represent.</li> <li>ii. Please provide further justification for the ES conclusion set out in paragraph 14.19.11, that the GHG impact of the scheme would not have a material impact on the Government meeting its carbon reduction targets.</li> </ul>
CC.1.7	Applicant	<p>The ES, Chapter 14, Table 14.12: GHG Mitigation measures, makes reference to the construction contractor developing and implementing a plan to reduce energy consumption and associated carbon emissions. The delivery mechanism is stated to be the OEMP. However, the contents of any such plan insofar as they have been provided with the application seem unduly vague.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The Applicant is requested to comment as to how appropriate construction mitigation measures could be delivered with a greater degree of certainty.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>ii. Please identify the relevant parts of the OEMP designed to secure such mitigation.</p> <p>The OEMP Table 3.2b MW REAC Table Ref MW-AIR 5 simply states that the main works contractor "<i>shall implement measures to reduce emissions during the construction of the Scheme</i>". That seems imprecise and fails to reflect all mitigation measures anticipated by Tables 14.12 and 14.13.</p> <p>iii. Please identify how the necessary GHG mitigation measures and climate change resilience measures could be satisfactorily secured by the OEMP in a manner that would ensure their enforceability.</p> <p>iv. Please specify the range of construction and operational measures referred to in Table 14.13 that would be in place to improve the resilience of the scheme to climate change and identify where these are included in and secured by the OEMP and/or dDCO.</p>
<b>CA.1</b>	<b>Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations</b>	
<b>The scope of the Compulsory Acquisition powers sought</b>		
CA.1.1	Applicant	<p>The Explanatory Memorandum, paragraph 2.10, states that all elements of the Proposed Development either constitute part of an NSIP or are 'associated development' within the meaning of section 115(2) PA2008 and so can be properly authorised by the Order. The Applicant has chosen not to differentiate between these two categories in the dDCO.</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. How does that approach reflect the Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects (Department for Communities and Local Government April 2013)?</li> <li>ii. Explain further the example given of potential overlap between some on-highway and some off-highway diversion of statutory undertakers' equipment and why the 'associated development' aspects of the scheme could not be appropriately categorised as such in the dDCO?</li> <li>iii. The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 2.3.1, lists the works necessary to deliver the scheme. Which, if any, of the categories a. to u. can be identified as associated development?</li> </ul>
CA.1.2	Applicant	<p>The Explanatory Memorandum, paragraph 2.10, states that the extinguishment of private rights over land would enable the Applicant to take land with a clear unencumbered title, thereby minimising impediments to the delivery of the scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Explain in further detail why it is necessary to include provisions allowing for the extinguishment of private rights and restrictive covenants over the Order Land.</li> <li>ii. What is the nature/extent of any delay to the scheme that might otherwise result?</li> <li>iii. What alternatives to this approach have been explored?</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.3	Applicant	<p>To assist with the consideration of whether the extent of the land to be acquired is no more than is reasonably required for the purposes of the development to which the development consent will relate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 2.4.1, refers to the Applicant requiring a degree of flexibility as to where certain elements of the scheme can be constructed within the limits of deviation (LoD) provided for in the dDCO. How would it be ensured that powers of Compulsory Acquisition would not be exercised in respect of land not ultimately required as a result of the detailed design process?</li> <li>ii. The Statement of Reasons, paragraphs 5.3.5 and 5.3.7, refer to the acquisition of rights in the sub-soil above the tunnel and up to (and including, where necessary) the surface of the land, to restrict activities on land that may affect the structural integrity of the tunnel. Please explain in detail the purpose and need for this power; the type of restrictions on activities that are sought to be imposed and the type of activities that it is anticipated might affect structural integrity.</li> <li>iii. Please expand upon the progress of discussions with the relevant landowners to minimise any impact upon existing surface activities.</li> <li>iv. The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 5.3.7, refers to the need for consultation on the restrictive covenants that would be imposed. What would be the process for any such consultation? How would such consultation and/or the content of any restrictive covenants</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>be secured by the dDCO? If it is not intended to be secured in that way, please provide justification for such an approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v. Please provide an indication of the anticipated content and/or an initial draft of any restrictive covenants intended to be imposed.</li> <li>vi. The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 5.3.9, refers to the construction compound requirements for the tunnelling operations. Please provide further details to justify the extent of the land sought to be used for this and other construction compounds. For each compound explain why a compound of this size is required and the justification for the extent of the plots proposed to accommodate them.</li> <li>vii. The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 5.3.12, seeks to justify the extent of the land over which powers are sought for the creation and acquisition of new rights to accommodate the diversion of statutory undertakers' apparatus. Please explain and justify in further detail the extent of the land over which such powers are sought given the width of the corridors likely to be needed for that purpose.</li> </ul>
CA.1.4	National Trust	Please explain your concerns as regards the proposed LoD generally and in particular as regards the potential for variation in relation to the portal entrances.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.5	National Trust	Please expand upon your concerns as regards the scope for restrictions to be imposed upon the use of the land above the tunnel.
CA.1.6	Applicant	Please explain further the relationship between the time limit for the exercise of temporary powers of possession set out in Article 21(2) and the time limits for the exercise of Temporary Possession powers set out in Articles 29 and 30.
CA.1.7	Applicant	<p>Article 22 (1) of the dDCO would authorise the creation of new rights/restrictive covenants over all of the Order land and the power is not restricted to that land specified in Schedules 4 and 6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide further justification for the extent of the power sought with reference to the conditions specified for the exercise of such powers by section 122 PA2008.</li> <li>ii. Please describe the nature of the restrictive covenants sought by way of a schedule or updated Book of Reference and provide full justification for them.</li> </ul>
CA.1.8	Applicant	For the avoidance of doubt, please confirm the total number of plots falling within each of the four tables listed in the Statement of Reasons, Annex A.
CA.1.9	Applicant	Please provide justification for the extent of the National Trust land sought to be subject to powers of Temporary Possession.

<b>ExQ1</b>		
<b>Question to:</b>		<b>Question:</b>
<b>Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition of the land, rights and powers that are sought by the dDCO</b>		
CA.1.10	Applicant	For the avoidance of doubt, what are all the factors that are regarded as constituting evidence of a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition powers sought and where, giving specific paragraph references, are these set out in the submitted documentation?
CA.1.11	Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 5.4.1, submits that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What assessment, if any, has been made of the effect upon individual Affected Persons and their private loss that would result from the exercise of Compulsory Acquisition powers in each case?</li> <li>ii. Paragraph 5.4.7 asserts that the public benefits of the scheme outweigh any residual adverse effects including private loss suffered by individual land owners and occupiers. What is the reasoning behind that assertion and how has that balancing exercise between public benefit and private loss been carried out?</li> </ul>
<b>Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored</b>		
CA.1.12	Applicant	In the light of the relevant DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land, paragraph 8:

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. How can the Panel be assured that all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored?</li> <li>ii. Set out in summary form, with document references where appropriate, what assessment/comparison has been made of the alternatives to the proposed acquisition of land or interests therein in each case.</li> </ul>
CA.1.13	Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 5.5, refers to public consultation and the consideration given to that in the selection of the most appropriate option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain what, if any, account has been taken of responses to Pre-application consultation (both in relation to statutory and non-statutory consultation) in the route selection and in considering whether there are reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition.</li> <li>ii. Please provide any examples of route changes and changes to design development options within the preferred route in response to public consultation.</li> </ul>
CA.1.14	Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons, section 4.11, indicates that the Applicant has engaged with all landowners and occupiers with a view to acquiring their land interest by agreement. The Additional Submission 5 – Land</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Acquisition and Temporary Possession Negotiations Schedule has been submitted to show the progress of negotiations with Affected Persons.</p> <p>Please provide an updated Schedule on the state of any negotiations with each Affected Person to acquire the various land/rights in question.</p>
<b>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</b>		
CA.1.15	Applicant	<p>The Funding Statement outlines two options for funding with Option 1 being a combination of private and public finance and Option 2 solely public finance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain the process and timeline for deciding upon the funding option that would ultimately be adopted.</li> <li>ii. Option 1 would make use of the Private Finance 2 (PF2) contract model. Does that remain an option supported by the Government?</li> <li>iii. Does the Road Investment Strategy (RIS) and the figure of £15 billion ring-fenced for major road investment place reliance upon such schemes proceeding by way of Option 1 or would that figure support all RIS schemes proceedings solely by way of public finance?</li> <li>iv. The Funding Statement makes reference to the RIS published on 1 December for the period 2015/2016 and 2020/2021. Does that represent the current position or has that been overtaken by a later RIS? If so, has the funding of the scheme been included within</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>that? If not, what reliability can be placed upon Option 2 – solely public finance?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v. Please provide an update to the Funding Statement to fully reflect the current position.</li> <li>vi. The Funding Statement indicates that the main scheme has a capital cost estimate of £1.7 billion and Appendix A includes reference to £2 billion of investment in the A303 corridor as a whole. What is the capital cost element for the remainder of the A303 corridor and does the £2 billion figure rely upon parts of the corridor proceeding by way of Option 1 or another form of funding that does not rely solely upon public finance?</li> </ul>
CA.1.16	Applicant	<p>The Funding Statement states that Highways England with its external advisor PwC held market engagement with private finance funders in June/July 2018 and those soundings raised no concern on market capacity to fund A303 privately.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The Appendix B letter from PwC confirms that it has assisted with certain activities. However, it does not comment on the availability of private funds to implement the scheme. Please provide evidence to support the assertion made in that respect.</li> <li>ii. What reliance can be placed upon the continuing availability of private funds in the future should market conditions change?</li> </ul>



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CA.1.17	Applicant	Please summarise the evidence relied upon to support the conclusion that there is a reasonable prospect that the scheme, if granted consent, would actually be taken forward and in what time period?
CA.1.18	Applicant	<p>The Funding Statement, paragraph 3.2.3, indicates that total direct development costs including land acquisition are estimated at £300 million including allowances for risk and inflation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What proportion of that figure can be attributed to land acquisition costs?</li> <li>ii. How can the Panel be satisfied as to the reliability of that figure, and what is its degree of accuracy?</li> </ul>
<b>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</b>		
CA.1.19	Applicant	What degree of importance has been attributed to the existing uses of the land proposed to be acquired, and why?
CA.1.20	Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 6.2.1, indicates that the Applicant considers the significant public benefits that would arise from the scheme would outweigh any harm to individuals.</p> <p>Explain more precisely the factors which have been placed in the balance (including references to any paragraphs of the relevant NPS), the weight</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		attributed to those factors and how this exercise has actually been undertaken?
CA.1.21	Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 6.2.4, asserts that the interference with human rights in this case would be proportionate and justified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. How has the proportionality test been undertaken?</li> <li>ii. Explain the proportionate approach which has been taken in relation to each plot.</li> </ul>
CA.1.22	Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 6.2.2, refers to the acquisition of the sub-soil below and of rights over subsoil and surface where the tunnel would pass underneath the properties known as 1 and 2 Custodian Cottages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain and justify the assertion that the dwellinghouses would not therefore be directly affected.</li> <li>ii. Please provide details of any permanent rights sought to be acquired over the land within the ownership/occupation of those property owners.</li> <li>iii. Please identify any potential interference with their Convention rights that might occur.</li> </ul>
CA.1.23	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 6.2.5, states that the Applicant has had regard to landowner feedback both in the initial design of the scheme

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>and in iterative design changes throughout the development of the scheme.</p> <p>Please provide a separate list of the design changes relied upon in this respect together with the relevant document reference and paragraph number so that these can be readily identified.</p>
CA.1.24	Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 6.5.1, states that the Applicant has complied with its duties under section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain how the Applicant has had regard to its public sector equality duty in relation to the powers of Compulsory Acquisition sought and where this can be identified in the Equalities Impact Assessment.</li> <li>ii. Have any Affected Persons been identified as having protected characteristics?</li> </ul>
<b>The accuracy of the Book of Reference, Land Plans and points of clarification</b>		
CA.1.25	Applicant	<p>Please confirm that the Book of Reference accurately sets out the various plots and interests and provide a schedule of all amendments submitted since the application was made together with an update to the Book of Reference. Please identify any inaccuracies that have come to light.</p>
CA.1.26	Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 4.4.2, states that diligent inquiry to identify affected landowners, those with interests in land, and those with a potential claim, was undertaken by the Applicant's land referencing</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>supplier and a summary of the steps undertaken is set out at paragraph 4.9.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please comment upon the reliability and accuracy of the non-contacting referencing stage.</li> <li>ii. Please explain why the adoption of a 10m buffer zone and the inclusion of properties identified as potentially affected by a 1dB or greater increase in noise as a result of the scheme as potential Category 3 parties represents a worst-case assessment and a precautionary approach.</li> <li>iii. What reliability can be placed upon the use of public sources of information to establish ownership of unregistered land as outlined in the Statement of Reasons, paragraph 4.9.3?</li> </ul>
CA.1.27	Applicant	<p>What assurance and evidence can the Applicant provide of the accuracy of the land interests identified as submitted and indicate whether there are likely to be any changes to the land interests, including the identification of further owners/interests or monitoring and update of changes in interests?</p>
CA.1.28	Applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Explain how the Book of Reference complies with the guidance published by the former Department for Communities and Local Government – Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition for land Annex D, paragraph 10.</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		ii. Where have the proposed new rights and restrictive covenants been identified and cross-referenced to the relevant development consent order articles? Please explain how this has been achieved by the Book of Reference.
CA.1.29	Applicant	Please confirm that the Book of Reference complies with the advice contained in Annex D, paragraph 8, of the guidance. For example, are all those identified in Part 3 also recorded in Part 1?
<b>The acquisition of Statutory Undertakers' land – s127 of the PA2008</b>		
CA.1.30	Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 7.5, refers to two Statutory Undertakers, namely, Southern Electric Power Distribution and Wessex Water owning land directly affected by the scheme.</p> <p>Please confirm that that represents a complete list of all such statutory undertakers and provide the present state of any negotiations with each one, including whether the undertaker objects to the acquisition of the land or rights and on what grounds.</p>
CA.1.31	Applicant	Have all the Protective Provisions in Schedule 11 and/or asset protective agreements between the various parties been agreed? If not, please identify any outstanding areas of disagreement.
<b>The extinguishment of rights, and removal of apparatus of statutory undertakers – s138 of the PA2008</b>		

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CA.1.32	Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 7.5.12, refers to six Statutory Undertakers, that would be affected by major utilities diversions as a result of the scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please confirm that that represents a complete list of all such Statutory Undertakers.</li> <li>ii. Please provide an update on the present state of any negotiations with each one indicating whether Protective Provisions have been agreed and identifying any matters that remain outstanding.</li> <li>iii. Please explain why the extinguishment or the relevant right or removal of the relevant apparatus is necessary in each case.</li> </ul>
CA.1.33	Esso Petroleum	<p>The RR made on behalf of Esso Petroleum raises concerns that the scheme would potentially interfere with its existing fuel pipeline.</p> <p>Please provide an update on the present state of negotiations with the Applicant as regards both the Protective Provisions and the diversion agreement.</p>
<b>The acquisition of rights over special category land comprising open space</b>		
CA.1.34	Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons, Table 7.1, identifies various land plots within the Order limits as open space.</p> <p>Please confirm that no other land affected comprises land forming part of a common, open space or fuel or field garden allotment.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.35	Applicant	<p>In the light of the relevant DCLG guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please confirm that the proposed replacement land is not already subject to rights of common, or to other rights, or used by the public even informally for recreation.</li> <li>ii. Please explain in detail why the proposed replacement land would be suitable for that purpose.</li> </ul>
CA.1.36	Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 7.3.9, indicates that, in respect of plots 10-18, 10-19, 11-04 and 11-05 there would be compliance with section 132(3) PA2008.</p> <p>Explain in detail the reasoning behind the assertion that these plots of land when burdened with the rights sought would be no less advantageous than it was before.</p>
CA.1.37	PFA Consulting on behalf of Amesbury Property Company Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please indicate whether it is agreed that in respect of plots 10-18 and 11-05 there would be compliance with section 132(3) PA2008.</li> <li>ii. If not, please explain why that is the case and identify any areas of disagreement?</li> </ul>
CA.1.38	Greggs plc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please indicate whether it is agreed that in respect of plots 10-19 and 11-04 there would be compliance with section 132(3) PA2008.</li> <li>ii. If not, please explain why that is the case and identify any areas of disagreement?</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>		
<b>Question to:</b>		<b>Question:</b>
<b>Crown land</b>		
CA.1.39	Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 7.1, indicates that the dDCO makes provision for the acquisition of land interests which are not held by the Crown but which exist in Crown land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide an update on the progress of discussions with the Secretary of State for Defence and the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport.</li> <li>ii. Has the consent of the Crown been obtained to the inclusion of all Articles in the dDCO which affect Crown land?</li> <li>iii. In view of the provisions of section 135(2) PA2008, could the Applicant clarify when it is anticipated that these consents will be forthcoming?</li> </ul>
<b>Special category land – land owned by the National Trust</b>		
CA.1.40	Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 7.4, indicates that the DCO, if made, would authorise the Compulsory Acquisition of land and rights over land held inalienably the National Trust.</p> <p>In the light of section 130 PA2008, please provide an update as regards the discussions on this matter being held with the National Trust.</p>
<b>Related applications, orders and consents</b>		



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CA.1.41	Applicant	<p>The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 7.6, refers to other consents outside the DCO that would be required from other authorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please confirm that all necessary consents have been identified.</li> <li>ii. Please provide an update to the Consents and Agreements Position Statement and identify the progress made by the Applicant in its discussions with the relevant bodies.</li> <li>iii. How can the Panel be confident that the need for these other consents would not present any obstacle to the implementation of the project should development consent be granted?</li> </ul>
<b>Objections to the grant of powers of Compulsory Acquisition</b>		
CA.1.42	Applicant	<p>The Applicant is requested to provide a response to the objections which have been received to the request for grant of Compulsory Acquisition powers and an update as regards negotiations with those objectors.</p>
CA.1.43	PFA Consulting on behalf of The Amesbury Property Company Limited (APC) and Classmaxi Limited (CML)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide further details of your objection to the Compulsory Acquisition of the areas of land and/or the rights over these areas of land sought.</li> <li>ii. Please explain further your alternative proposal for Byway AMES 1.</li> <li>iii. Please explain your proposed mechanism to demonstrate that the use of Compulsory Acquisition powers is neither necessary or justified.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		iv. What is the current state of progress of negotiations with the Applicant to agree such a mechanism?
CA.1.44	Applicant	i. Please respond the specific objection to the exercise of Compulsory Acquisition powers raised by APC and CML on the grounds that the extent of the land/rights sought to be acquired is unreasonable. ii. What is the current state of progress of negotiations with the objector to agree their proposed mechanism to avoid excessive land-take?
CA.1.45	Countryside Solutions on behalf of Beacon Hill Land Limited	Please provide further details of the objection to the Compulsory Acquisition of the areas of land sought to be acquired and why it would be excessive to acquire the freehold as opposed to rights over the land.
CA.1.46	Applicant	Please respond the specific objection to the exercise of Compulsory Acquisition powers raised by Countryside Solutions on behalf of Beacon Hill Land Limited.
CA.1.47	Howard Smith MRICS on behalf of P J Rowland & Sons (Farmers) Limited	Please provide further details of the impact that the exercise of the powers of Compulsory Acquisition sought would have upon your client's business.
CA.1.48	Rachel Hosier on behalf of Max Hosier and Helen Hosier	Please provide further details of the impact that the exercise of the powers of Compulsory Acquisition sought would have upon the farming

ExQ1		
Question to:	Question:	
		business and your reference to a management agreement for a legacy brief.
CA.1.49	Countryside Solutions on behalf of Morris and King Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide further details of the objection to the extent of the area proposed to be occupied as a temporary compound.</li> <li>ii. Please provide further details of the impact that the exercise of the powers of Compulsory Acquisition sought would have upon your client's horse livery and farming business.</li> </ul>
CA.1.50	Fowler Fortescue on behalf of the Turner family	Please provide further details of the objection to the extent of the area proposed to be subject to the exercise of the powers of Compulsory Acquisition and the impact that the exercise of those powers would have upon your client's farming business.
<b>DCO.1</b>	<b>Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)</b>	
<b>Part 1 – Preliminary - Articles</b>		
DCO.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 – “the authorised development”</b></p> <p>Article 2 states that: ““authorised development” means the development and associated development, described in Schedule 1 (authorised development) or any part of it and any other development authorised by this Order, which is development within the meaning of section 32 (meaning of development of the 2008 Act”.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The dDCO Schedule 1 includes parts of the works relating to the provision of new byways and private accesses for which development consent is sought "<i>as shown illustratively</i>" on the Works Plans and Rights of Way and Access Plans. Explain, for each of those work numbers to which that applies, why the Applicant cannot be more specific at this stage as to the nature and location of the works sought.</li> <li>ii. Please justify the degree of flexibility that reliance upon these 'illustrative' plans would allow. Explain where and how this aspect of scheme flexibility has been assessed by the ES?</li> </ul>
DCO.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 – "<i>the authorised development</i>"</b></p> <p>Schedule 1 of the dDCO would also authorise ancillary works "<i>for the purposes of or in connection with the construction of any of the works and other development mentioned above...</i>", and Schedule 1 (a) to (b) lists a number of ancillary works. The Explanatory Memorandum states that this is to ensure that the authorised development is constructed efficiently and without impediment. However, the term "<i>ancillary works</i>" is not defined nor does it specify that they shall be carried out within the order limits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide further details as to the intended scope and location of these ancillary works.</li> <li>ii. Having regard to Figure 2.7(A-E) of the ES and paragraphs 2.4.1-2.4.28, and assumptions around construction compound locations</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>and embedded mitigation such as landscape bunds, please explain why the construction compounds are not listed as specific work numbers in the dDCO and that such provisions only appear in relation to the ancillary works?</p> <p>iii. The Explanatory Memorandum justifies the inclusion of the powers to carry out ancillary works by reference to other made DCOs. Please explain why the particular DCOs mentioned are relied upon as precedents in this case?</p>
DCO.1.3	Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 – “the authorised development”</b></p> <p>i. For Work No. 8 and the general provisions in ancillary works item (b)(vii), should the latter be limited in extent to reflect the works captured under Work No. 8?</p> <p>ii. Furthermore, should Work No. 8 be further defined with reference to the detail on the Environmental Masterplan (Figure 2.5L) or alternative plan to secure the detail to the extent that it has been assessed in the ES?</p> <p>iii. There is no ‘engineering detail’ on the Parsonage Down reprofiling works as part of the engineering section drawings [APP-010] and [APP-011]. It is also unclear why the limits of deviation (LoD) for Work No. 8 have been drawn as they have on the Works Plans (sheets 3 and 12 of [APP-008]). Based on the general arrangement plans (sheets 3 and 12 of [APP-012]), it would appear that there are “<i>proposed landscape profiling</i>” works to the south of the LoD</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>of Work No. 8, with the whole area presented on the general arrangements plans as a single, continuous unit. Please clarify and explain these points?</p>
DCO.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 – “the authorised development”</b></p> <p>Associated Development has not been separately described in Schedule 1. The Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects (Department for Communities and Local Government April 2013) states that: <i>“As far as practicable, applicants should explain in their explanatory memorandum which parts (if any) of their proposal are associated development and why.”</i> Furthermore, Advice Note 13: ‘Preparation of a draft order granting development consent and explanatory memorandum’ advises that the draft DCO should include: <i>“A full, precise and complete description of each element of any necessary “associated development, which should be clearly identified in a Schedule to the draft DCO.”</i></p> <p>The Explanatory Memorandum points to the potential for overlap between the two categories of development but does not seek to distinguish between them as anticipated by the guidance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain this omission and identify those parts of the proposal which represent Associated Development in accordance with the guidance.</li> <li>ii. Please comment on whether a prohibition of motor vehicles for the severed link between AMES11 and AMES12 should be</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		regarded as Associated Development and included within the dDCO.
DCO.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 – “the authorised development”</b></p> <p>Article 2 defines “<i>ecological mitigation works</i>” to “<i>include bat roost and badger set closures and provision of hibernacula</i>”.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Does this comprise a full and complete definition of the term and, if not, why not?</li> <li>ii. Why are the “<i>ecological mitigation works</i>” defined separately in this way whereas “<i>archaeological mitigation works</i>” and “<i>investigations for the purpose of assessing ground conditions</i>” are not separately defined in the dDCO interpretation section?</li> <li>iii. Should the latter two categories of works not also be defined in Article 2?</li> <li>iv. Please explain why there is no direct reference to the documents which contain the specification of the archaeological, ground conditions and ecological mitigation works.</li> <li>v. Although Table 3.2a of the Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) contains some information on the “<i>environmental commitments</i>” associated with the works, should the specification of the works not be provided as a separate document to be secured within the dDCO so as to limit and clarify the extent of what would be permitted as “<i>preliminary work</i>”?</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>vi. Does the definition of the archaeological preliminary works need to be better aligned to the detailed archaeological mitigation strategy (DAMS) and should a distinction be drawn with the preliminary archaeological mitigation works?</p>
DCO.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 – “the authorised development”</b></p> <p>The “authorised development” set out in Schedule 1 includes a number of sub-works under the main work numbers. The Explanatory Memorandum states that Schedule 1 describes the authorised development, which is described in more detail in Chapter 2 of the ES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain the extent to which the description of the development used to undertake the environmental assessment includes the sub-works described in the dDCO.</li> <li>ii. Please also explain the extent to which the geographic location of the proposed sub-works is relevant to the finding of likely significant effects in the ES taking into account the LoD</li> <li>iii. If the location of the sub-works is a relevant consideration informing the outcome of the assessment, please explain how this would be secured with reference to the relevant dDCO provisions and work plans.</li> <li>iv. For example, if the western portal (DCO Work No. 1E) were to be constructed at the westernmost extent of the LoD set out in Article 7, would this have any bearing on the location of Green Bridge Four which is stated in the ES as being “approximately 150m in</li> </ul>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<i>length and approximately 150m from the western boundary of the WHS"?</i>
DCO.1.7	Wilshire Council	<p><b>Article 2 – “the authorised development”</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please comment upon the definition of “<i>authorised development</i>” as set out in the dDCO and explain further your concerns in relation to the indicative nature of the design and lack of design detail provided by the application.</li> <li>ii. Please explain in detail why a prohibition of motor vehicles for the severed link between AMES11 and AMES12 should be regarded as associated development and suggest how such a provision could be included within the dDCO.</li> </ul>
DCO.1.8	Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 – “commence”</b></p> <p>The definition of “<i>commence</i>” excludes certain operations and potentially allows for a large number of different types of works to be undertaken prior to the approval of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) or OEMP. Some of these activities are defined as “<i>preliminary works</i>” in Schedule 2, Part 1 and would be the subject of the preliminary works OEMP. The Additional Submission 3 states that it is <i>expected</i> that seven preliminary works CEMPs would be prepared and, unlike the main CEMP, it is not stated that they would be required to be prepared prior to the commencement of those works. Nonetheless, the REAC Table 3.2a indicates that the preliminary works contractor “<i>shall</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>prepare a CEMP for their works, as applicable to the scope of their contract, prior to the commencement of their works."</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Why has this approach been taken and further why is there a distinction between the two types of works?</li> <li>ii. Should the approval, timeline and implementation of the preliminary works OEMP be secured by requirement?</li> <li>iii. Given the potential impacts of these advance works how can the degree of flexibility sought by the current approach be justified?</li> <li>iv. The Explanatory Memorandum states that the works that are excluded from the definition are either de minimis or have minimal potential for adverse impacts. Please clarify and explain the anticipated impacts of the exempted activities and how these have been assessed.</li> <li>v. Please identify any activities excluded from the definition of "commence" that are not defined as comprising "preliminary works" in Schedule 2, Part 1.</li> <li>vi. The Explanatory Memorandum in relation to the definition of "commence" refers to other made DCOs that support the principle of excluding the listed activities. Please provide full details as to why the quoted examples should be regarded as reliable precedents and set out any differences between the drafting in those DCOs and the definition as drafted in the dDCO.</li> </ol>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.1.9	Wilshire Council	<p><b>Article 2 – “commence”</b></p> <p>Please comment generally on the definition of “commence” in the dDCO and, in particular, whether any amendment to the definition or imposition of requirements are necessary to control the excluded operations.</p>
DCO.1.10	Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 – “compulsory acquisition notice”</b></p> <p>Please comment as to whether “compulsory acquisition notice” should be defined in the dDCO.</p>
DCO.1.11	Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 – “the environmental statement”</b></p> <p>The definition of “the environmental statement” refers to the documents of that description referenced in Schedule 12.</p> <p>Please confirm that this will be appropriately updated in the event that further documents are submitted that require inclusion during the course of the Examination.</p>
DCO.1.12	Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 – “maintain”</b></p> <p>i. The definition of “maintain” is broadly drawn. Please justify the inclusion of such a generous definition in this case.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Do any of the other activities mentioned in the definition such as <i>"remove"</i> or <i>"reconstruct"</i> require any further definition? If not, please explain why?</li> <li>iii. Given that the definition of <i>"maintain"</i> should not result in works being authorised which have not been assessed in the ES in accordance with the EIA regulations, please confirm that all these works have been so assessed and identify where this is recorded.</li> <li>iv. Please consider whether the following words should be added at the end of the definition: <i>"provided such works do not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects to those identified in the Environmental Statement, and any derivative of "maintain" must be construed accordingly"</i>.</li> <li>v. The Explanatory Memorandum seeks to justify the inclusion of <i>"adjust"</i> and <i>"alter"</i> as being necessary constituents of <i>"maintain"</i> in order to provide the ability to carry out minor corrective works as part of routine maintenance. Please consider whether the dDCO definition, itself, should be qualified in that way.</li> <li>vi. The Explanatory Memorandum in relation to the definition of <i>"maintain"</i> refers to other made DCOs that support the principle of such a broad definition. Please explain why the quoted examples should be regarded as reliable precedents and set out any differences between the drafting in those DCOs and the definition as drafted in the dDCO.</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.1.13	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Article 2 – “maintain”</b></p> <p>Please comment generally on the definition of “maintain” in the dDCO and, in particular, whether any amendment to the definition is necessary.</p>
DCO.1.14	Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 - “tree and hedgerow plans”</b></p> <p>The dDCO does not include a definition of ‘tree and hedgerow plans’. Are further plans required to specifically identify the trees and hedgerows that fall within the ambit of article 17 and, if so, should such a definition be included.</p>
DCO.1.15	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Article 2 - “tree and hedgerow plans”</b></p> <p>Please comment in relation to the above question.</p>
DCO.1.16	Environment Agency Natural England	<p><b>Article 3 (1) and (2) – Disapplication of legislative provisions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please comment generally on the effect of this Article given that its consequence would be that certain consents would no longer need to be obtained.</li> <li>ii. Would there still be sufficient regulation of the activities that fall within Article 3(1) (a) to (g)?</li> </ul>
DCO.1.17	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Article 3 (1) and (2) – Disapplication of legislative provisions</b></p>

ExQ1		
Question to:	Question:	
		Please comment generally on the effect of Article 3(2).
DCO.1.18	Applicant	<p><b>Article 3 (1) (h) - Disapplication of legislative provisions</b></p> <p>Why is it not proposed to align the Temporary Possession powers in the dDCO with the section 20(3) Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 three months' notice period?</p>
DCO.1.19	Applicant	<p><b>Article 3 (1) (h) - Disapplication of legislative provisions</b></p> <p>Please consider whether it would be appropriate to align the Temporary Possession powers set out in Articles 21, 29 and 30 with the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 requirement to specify the maximum period of Temporary Possession?</p>
<b>Part 2 – Works Provisions - Articles</b>		
DCO.1.20	Applicant	<p><b>Article 7 – Limits of Deviation</b></p> <p>The reference to "<i>plans</i>" in Article 7(3) should be to "<i>works plans</i>".</p> <p>Please confirm that the word "<i>works</i>" will be inserted before "<i>plans</i>" in the revised dDCO?</p>
DCO.1.21	Applicant	<p><b>Article 7 – Limits of Deviation</b></p> <p>For Work No. 4, please clarify whether the LoD would allow for the realigned A360 to be within the World Heritage Site (WHS) boundary?</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.1.22	Applicant	<p><b>Article 7 – Limits of Deviation</b></p> <p>The ES, Chapter 2, Table 2.1: Limits of deviation summarises the proposed LoD for the scheme and the Additional Submission 1 ‘signposting’ document seeks to explain the controls that would regulate the location/dimension of the Works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. For the avoidance of doubt, please provide an expanded Table 2.1 to include all sub-paragraphs of the relevant work number, for example, Work No. 1A (i) to (vii).</li> <li>ii. Please explain the relationship between the lateral and centreline limits of deviation set out in ES Chapter 2, Table 2.1.</li> </ul>
DCO.1.23	Applicant	<p><b>Article 7 – Limits of Deviation</b></p> <p>The ES Chapter 2, Table 2.1: Limits of deviation, sets out the LoD for each of the proposed works.</p> <p>In relation to Work Nos. 1E, 1F and 1G, please clarify how the LoD relate to the relevant Works Plans. The limits shown on the Works Plans (sheets 6-8) show the start and end of linear works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Is it intended that the LoD would allow the start and end of these linear works to move in accordance with the lengths specified in Table 2.1? If so, please update the Works Plans to show where these limits are spatially.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Please also clarify this point in relation to the engineering section chainage profile drawings which show the start and end points within the LoD and figure 2.16.</li> <li>iii. Should Table 2.1 limit the lateral deviation of Work Nos. 1E, 1F and 1G, as it presently indicates that these works would only be constrained laterally by the Order limits?</li> <li>iv. Please confirm that the extent of the deviations sought, including that allowed for Work Nos. 1 E, 1F and 1G, have been assessed in the ES.</li> <li>v. Article 7(3)(b) would permit a very wide lateral deviation in the construction or maintenance of Work No. 1 F. Please provide a further explanation as to why this is regarded as being necessary and proportionate.</li> </ul>
DCO.1.24	Applicant	<p><b>Article 7 – Limits of Deviation</b></p> <p>The ES, Chapter 6, makes no reference to the LoD. There is only a single reference to a ‘worst case’ having been adopted.</p> <p>Please explain with particular reference to the lateral LoD of the tunnel portals themselves and the upper / lower limits of deviation set out in the dDCO and on the tunnel LoD plan [APP-019]. For example, does the assessment assume that the tunnel would be built at the shallowest depth with highest potential for impacts on buried archaeology?</p>



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.1.25	Applicant	<p><b>Article 7 – Limits of Deviation</b></p> <p>Please explain, with reference to the relevant ‘asset groups’, for works 1E, 1F and 1G how the cultural heritage assessment in ES Chapter 6 [APP-044] and the Heritage Impact Assessment [APP-195] have specifically accounted for the LoD set out in the dDCO and shown on the tunnel limits of deviation plan [APP-019].</p>
DCO.1.26	Applicant	<p><b>Article 7 – Limits of Deviation</b></p> <p>The Explanatory Memorandum, paragraph 6.12, states that Article 7(7) would enable a proportionate degree of extension to the length of the tunnel in either a westerly or easterly direction as specified in the accompanying table.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain in detail why provision for these allowances are necessary and proportionate and the likely scenario under which such a deviation would be required.</li> <li>ii. Please provide a full explanation as to why the flexibility sought by Article 7(7)(b) for Work Nos. 1 E, 1F and 1G, is necessary and proportionate? The Explanatory Memorandum would appear to be silent on this matter.</li> <li>iii. Please provide full justification for this clause and identify where the permitted degree of flexibility provided by all aspects of Article 7(7) has been assessed by the ES.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		iv. How does this reflect the guidance in Advice Note 15, paragraph 17?
DCO.1.27	Applicant	<p><b>Article 7 – Limits of Deviation</b></p> <p>Please explain how Article 7 is intended to apply to those works comprised in the relevant work numbers which are presently shown by way of ‘illustrative’ plans? For example, what would be the scope for lateral or vertical deviation for Work No. 1A(ii) (Green Bridge One)?</p>
DCO.1.28	Applicant	<p><b>Article 7 – Limits of Deviation</b></p> <p>Does Article 7 require amendment to include reference to the ES assessment? For example, the A556 (Knutsford to Bowden Improvement) DCO (from which support is drawn in relation to Article 11) includes the proviso that the <i>“deviation is within the scope of the environmental impact assessment”</i>.</p>
DCO.1.29	Applicant	<p><b>Article 7 – Limits of Deviation</b></p> <p>Article 7(6) allows for deviation that would exceed the specified limits where effects <i>“would not give rise to any materially new or materially worse adverse environmental effects from those reported in the environmental statement.”</i></p> <p>i. How would the deviations allowed for by Article 7(6) be assessed in the future as against the effects revealed by the ES?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. What would be the mechanism for the Secretary of State to certify his or her satisfaction and should provision be made for that decision to be made in consultation with the relevant planning authority?</li> <li>iii. How does the flexibility that this article would allow sit with enabling full and appropriate public consultation on any final scheme that might be delivered?</li> <li>iv. Should the deviations allowed for result in a material change to the project which has not been examined, by what means would this be consulted upon?</li> <li>v. This procedure would seem to have the scope to circumvent the procedures for applying for non-material and material changes to DCOs in the PA2008. The Explanatory Memorandum, paragraph 6.13, refers to: <i>"reducing the risk that the authorised development as approved cannot later be implemented for reasons which, at the time the application was made, could not reasonably have been foreseen"</i>. The Additional Submission 1 DCO application 'signposting' document, paragraph 2.4, claims that it is prudent to enable <i>"implementation to proceed without the scheme promotor having to recourse to additional consenting procedures, such as applications for material or non-material DCO changes"</i>. Please explain why potential budgeting and programming implications of making such an application can be said to justify not making use of the statutory procedures in the</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>PA2008, by way of an application to make a change to the DCO, rather than the proposed ad hoc certification process by the Secretary of State?</p> <p>vi. Why has Advice Note 15, paragraph 17, not been followed in this respect?</p>
DCO.1.30	Wiltshire Council Natural England	<p><b>Article 7 – Limits of Deviation</b></p> <p>Please comment on the limits of deviation proposed for the development.</p>
DCO.1.31	Applicant	<p><b>Article 11 – Temporary stopping up of streets</b></p> <p>i. Please explain why the streets that would be the subject of this power cannot be identified and referred to in a schedule at this stage?</p> <p>ii. Does that represent a necessary and proportionate approach?</p>
DCO.1.32	Applicant	<p><b>Article 12 – Access to works</b></p> <p>i. Please consider whether the words "<i>with the consent of the street authority</i>" should be included.</p> <p>ii. Please provide further justification for this general power which would permit the creation of means of access without examination.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		iii. The Explanatory Memorandum in relation to this article refers to made DCOs that set a precedent for this general power. Please explain why the quoted examples should be regarded as providing reliable precedents and set out any differences between the drafting in those DCOs and the article as drafted in the dDCO.
DCO.1.33	Applicant	<b>Article 13 (7)(a) – Discharge of water</b> Please consider a drafting change as a result of the Homes and Communities Agency being replaced by Homes England?
DCO.1.34	Environment Agency	<b>Article 13 (7)(a) – Discharge of water</b> Please comment on the Article 13 provisions generally and the safeguard provided by Article 13(6) in particular.
DCO.1.35	Applicant	<b>Article 14 – Protective works to buildings</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Notwithstanding the reference to the Model Provisions and made DCOs referred to in the Explanatory Memorandum, paragraph 6.36, explain further why is it necessary to have this power in the circumstances of this particular project.</li> <li>ii. Please identify the ‘certain buildings’ that may require protective works on the edge of the Order limits referred to in the Explanatory Memorandum, paragraph 6.37.</li> </ul>
DCO.1.36	Applicant	<b>Article 15(1)(b) – Authority to survey and investigate the land</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please identify the land adjacent to, but outside the Order limits where surveys or investigation work would potentially be needed and explain why.</li> <li>ii. The Explanatory Memorandum, paragraph 6.43, refers to the Model Provisions and the Silvertown Tunnel DCO as setting a precedent for this general power. It acknowledges that the drafting departs from the model provisions in that it would apply on land outside but adjacent to the Order limits where "<i>reasonably necessary</i>". Please explain why this power is considered to be necessary and proportionate in the particular circumstances of this case.</li> <li>iii. Please set out any differences between the circumstances which justified the inclusion of the article in the Silvertown Tunnel DCO and the situation in this case and any differences in the drafting of the comparable article in that DCO and the article as drafted in the dDCO.</li> </ul>
DCO.1.37	Applicant	<p><b>Article 16 – Removal of human remains</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Notwithstanding the reference to the Model Provision in the Explanatory Memorandum, paragraph 6.44, explain further why it is necessary and proportionate to have this power in the particular circumstances of this project.</li> <li>ii. The Explanatory Memorandum acknowledges that the drafting of paragraph (12) departs from the model provision and states that</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>this approach has precedent in the Crossrail Act 2008. Please explain further why that Act and project should be regarded as providing an appropriate comparison and reliable precedent for this scheme? Please identify any differences in the drafting of the comparable section of that Act and the article as drafted in the dDCO.</p>
DCO.1.38	Applicant	<p><b>Article 17 – Felling or lopping of trees and hedgerows</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please confirm that the power to fell or lop any tree would not affect any tree protected by a tree preservation order (TPO) or situated in a conservation area.</li> <li>ii. If any trees covered by this article are protected by virtue of TPOs or being situated in a conservation area, in the light of Advice Note 15 paragraph 22.2, please specifically identify them by reference to a plan and schedule.</li> <li>iii. The Explanatory Memorandum, paragraph 6.49, makes reference to the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. Explain why this power is necessary in relation to hedgerows given the existing powers available to the Applicant to remove hedgerows under those regulations.</li> <li>iv. In the light of Advice Note 15, paragraph 22, and Good Practice point 6, please identified hedgerows affected in a schedule and on a plan accompanying the dDCO and also identify those hedgerows that are 'important' hedgerows.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		v. The Explanatory Memorandum, paragraph 6.48, states that the powers available to the Applicant under the Highways Act 1980 would be insufficient to protect the tunnel comprised in the authorised development. Please explain why the tunnel requires special consideration in this respect.
DCO.1.39	Applicant	<p><b>Article 18 – Maintenance of drainage works</b></p> Please provide a full explanation of and justification for the inclusion of this Article.
DCO.1.40	Environment Agency	<p><b>Article 18 – Maintenance of drainage works</b></p> Please comment upon the purpose and effect of this Article in relation to responsibility for maintenance of drainage works.
DCO.1.41	Applicant	<p><b>Article 21 – Time limit for exercise of powers to possess land temporarily or to acquire land compulsorily</b></p> The power provided by Article 21(2) would allow the undertaker to remain in Temporary Possession of the land indefinitely.  Notwithstanding the inclusion of similar powers in other made DCOs, please provide full justification for the need for this power given the particular circumstances of this project.
DCO.1.42	Applicant	<p><b>Article 22 – Compulsory acquisition of rights</b></p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>This Article provides a wide power to acquire rights over the Order land or impose new restrictive covenants affecting the land.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide full justification for seeking this wide power over all of the Order land.</li> <li>ii. The Explanatory Memorandum, paragraph, 7.8 draws support for the power to impose restrictive covenants from the Silvertown Tunnel Order 2018. Please set out the particular circumstances which justified the inclusion of the article in the Silvertown Tunnel DCO and the particular circumstances relied upon to justify its inclusion in this case.</li> <li>iii. The corresponding article in that DCO was subject to the proviso that the undertaker TfL could not impose restrictive covenants affecting the land situated within identified regions. Thus, it would seem that the precedent relied upon was not drafted as widely as that now sought. Please explain this difference in the drafting of the comparable article in that DCO and the article as drafted in the dDCO.</li> <li>iv. Please comment as to whether such a wide power is necessary and proportionate in the light of the Secretary of State's decision, paragraph 62, of the M4 Motorway (Junctions 3 to 12) (Smart Motorway) DCO which expressed the view that it was inappropriate in that case to give such a wide power over any of the Order land in the absence of a specific and clear justification for conferring</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>such a wide-ranging power without an indication of how the power would be used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v. Please provide specific and clear justification for the use of the power sought in this case and an indication of how it would be used.</li> <li>vi. In the light of Advice Note 15, paragraph 24.1, and Good Practice point 9, please provide justification which is specific to each of the areas of land over which the power is being sought, rather than generic reasons and include a clear indication of the sorts of restrictions which would be imposed.</li> <li>vii. In the light of Advice Note 15, paragraph 24.3, please identify the land to which the restrictive covenants relate and describe the nature of the restrictive covenants sought in a schedule and provide full justification for each covenant.</li> <li>viii. Explain further why power to create new rights over all the Order land is necessary and proportionate, as opposed to limiting such a power to create new rights over the land listed in Schedules 4 and 6.</li> </ul>
DCO.1.43	Applicant	<p><b>Article 22 – Compulsory acquisition of rights</b></p> <p>A number of Interested Parties raise the issue of the potential for the restriction (via restricted covenants) of future archaeological research</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>within the affected part of the WHS (eg above the tunnel route) as being contrary to the provisions of the Stonehenge WHS Management Plan.</p> <p>Please comment on these concerns in respect of the need for restrictive covenants and their potential to conflict with the WHS management plan.</p>
DCO.1.44	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Article 22 – Compulsory acquisition of rights</b></p> <p>Please explain in detail the concern raised as regards the power to impose restrictive covenants on groundworks on land above the tunnel and the implications that might have for archaeological investigations in the WHS.</p>
DCO.1.45	Applicant	<p><b>Article 24 – Power to override easements and other rights</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain why this power is necessary given the effect of sections 152 and 158 of the PA2008 which appear to cover the same issue?</li> <li>ii. Does this Article provide anything additional which sections 158 and 152 do not provide for which should reasonably be included in this particular dDCO?</li> </ul>
DCO.1.46	Applicant	<p><b>Article 27 – Subsoil or new rights only to be acquired</b></p> <p>This Article includes power to impose restrictive covenants. In the light of Advice Note 15, paragraph 24, please describe the nature of the restrictive covenants sought in a schedule or the Book of Reference.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.1.47	Applicant	<p><b>Article 29 – Temporary use of land for constructing the development</b></p> <p>The Explanatory Memorandum points out that the time limits set out in Article 21 apply to this Article. The effect of this appears to be that the undertakers may remain on the land indefinitely. Please explain why this is necessary and proportionate.</p>
DCO.1.48	Applicant	<p><b>Article 29 – Temporary use of land for constructing the development</b></p> <p>Notwithstanding the details provided in the Explanatory Memorandum, explain in detail the justification and necessity for seeking to take Temporary Possession of the land in question having regard to human rights considerations.</p>
DCO.1.49	Applicant	<p><b>Article 31 – Statutory undertakers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain why it would be impracticable to show and describe all statutory undertakers' land and why such a general power in relation to apparatus not specifically shown on the land plans and described in the Book of Reference is required in the particular circumstances of this case?</li> <li>ii. In that respect, the Statement of Reasons, paragraph 7.5, indicates, that land held by Southern Electric Power Distribution Limited and Wessex Water has been identified and the location of relevant major utilities diversions is known. Why is it</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		nevertheless considered necessary and proportionate for a general power over or within any of the Order land to be sought?
DCO.1.50	Applicant	<p><b>Article 31 – Statutory undertakers</b></p> <p>The Explanatory Memorandum draws support for this approach the M20 J10a DCO 2017 which includes a similar Article. However, there are other made DCOs relating to other road improvement schemes where this power is restricted to the land belonging to statutory undertakers shown on the land plans within the limits of the land to be acquired or used permanently or temporarily and described in the Book of Reference.</p> <p>Why has a different approach been adopted in this case?</p>
DCO.1.51	Applicant	<p><b>Article 31 – Statutory undertakers</b></p> <p>Please note that where a representation is made under section 127 PA2008 and has not been withdrawn, the Secretary of State will be unable to authorise Article 29 unless satisfied evidence that the tests in section 127 would be met.</p> <p>Where appropriate, the Applicant is requested to provide evidence that the tests in sections 127 or 138 PA2008, as appropriate, would be met.</p>
DCO.1.52	Applicant	<p><b>Article 31 – Statutory undertakers</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please identify the relevant Statutory Undertakers where Protective Provisions have not yet been agreed and provide an update on the progress of such negotiations.
DCO.1.53	Southern Electric Power Distribution plc Wessex Water BT Group plc Esso Petroleum Company Limited Century Link Limited Sky Virgin Media Limited Southern Gas Networks plc Wessex Water Services Limited	<b>Article 31 – Statutory undertakers</b> The relevant Statutory Undertakers are requested to set out their views as to whether the section 127 and 138 tests would be met or confirm that they wish to withdraw their representations.
DCO.1.54	Wiltshire Council	<b>Article 34 – Special category land</b> Please comment on the proposed mechanism for providing the replacement land including the reference to consultation with the planning authority.
DCO.1.55	Applicant	<b>Article 34 – Special category land</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In relation to plots 10-18, 10-19, 11-04 and 11-05 please explain further why the Explanatory Memorandum, paragraph 7.3.9, states that the land when burdened with the rights sought will be no less advantageous than it was before.
DCO.1.56	Applicant	<p><b>Article 38 – Crown land</b></p> <p>Please confirm that all Crown interests (other than those held otherwise than by or on behalf of the Crown) are excluded from the scope of the powers of Compulsory Acquisition.</p>
DCO.1.57	Applicant	<p><b>Article 38 – Crown land</b></p> <p>Please provide an update as regards obtaining the necessary consents under section 135(1) and 135(2) PA2008 from the Secretary of State for Defence and the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport.</p>
DCO.1.58	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Article 49 – Traffic regulation measures</b></p> <p>Please comment generally upon the implications of and any concerns relating to this article of the dDCO.</p>
DCO.1.59	Applicant	<p><b>Article 51- Consent to transfer the benefit of the order</b></p> <p>The Article, as drafted, would allow powers under the Order to be transferred and the Secretary of State’s consent would seem to only be required for the transfer of the functions of the Undertaker.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please redraft the Article so that the Secretary of State's consent would be required for any transfer of powers/liabilities under the Order.
DCO.1.60	Applicant	<p><b>Article 51- Consent to transfer the benefit of the order</b></p> <p>The Explanatory Memorandum, paragraph 9.4, draws support for this Article as drafted from the Silvertown Tunnel Order 2018. However, this has not been the case for other DCOs authorising road schemes.</p> <p>Please set out the particular circumstances relied upon to justify the inclusion of the Article as drafted in this case.</p>
DCO.1.61	Applicant	<p><b>Article 52 – Application of landlord and tenant law</b></p> <p>Please explain why this Article is necessary given the particular circumstances of this project.</p>
DCO.1.62	Applicant	<p><b>Article 53 – Operational land for the purposes of the 1990 Act</b></p> <p>Please explain why this Article is necessary given the particular circumstances of this project.</p>
DCO.1.63	Applicant	<p><b>Article 58 - Arbitration</b></p> <p>Please consider the addition of the following words to the end of this Article in the dDCO: <i>"to be appointed on the application of either party (after giving notice in writing to the other) by the Secretary of State"</i>.</p>



ExQ1		
Question to:	Question:	
<b>Schedule 2 – Part 1 – Requirements</b>		
DCO.1.64	Applicant	<p>There would seem to be an absence of specific Requirements covering matters such as construction traffic impacts, traffic monitoring and mitigation, cultural heritage, ecology, land contamination and pollution control, surface water, drainage, flood risk, air quality, lighting, noise and vibration that might reasonably be expected to be included.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the reliance placed upon Requirement 4 and the OEMP to secure environmental mitigation for the scheme, please provide justification for their absence and consider the inclusion of specific Requirements to cover the areas of greatest environmental concern and ensure they are readily enforceable.</p>
DCO.1.65	Wiltshire Council	<p>Please comment as to whether any additional Requirements would be necessary to secure the proposed monitoring and mitigation measures, for example, in relation to air quality, noise, vibration and flood risk.</p> <p>Please provide, for the ExA's consideration, draft Requirements for any such topic areas where the Council perceives there to be a need for them to be imposed.</p>
DCO.1.66	Applicant	<p>There would seem to be some matters included in the Environmental Mitigation Schedule that are not secured by Requirements. For example, in some cases reliance is simply placed upon contractual requirements between the Undertaker and the main works contractor. Furthermore, the ExA questions whether the mitigation and/or commitment is in all</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>cases adequately secured by the requirement referred to in the Mitigation Schedule.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain further how all the mitigation identified by the ES and set out in the Mitigation Schedule would be secured by the dDCO.</li> <li>ii. Please identify any aspect of the proposed mitigation that is not specifically secured by the dDCO Requirements and provide full justification for the omission.</li> <li>iii. Please explain the procedure and timeline for the approval of the CEMPs and scope for consultation with the local authority within that process.</li> <li>iv. How would any consultation process, for example, in relation to the Noise and Vibration Management Plan be secured by the dDCO?</li> </ul>
DCO.1.67	Applicant	<p>The OEMP, paragraph 3.2.10, states that in preparing the CEMP for the main works, the main works contractor or the maintenance authority shall update the full REAC table for the main works. Where actions are modified, this should be justified as being consistent with the principle of the OEMP to the satisfaction of Highways England.</p> <p>How can that degree of flexibility be justified in this case and should the local planning authority not be consulted upon any changes to the REAC tables?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.68	Applicant	<p>The Additional Submission document 1, Appendix 5.1, for Works No 1A (vi) indicates that the construction and installation of a new variable message sign would be controlled by means of the reference to the same within Table 3.3b of the OEMP which in turn is secured by Requirement 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. However, would that provide a sufficiently precise and satisfactory safeguard in relation to the erection of such a sign at the western end of the WHS or should that be made the subject of a specific Requirement?</li> <li>ii. Please explain in practice what is meant by the reference to <i>"no road sign will be set higher than the top of the adjacent cutting"</i>.</li> <li>iii. The Additional Submission document 1 also indicates that, if changes were made to the position of the Motorway Signal Mark 4 (MS4s), it would still be the intention of the Applicant not to locate them within the WHS. However, are there satisfactory safeguards within the dDCO to prevent that occurrence or should that be made the subject of a specific Requirement?</li> </ul>
DCO.1.69	Applicant	<p>The Additional Submission document 1, Appendix 5.1, for Work No. 1C (i) describes it by reference to an 'illustrative' Rights of Way and Access Plan.</p> <p>Should that description also include reference to the relevant Engineering Section drawing referred to in the Appendix to that</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		document as providing the means of control to regulate the location/dimension of the work?
DCO.1.70	Applicant	<p>In relation to Additional Submission document 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Does the description of preliminary works, paragraph 2.1, coincide with that in the dDCO, paragraph 2.4.1?</li> <li>ii. The preliminary works contractors would be required to prepare the Preliminary Works CEMPS for their works for approval by and in consultation with Highways England. For the main works, paragraph 2.5.2, provides that in preparing the CEMP, the main works contractor must consult with Wiltshire Council and the Environment Agency. Why is there no provision for consultation for the Preliminary Works CEMP?</li> <li>iii. How is it anticipated that the main works CEMP consultation and approval process would operate in practice?</li> </ul>
DCO.1.71	Applicant	<p>Additional Submission 3, paragraph 3.1.2, confirms that certain preliminary works contractors would be required to prepare a noise and vibration management plan (PW-NO13), together with vibration management actions (PW-NO14) and noise monitoring (PW-NO15).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain why the preparation of the management plan (PW-NO13) does not require consultation with the local planning authority.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Why there is no requirement to carry out the works in accordance with the approved noise and vibration management plan unlike the heritage management plan (PW-CH1)?</li> <li>iii. Please explain the reporting procedure for the noise monitoring (PW-NO15).</li> <li>iv. How would adherence to and enforceability of the provisions set out in PW-NO13, PW-NO14 and PW-NO15 be ensured?</li> </ul>
DCO.1.72	Applicant	<p>Additional Submission document 3, paragraph 5.1.2, indicates that failure to prepare and/or comply with the phase specific CEMPs and/or management plans would be a breach of the OEMP and would constitute a breach of Requirement 4.</p> <p>Although, for example MW-G7, states that management plans shall be prepared for certain specified topics please identify where it states that they would be implemented and adhered to and where a timeline for that process can be found?</p>
DCO.1.73	Applicant	<p>Additional Submission document 3, paragraph 6.1.2, indicates that the preliminary works would be exempted from, for example, Requirements 8, 9 and 10.</p> <p>Please explain further why it is not necessary for these works to be subject to those or similar Requirements.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.74	Wiltshire Council	<p>The OEMP provides for Highways England to approve the CEMP and other management plans defined within the OEMP, detailed schemes required by the OEMP and variations to these.</p> <p>Please comment on the proposed system for approval of these various matters and identify any specific concerns and/or means whereby consultation with the Council could be secured by the dDCO.</p>
DCO.1.75	Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain further the need, if any, for additional Requirements to cover historic contamination mitigation measures and remediation work, the dewatering impact assessment and mitigation measures, the groundwater monitoring programme, updated groundwater risk assessment provision for the containment of contaminated runoff, and the treatment of runoff. Please provide draft Requirements for those topic areas for the ExA's consideration.</li> <li>ii. Please explain how the provision of environmental enhancements and opportunities could be secured through the dDCO.</li> </ul>
DCO.1.76	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 1 - Interpretation</b></p> <p>Please clarify whether it is intended that the OEMP proposed to be certified by the Secretary of State is the OEMP submitted as ES document 6.3 and whether this is regarded as a final version rather than a draft.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.77	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 1 - Interpretation</b></p> <p>Why is the definition of "archaeological mitigation works" within the dDCO definition of "preliminary works" not specifically linked to the definition of such works as set out in section 4 of the OAMS?</p>
DCO.1.78	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 1 - Interpretation</b></p> <p>Could the Applicant, by updating Tables 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 of the OAMS against each of the numbered works, be more definitive about which items of archaeological mitigation works would be delivered as part of the "preliminary works" and which would (and/or could) be delivered as part of the main construction works?</p>
DCO.1.79	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 1 - Interpretation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain why the dDCO does not refer to the OAMS.</li> <li>ii. Is it proposed that the OAMS will be superseded by the DAMs during the course of the Examination?</li> </ul>
DCO.1.80	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 3 (1) and (2) – Preparation of detailed design etc</b></p> <p>The Additional Submission document 1 – DCO application 'signposting' document, paragraph 2.3.3, states that "compliance with certain key DCO Plans is secured by DCO Requirement 3". Requirement 3(1) envisages that the detailed design will be developed at a later date and simply requires it to be "compatible" with the works plans and the engineering</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>section drawings. This seems to be at odds with the Explanatory Memorandum, paragraph 10.5.3, which states that <i>"the authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the scheme design shown on certain plans"</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please justify the degree of flexibility sought by Requirement 3 and explain why it does not specify that the authorised development must be required to be carried out in accordance with the scheme design shown on submitted plans, as stated in the Explanatory Memorandum.</li> <li>ii. There is no reference to consultation with the relevant planning authority at that detailed design stage. The reference to consultation with the planning authority on matters related to its functions applies when the Secretary of State is considering amendments to the submitted plans and drawings. Explain why there is no proviso for consultation in relation to the initial detailed design stage and should it be included.</li> <li>iii. Please explain why there is no reference in this Requirement to the Rights of Way and Access Plans.</li> </ul>
DCO.1.81	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 3 (1) and (2) – Preparation of detailed design etc</b></p> <p>The Additional Submission document 1 – DCO application ‘signposting’ document, paragraph 2.4.1, states that <i>"the development consent, if granted, includes a proportionate amount of flexibility, allowing a degree of potential departure from certain aspects of the consented</i></p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>Scheme as shown in certain DCO plans – in this case the Works Plans and the Engineering Section Drawings - as these are the documents which set the constraints by reference to which the limits of deviation are subsequently defined”.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Whilst the need for a degree of flexibility is recognise, given the reliance placed on those Works Plans and Engineering Section Drawings is the absence of detail revealed by them not disproportionate?</li> <li>ii. Please justify why a greater level of detail could not be provided at this stage. For example, in relation to the locations of features such as compounds, tunnel support buildings, green bridges, electricity sub-stations, drainage, retaining structures and wingwalls.</li> <li>iii. Could these plans depict the designated land parcels such as the World Heritage Site (WHS), SSSI, SAC, and SPA with appropriate annotations to demarcate the Private Means of Access?</li> </ul>
DCO.1.82	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 3 (1) and (2) – Preparation of detailed design etc</b></p> <p>Many aspects of the works packages listed in Schedule 1 of the dDCO are referred to being shown “<i>illustratively</i>” on the relevant Works Plans and Rights of Way and Access Plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain why these features are only ‘illustrative’ and precisely what is meant by that term.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		ii. Why can the drawings to be certified not be more specific in the identification of the relevant features that comprise the proposed works?
DCO.1.83	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 3 (1) and (2) – Preparation of detailed design etc</b></p> <p>Requirements 3(1) and 3(2) would allow for the works plans and engineering section drawings which will have been examined as part of the current application, to be changed at a later date without having to follow the statutory process in section 153, Schedule 6 of the PA2008, contrary to Advice Note 15. This provision appears to circumvent the statutory procedures for non-material and material changes to DCOs in the PA2008 by allowing the Secretary of State to approve changes at a later date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain why Advice Note 15, paragraph 17, has not been followed in this respect.</li> <li>ii. Where is the opportunity for properly consulting upon and assessing environmental impacts of such an amendment and for public consultation in the process?</li> </ul>
DCO.1.84	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 3 (1) and (2) – Preparation of detailed design etc</b></p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan includes details that are not referenced in other plans referred to in Requirement 3 of the dDCO (for example landscaping and drainage attenuation details). The ExA is therefore considering the merit in securing delivery of the Environmental</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Masterplan as part of this Requirement such as to have sufficient confidence in its delivery as assessed in the ES. Requirement 3 also uses the term that the detailed design must be "<i>compatible</i>" with the plans referred to within the requirement and the ExA is unclear why this language has been used instead of the design being "<i>in accordance with</i>" the plans.</p> <p>Please comment on both of these points.</p>
DCO.1.85	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The OEMP makes provision for the preparation of a CEMP by the main contractor in consultation with Wiltshire Council and the Environment Agency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain how that would provide adequate control of the content of the CEMPs and how they would be secured, implemented and enforced to reflect the mitigation anticipated for the scheme.</li> <li>ii. Please respond likewise in relation to the preliminary works CEMP and also explain why similar consultation is not required for the preliminary works CEMP.</li> <li>iii. Please explain the means of consultation for the proposed management plans to be appended to the CEMP and how their approval, implementation and enforcement would be achieved.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>iv. Explain why this requirement does not specifically control the provision, approval and implementation of the management plans, working methods and mitigation measures for each of the topics covered in the environmental report and incorporate the measures specified in the ES and Environmental Mitigation Schedule.</p> <p>v. Should these matters not be specifically required by Requirement 4 with the relevant plans listed and/or the relevant topics and mitigation to be covered by the OEMP?</p>
DCO.1.86	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The OEMP indicates that the CEMPs would be prepared for ‘the relevant phase’ of the scheme by the ‘relevant contractor’ which would incorporate the requirements of the OEMP relevant to that phase, and contractors would be required to comply with applicable environmental legislation and any additional environmental controls imposed in the DCO. Each CEMP or update would be prepared in accordance with the principles of the original OEMP and would require approval by ‘The Authority’. The OEMP identifies ‘The Authority’ as Highways England. Given that Highways England might be the author and approver of the CEMPs.</p> <p>How can that approach be justified and assurance provided that appropriate scrutiny would be applied when reviewing documentation which ‘The Authority’ has both produced and approved?</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.1.87	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The Additional Submission document 3 seeks to explain the relationship between the CEMPs and the OEMP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Nevertheless, should dDCO Requirement 4 also require the development to be carried out in accordance with the CEMPs and specifically require that the CEMP itself must include the series of management plans for individual topics listed at MW-G7?</li> <li>ii. Likewise, for the preliminary works OEMP/CEMP(s) should the seven preliminary work CEMPs be defined within Requirement 3 itself?</li> <li>iii. The Additional Submission document 3 also states that just one CEMP is expected to be required for the main works, but if more than one is necessary at a later stage, what provisions are there to secure this?</li> <li>iv. A visual aid of the plans has been provided at section 4 of the Additional Submission document, could this be incorporated within an updated examination version of the OEMP to be certified, for ease of reference and to ensure the version to be certified clearly sets out the relationships between sub-documents?</li> </ul>
DCO.1.88	Applicant	<b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		For the proposed HEMPs: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Should the dDCO also define HEMPs and require their provision?</li> <li>ii. What forms would that plan take and how many HEMPs would there be?</li> <li>iii. Would there be an overall HEMP and sub-HEMPs?</li> <li>iv. What would be the procedure for the approval of "the" HEMP?</li> <li>v. Would HEMPs be provided in relation to the completion of the preliminary works?</li> </ol>
DCO.1.89	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The diagram provided in Figure 1-1 of the Additional Submission document 2 [AS-010] implies that there is a link between the main works Heritage Management Plan, Method Statements and the HEMP. However, Chapter 6 [APP-040] makes no reference to the HEMP or its relevance in terms of the cultural heritage operational effects assessment, and the OAMS does not specify how the HMP, Method Statements, OWSI and SSWSI specifically interact with the HEMP.</p> <p>Please explain how the HEMP would relate to the various archaeological management plans as set out in the OAMS.</p>
DCO.1.90	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Please explain further the justification for the core working hours, site specific working hours, additional working hours and the continuous nature of the tunnelling operation set out in the OEMP.</p> <p>Should these working hours be set out in Requirement 4 to provide clarity and to assist in their enforceability?</p>
DCO.1.91	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please comment generally on the proposed core working hours, the additional hours and the proposed suspension of works for solstices apart from the tunnelling operation, tunnel related activities or transport of tunnel arisings set out in the OEMP and the means whereby these would be monitored and enforced.</li> <li>ii. Please identify any apparent discrepancies and omissions in relation to core working hours.</li> <li>iii. Please comment upon whether any core working hours should be specifically identified by way of a requirement in the dDCO.</li> <li>iv. Please comment generally on the proposed means of preparation, implementation, monitoring and enforcement of the CEMPs and management plans as provided for by the OEMP.</li> </ul>
DCO.1.92	Environment Agency	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain in detail your concerns in relation to the deficiencies of the OEMP including those in relation to the</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>drainage strategy, the River Avon floodplain, and the risk of impact on the Rivers Till and Avon during construction.</p> <p>ii. Please state exactly what changes would be needed to the OEMP and/or dDCO Requirements for those concerns to be overcome.</p>
DCO.1.93	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The OEMP, Table 3.2b D-CH1 to DCH13, sets out various action/commitments including (D-CH14) that there would be no tunnel shafts within the WHS and the responsible person is stated to be the main works contractor.</p> <p>Should any of these commitments such as the provision of visual screening earth bunds (D-CH1) and those actions relating to lighting (DCH8-12) include provision for consultation and/or be the subject of specific Requirements in the dDCO?</p>
DCO.1.94	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The OEMP, Table 3.2b (D-LAN2), provides a commitment that there would be a 1.5m high environmental barrier along the southern aspect of the River Till viaduct westbound bridge deck.</p> <p>Should this be the subject of a specific requirement in the dDCO and include provision in relation to consultation and/or approval of design?</p>
DCO.1.95	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The OEMP, Table 3.2b (D-LAN2), provides a commitment that the provision of fencing and surfacing within the WHS shall be developed in consultation with the National Trust, Historic England, English Heritage, and Wiltshire Council and approved by The Authority.</p> <p>Should this be the subject of a specific Requirement in the dDCO?</p>
DCO.1.96	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 5 - Archaeology</b></p> <p>Requirement 5 makes provision for the authorised development to be carried out in accordance with the detailed archaeological mitigation strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Should that Requirement also set out the means whereby that strategy must be prepared, submitted to and approved by the relevant authority before the commencement of any work?</li> <li>ii. Why do the Requirements not specifically provide for the approval of and the carrying out of development in accordance with the other proposed management/mitigation strategies? Please explain this omission.</li> <li>iii. Please consider whether the reference to a detailed archaeological and heritage outreach and education programme within the detailed archaeological mitigation strategy should be included in Requirement 5?</li> </ul>
DCO.1.97	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Requirement 5 - Archaeology</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain why a detailed archaeological and heritage outreach and education programme within the detailed archaeological mitigation strategy should be included in Requirement 5 and provide an amended draft of that Requirement showing how that might be achieved.</li> <li>ii. Please suggest how any additional mitigation required to minimise the adverse impacts of the scheme on the setting of asset groups in the western part of the WHS might be secured by the dDCO.</li> </ul>
DCO.1.98	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 6 – Protected species</b></p> <p>The Environment Agency states that Requirement 6 should be for both the permanent and temporary works.</p> <p>Please confirm that to be the agreed position and indicate whether any and, if so, what changes to the draft requirement are necessary to reflect this.</p>
DCO.1.99	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 7 – Contaminated land</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Should this requirement include provision for the submission of the risk assessment once completed to the relevant authority?</li> <li>ii. Should this Requirement contain a timeline for approval of the scheme/programme and for remedial measures to be carried out</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>in accordance with a timetable agreed as part of the approved scheme?</p> <p>iii. Please comment on the Environment Agency's proposed additional requirements relating to a strategy for dealing with risk from contaminated land from the historic uses and the submission and approval of a verification report. Please indicate whether the inclusion of requirements along those lines are agreed and, if not, why not.</p>
DCO.1.100	Environment Agency	<p><b>Requirement 7 – Contaminated land</b></p> <p>i. Please explain further the need for the dDCO to include specific Requirements for further investigation, risk assessment, remediation and verification of areas identified as having potentially contaminative past uses and the submission and approval of a verification report.</p> <p>ii. Explain why Requirement 7, as drafted, is regarded as being insufficient provide a safeguard in relation to all relevant aspects of contaminated land and groundwater and submit any alternative or additional Requirements covering this topic in draft form.</p>
DCO.1.101	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 8 - Landscaping</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please amend to include as part of the elements of the landscaping scheme set out in Requirement 8(2) a timetable for carrying out the agreed scheme.
DCO.1.102	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 8 - Landscaping</b></p> <p>Why does Requirement 8(2)(b) only specify "<i>noise fences and walls</i>" as opposed to fences or walls designed for other purposes?</p>
DCO.1.103	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 8 - Landscaping</b></p> <p>Please explain why the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan itself [APP-267] is not specifically referred to as part of dDCO Requirement 8? In particular, there are maintenance obligations in section 13 of [APP-267] which the ExA consider may be appropriately set out or referred to specifically in the Requirement itself.</p>
DCO.1.104	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 9 – Traffic management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please consider whether this condition should state the topics to be covered in the plan including items a) to j) listed in Table 3.2b of the OEMP and re-draft in in that form.</li> <li>ii. Please re-draft Requirement 9(2) to read "<i>The traffic management plan approved under sub-paragraph 9(1) must be implemented during the construction of the authorised development</i>".</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		iii. Should there be an additional Requirement designed to control the use of site access points for haul roads and traffic management measures where the crossing of public roads is required?
DCO.1.105	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Requirement 9 – Traffic management</b></p> i. Please comment generally in relation to the means whereby by proposed traffic management control measures would be secured by Requirement 9.                     ii. Please identify any additional traffic control measures that need to be enforced by way of a specific Requirement in the dDCO or by any other means.
DCO.1.106	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 10 - Drainage</b></p> Please consider whether reference to a timetable for carrying out the drainage system works needs to be included in this Requirement.
DCO.1.107	Environment Agency	<p><b>Requirement 10 - Drainage</b></p> i. Please comment generally as regards the provisions in the OEMP and drainage strategy and the means whereby the agreement of the detailed design of the drainage infrastructure, monitoring and maintenance could be secured by the dDCO.

ExQ1		
Question to:	Question:	
		ii. Please submit with reasons any modifications or additions to the drainage strategy or other Requirements that are considered to be necessary.
<b>Schedule 11 – Protective Provisions</b>		
DCO.1.108	Applicant	Please provide an update as to the present state of negotiations with the Statutory Undertakers and revised Protective Provisions where appropriate?
DCO.1.109	Applicant	Please indicate whether the terms of the Protective Provisions set out in Schedule 11 are agreed and, if not, what are the areas of disagreement?
DCO.1.110	Environment Agency Esso Petroleum Company Ltd	Please indicate whether the terms of the Protective Provisions set out in Schedule 11 are agreed and, if not, what are the areas of disagreement?
<b>Fg.1</b>	<b>Flood risk, groundwater protection, geology and land contamination</b>	
Fg.1.1	Applicant	<b>Geology and soils</b> i. Notwithstanding the analyses undertaken on cores from specific locations ([APP-048] paragraph 10.6.74); being uranium bearing materials, would there still be a potential for the emission of radon

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>from the chalk materials (which do not appear to have been directly assessed, ie through inherent variability)?</p> <p>ii. What mitigation would be necessary and how would this be secured through the DCO?</p>
Fg.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Geology and soils</b></p> <p>i. Would the operational tunnel need to be considered a more confined environment, where the risk posed by the potential accumulation of radon is a greater risk to human health (end users and maintenance workers)?</p> <p>ii. What mitigation would be necessary and how would this be secured through the DCO?</p>
Fg.1.3	Applicant	<p><b>Geology and soils</b></p> <p>i. Has consideration has been given to the provision of basic radon protection measures on a precautionary basis during construction and operation?</p> <p>ii. How would this be secured through the DCO?</p>
Fg.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>Geology and soils</b></p> <p>i. Can the Applicant explain why there is no reference as part of PW-GEO1 or PWGEO2 in the OEMP to the conceptual site models</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(CSMs) which were developed for the specific spatial work areas within the scheme.</p> <p>ii. Should the subsequent GI works be based on the CSMs and specifically cited in the OEMP and or the DCO?</p>
Fg.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>Geology and soils</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 10: Geology and soils [APP-048] identifies that the risk of discovering further solution features is higher than previously anticipated.</p> <p>i. Notwithstanding the information in section 10.6.21, could the Applicant provide further detail regarding the approach and mitigation measures involved should 'open voids' in the phosphatic chalk be encountered during the construction phase of the scheme, particularly during the tunnelling process?</p> <p>ii. How would any mitigation measures be secured through the DCO?</p>
Fg.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>Geology and soils</b></p> <p>In the Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments set out in the OEMP [APP-187] the sequence jumps from MW-GEO9 to MW-GEO10. Please clarify whether MW-GEO9 is missing or if MW-GOE10 should be renumbered?</p>
Fg.1.7	Applicant	<p><b>Contaminated land</b></p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Please provide greater clarity as to the strategy for dealing with risk from contaminated land beyond what is set out in section 10.8 of [APP-048] and PW-GEO1, PW-GEO2 and MW-GEO1-MW-GEO10 of the OEMP [APP-187]. In responding, please take account of the comments raised by the Environment Agency in [RR-2060].</p>
Fg.1.8	<p>Applicant            Environment Agency            Wiltshire Council</p>	<p><b>Contaminated land</b></p> <p>Requirement 7 requires that the Local Planning Authority and the Environment Agency are informed in the event that any previously unidentified contaminated land (including ground water) is found during the construction of the development. Subsequently the Undertaker must assess what, if any, remediation is necessary, this must be approved by the Local Planning Authority and the Environment Agency and then implemented.</p> <p>Is it necessary to amend the wording to provide a timescale in which the Local Planning Authority and the Environment Agency should be informed and/or to prevent further construction works being carried out in the area where the contamination has been found until the approval has been secured?</p>
Fg.1.9	Applicant	<p><b>Land and groundwater contamination</b></p> <p>The Tunnel Arising's Mitigation Strategy in Appendix 12.1 of the ES [APP-285] sets out that additives are to be introduced at the cutting face in the tunnel boring process to provide lubrication. It states that migration of</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>contaminants leached from materials placed at the surface may travel rapidly downwards into groundwater through fracture networks in the chalk providing little time for natural attenuation. The assessment of residual risk is acknowledged to be an ongoing process and discussions with the Environment Agency is planned.</p> <p>Considering the comments and queries posed by the Environment Agency [RR-2060] what is the planned response/actions and how can the ExA have confidence that remediation strategies and risk assessments will ensure the risks are adequately mitigated against if the extent of the risks are not fully defined that this stage?</p>
Fg.1.10	Applicant	<p><b>Combined effects</b></p> <p>It is noted that there is no clear discussion or reference to the interaction between geology and soils (Chapter 10), groundwater (Chapter 11 – Road Drainage and the Water Environment) and material assets and waste (Chapter 12).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Can the Applicant explain how the interaction between these closely aligned aspects has been considered as it does not appear to be given particular prominence in Chapter 15 of the ES where 'combined effects' are considered. For example, the consideration of groundwater levels within the scheme extents (within the differing geological facies) and the likely dewatering required during construction and operation of the proposed development.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		ii. In addition, what consideration has been given to the impedance of groundwater flow via the construction of the twin bore tunnel and potential seepage into the tunnel bores, once constructed?
Fg.1.11	Applicant	<p><b>Geology and groundwater</b></p> <p>Groundwater movement is (at least in part) a function of the underlying geology, therefore this matter is relevant to ES Chapter 10 (Geology and Soils) as well as ES Chapter 11 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment). The Bored Tunnel Limits of Deviation Plan [APP-019] depicts the Limits of Deviation for the bored tunnel and includes a longitudinal section of the proposed tunnel showing levels (metres above Ordnance Datum) of the upper limit of deviation for the finished road level and for the crown of the tunnel. The postulated groundwater levels would appear to be a potential issue with respect to the construction process.</p> <p>Can the Applicant clarify the hydrogeological characteristics of the underlying chalk materials and any likely mitigation measures eg dewatering?</p>
Fg.1.12	Applicant	<p><b>Geology</b></p> <p>Section 10.8.3 of ES Chapter 10 (Geology and Soils) specifies that a protective structure would be installed to protect the Esso oil pipeline against construction impact and the effects of ground settlement of the new road.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>It is acknowledged that targeted ground investigation works in this area have not been completed to inform the design, could the Applicant indicate what form this structure is likely to take and the construction of it (or what options would be considered)?</p>
Fg.1.13	Applicant	<p><b>Road drainage strategy</b></p> <p>Chapter 2 of the ES states (within 2.3.45) that drainage from the proposed tunnel would be conveyed by a carrier pipe to an 'impounding sump' which would then be removed from site by tanker. ES Appendix 11.3 Road Drainage Strategy [APP-281] provides a description and schematic of this feature. However, the location of this feature within the tunnel and the emptying point (potentially at surface in the WHS) are not currently shown on any plans.</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide further detailed information on this feature, its associated infrastructure, the resilience measures for the pumped system and the likely approach to transferring drainage waters to tankering, and how these measures will be secured and delivered as part of the DCO (with reference to the Works Plans)?</p>
Fg.1.14	Applicant	<p><b>Road drainage strategy</b></p> <p>The proposed drainage system from the proposed tunnel allows for water to be stored in an impounding sump but also allows for diversion to the highway network (depending on water quality) through the Operator using a control valve to switch flows.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Can the Applicant provide further details on the monitoring schedule, testing regime and thresholds to trigger the diversion of flows to each system?
Fg.1.15	Applicant	<p><b>Ground conditions</b></p> <p>ES Appendix 10.1 Preliminary Ground Investigation Report [APP-273] references a 'Ground Investigation Gap Analysis Report', produced by AmW, in 2016.</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide a copy of this report to assist in the decision-making process highlighting with more clarity areas of uncertainty with respect to ground conditions?</p>
Fg.1.16	Applicant	<p><b>Ground conditions</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 10 (Geology and Soils) sets out the monitoring works relating to geology and soils at Paragraph 10.8.19. This includes an undertaking that any areas restored to an agricultural land use would be subject to a 5-year period of condition monitoring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What determines if land is considered agricultural and subject to monitoring?</li> <li>ii. Will other land areas subject to restoration/landscaping be subject to similar monitoring?</li> <li>iii. Is a plan depicting all areas to be covered by monitoring efforts available to determine the extents of the monitoring regime?</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		iv. How will ground conditions be monitored, what would trigger any remedial works, and how would this be secured as part of the DCO?
Fg.1.17	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Additional water reports (referred to at the Preliminary Meeting)</b></p> <p>If not fully addressed in the relevant Statements of Common Ground, could the relevant parties provide an update on progress with the provision, and initial assessment of, each of the additional reports which have been provided? Please set out areas of common and uncommon ground with reasons.</p>
Fg.1.18	Wiltshire Council Environment Agency	<p><b>Flood risk</b></p> <p>Please set out your assessment of the Proposed Development in respect of the flood risk policy, including the application of the Sequential and Exception Tests, in the NPSNN. In responding to this question, please refer to the Applicant's evidence highlighting in particular any areas of disagreement.</p>
Fg.1.19	Applicant	<p><b>Flood risk</b></p> <p>The OEMP [APP-187] sets out specific measures for hoarding and fencing in areas at risk of flooding, explicitly referring to the River Till floodplain. Should this be expanded to specifically also apply to the River Avon floodplain and if not, why?</p>
Fg.1.20	Applicant	<p><b>Flood risk</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>The RR from Wiltshire Council [RR-2365] raises a concern that the infiltration systems are to be designed for 100yrs + 30% climate change increase, but the pluvial modelling of general surface water runoff allows for a 40% increase. The Ground Water Risk Assessment [APP-282] allows for an increase in recharge of 20%. There are interdependencies between these in terms of flood risk and the design approach for drainage.</p> <p>Please provide an explanation for the apparent inconsistencies and evidence to reassure the ExA that this has not resulted in any under or over estimates in the other studies.</p>
Fg.1.21	Applicant	<p><b>Flood risk and drainage</b></p> <p>Please identify where any increases in runoff compared to the existing road drainage design is anticipated and set out how this would be managed/mitigated.</p>
Fg.1.22	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Flood risk and drainage</b></p> <p>You have raised a number of matters in respect of the proposed use of a culvert in the drainage modelling, including that it would be contrary to the Council's policy on culverting.</p> <p>Please provide a copy of this policy and indicate its status in planning decision making?</p>
Fg.1.23	Applicant	<p><b>Flood risk and drainage</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The RR from Wiltshire Council [RR-2365] raises specific concerns in respect of the use of a proposed culvert. Please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Details of this part of the proposed drainage infrastructure.</li> <li>ii. Evidence as to why this option was considered to be the best/most appropriate.</li> <li>iii. Details of what other options were considered and why these were discounted.</li> <li>iv. A commentary as to how, if at all, Wiltshire Council's policy on culverting was taken into account.</li> <li>v. Details of what consideration has been given to the risk of blockages, and how could this be mitigated and secured in the DCO.</li> <li>vi. Details of what arrangements would be put in place for monitoring and maintenance of this feature.</li> </ul>
Fg.1.24	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Water quality</b></p> <p>With reference to the applicant's Water Framework Compliance assessment [APP-280], please expand on your concerns that the proposed use of a culvert may be against 'many' of the requirements of the Water Framework Directive.</p>
Fg.1.25	Applicant	<p><b>Flood risk</b></p>



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Please provide a response to the specific concerns/requests for clarification set out in paragraphs 66-69 of the RR from Wiltshire Council [RR-2365].
Fg.1.26	Applicant Historic England Environment Agency Wiltshire Council Mark Bush (on behalf of Blick Mead Archaeologist Team)	<b>Blick Mead – hydrology</b>  i. Please provide an update on the hydrological monitoring at Blick Mead and what additional investigation and monitoring has been undertaken to date.  ii. Please provide an update on the discussion about how this data is to be used and the implications for the tiered assessment.
Fg.1.27	Applicant Historic England Environment Agency Wiltshire Council Mark Bush (on behalf of Blick Mead Archaeologist Team)	<b>Blick Mead – hydrology</b>  i. Please provide an update on the provision of water meters at Blick Mead and the related data.  ii. What timescales are necessary to secure an appropriate baseline and, if this has not been completed, what are the implications and how could any mitigation be secured through the DCO?
Fg.1.28	Applicant Historic England Environment Agency	<b>Blick Mead – hydrology</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Wiltshire Council Mark Bush (on behalf of Blick Mead Archaeologist Team)	i. What consideration has been given to hydrological monitoring (and any associated remediation, if required) at Blick Mead during the construction and operational phases of the proposed development.  ii. How would this be secured through the DCO?
Fg.1.29	Applicant	<b>Groundwater</b>  Please provide a response/commentary on the detailed points raised in the RR from Wiltshire Council [RR-2365] in respect of groundwater (paragraphs 71-73).
Fg.1.30	Applicant	<b>Drainage and groundwater</b>  Please provide details of the maintenance regime for the drainage treatments areas and how this would be secured as part of the DCO.
Fg.1.31	Applicant	<b>Drainage</b>  Please provide details of the proposal for the conveyance of the drainage water to the drainage treatment areas.
Fg.1.32	Applicant Environment Agency	<b>Drainage and the Outline Environmental Management Plan</b>  In [RR-2060] the Environment Agency set out a number of concerns in respect of the drainage strategy and the OEMP.  Can the Applicant provide comments on these concerns and can both parties set out any further agreement which has been reached on these

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>matters and indicate what, if any, updates to the specified components of the OEMP (MW-WAT1, MW-WAT2, MW-WAT7, and MW-WAT9) have been made as a result of further discussions?</p>
Fg.1.33	Applicant	<p><b>Drainage</b></p> <p>Wiltshire Council [RR-2365] raise a concern that crate storage systems are proposed as part of the road drainage strategy. Please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Details of the locations and extents to which this infrastructure is likely to be utilised.</li> <li>ii. Details of what access, monitoring and maintenance arrangements would be put in place and how would these be secured.</li> <li>iii. Details of what arrangements would be put in place to mitigate a scenario where the system was not functioning as designed.</li> <li>iv. Details of what alternatives were considered and why have these been discounted.</li> </ul>
Fg.1.34	Applicant	<p><b>Drainage, groundwater and contamination</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What capacity would there be within the road drainage system to accommodate pollution spills?</li> <li>ii. What consideration has been given to designing the drainage treatment areas to be capable of holding any contaminated discharges before entering the infiltration zone?</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		iii. Why are such parameters not set out in the drainage strategy [APP-281]?
Fg.1.35	Applicant	<p><b>Drainage, groundwater and contamination</b></p> i. What risk assessment has been carried out as to the propensity for the infiltration within the drainage treatment areas to be restricted by a build-up of sediment? ii. How could this be mitigated and how could such mitigation be secured through the DCO?
Fg.1.36	Applicant	<p><b>Drainage, groundwater and contamination</b></p> A proprietary treatment system is proposed as part of the drainage treatment areas. i. Please provide details of this system including how particulates and chemical contaminants will be treated. ii. Please also set out the monitoring and maintenance arrangements for the system.
Fg.1.37	Applicant	<p><b>Flood risk and drainage</b></p> i. What consideration has been given to the effect of the road drainage (including, but not limited to the drainage treatment areas) on the surrounding land in terms of the impact on existing overland flows?

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		ii. Is any mitigation necessary and how would this be secured through the DCO?
Fg.1.38	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Flood risk and drainage</b></p> <p>The NPSNN requires that the DCO (or any associated planning obligations) need to make provision for the adoption and maintenance of any SuDS. Row 5.100 in Table A1 [APP-294] indicates that the dDCO includes a draft Requirement (10) relating to drainage. As currently drafted the Requirement does not make any reference to adoption or maintenance.</p> <p>How will future maintenance be secured, for example should the Requirement be expanded to incorporate this?</p>
Fg.1.39	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p>In the dDCO, Requirement 10 requires consultation with the planning authority in respect of the details of the drainage system.</p> <p>Should this be expanded to include consultation with the Environment Agency?</p>
Fg.1.40	Applicant	<p><b>Drainage</b></p> <p>Please provide assurance to the ExA that appropriate drainage arrangements during the construction phase will be secured, including details of phasing and how this would be secured through the DCO?</p>
Fg.1.41	Applicant	<p><b>Dewatering and abstraction</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide an update on any proposals which would require dewatering and consumptive abstraction.</li> <li>ii. Please respond to the Environment Agency's concerns on these matters and the proposed disapplication of abstraction licencing set out in [RR-2060].</li> </ul>
Fg.1.42	Applicant Environment Agency	<p><b>Protective Provisions – drainage authorities</b></p> <p>Please provide an update as to any progress in agreeing the relevant Protective Provisions?</p>
HW.1	<b>Health and wellbeing</b>	
HW.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology</b></p> <p>The assessment methodology excludes impacts where there are less than five properties affected (Para 13.4.2 of Chapter 13 of the ES) [APP051].          On what guidance is this based?</p>
HW.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology</b></p> <p>Can you confirm whether you have considered impacts on individual properties? The study area for 'private assets' would appear to only include "<i>land parcels required to accommodate the Scheme during</i></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<i>construction and/or operation"</i> (para 13.5.5 Chapter 13 of the ES) [APP051].
HW.1.3	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology</b></p> <p>In light of the proximity of the proposed construction compound to the rear of residential properties on the east side of Countess Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Can you explain whether the noise reading taken at C6 was on the road frontage or to the rear of 22 Countess Road or to the east facing façade of this property?</li> <li>ii. If the readings were taken on the road frontage what are the implications for noise to the rear of the properties during construction and operation?</li> </ul>
HW.1.4	Applicant Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Methodology</b></p> <p>In chapter 9 para 9.3.4 it is stated that you agreed the location of the recording positions to assess noise.</p> <p>Can you provide notes from the respective meetings held on 2 July and 7 August 2018?</p>
HW.1.5	Wiltshire Council Public Health England	<p><b>Methodology</b></p> <p>In Chapter 13 13.9.83 [APP-051] the Applicant seeks to rely on Best Practicable Means within the OEMP and the use of temporary noise barriers "<i>where possible</i>" to safeguard amenity.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Do you agree this is an acceptable method of protecting amenity and consequently public health?</li> <li>ii. Do you consider the phraseology sufficiently robust?</li> <li>iii. If you don't agree, what would you consider necessary to safeguard amenity and public health?</li> </ul>
HW.1.6	<p>Pippa Richardson, Rebecca Lock, Stephen Kent, The Druid Order of Avebury, Arch Druid Wayne Hughes, Loyal Arthurian Warband (Druid Order), Dan Lobb, Honouring the Ancient Dead (HAD), Sacred Grove Western Isles &amp; Astronomical Druid Order, Council of British Druid Orders, Amelia ap Ellis, Anne Patterson, Jon Eldude, Neo Rose, Richard Gaskin</p>	<p><b>Equalities Act</b></p> <p>The Equality Act 2010 s149(1) requires the ExA and ultimately the Secretary of State, to have due regard to the public sector equality duty - the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (eg religion/belief) and persons who do not share it.</p> <p>Could you please provide to the ExA a summary of the structure and basis of the religion/belief system that you or the people you represent have and the implications you consider the development would have for you and your religion/belief as a Druid?</p>
HW.1.7	Gary Bavin	<p><b>Equalities Act</b></p> <p>The Equality Act 2010 s149(1) requires the ExA and ultimately the Secretary of State, to have due regard to the public sector equality duty - the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (eg religion/belief) and persons who do not share it.</p> <p>Could you please provide to the ExA a summary of the structure and basis of the religion/belief system that you or the people you represent have and the implications you consider the development would have for you and your religion/belief as a Wycan Witch?</p>
HW.1.8	Elizabeth Fletcher, Mark A Jenkins, Mr Stephen R Pugh, Peter Tagg, Poppy Fee, Rita Bryant, Kathy Mingo, Karoline Smith, Debi Lysaght, Mrs Kerry Gaskin, Wendy Darling	<p><b>Equalities Act</b></p> <p>The Equality Act 2010 s149(1) requires the ExA and ultimately the Secretary of State, to have due regard to the public sector equality duty - the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (eg religion/belief) and persons who do not share it.</p> <p>Could you please provide to the ExA a summary of the structure and basis of the religion/belief system that you or the people you represent have and the implications you consider the development would have for you and your religion/belief as a Pagan?</p>
HW.1.9	Carl Burrows, Karen Meager, Katherine Challis, Craig Penfield	<p><b>Equalities Act</b></p> <p>The Equality Act 2010 s149 (1) requires the ExA and ultimately the Secretary of State, to have due regard to the public sector equality duty - the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (eg religion/belief) and persons who do not share it.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>Could you please provide to the ExA a summary of the structure and basis of the religion/belief system that you or the people you represent have and the implications you consider the development would have for you and your religion/belief?</p>
HW.1.10	Applicant	<p><b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b>            Equality Impact Assessment of ES 7.3            What groups do you regard as having protected characteristics and how does the approach to the scheme design comply with the Equalities Act?</p>
HW.1.11	Applicant	<p><b>Disability Discrimination</b>            [RR-1532] expresses concern that access to the site could have adverse effects on health due to restrictions to access to the site.            How have you considered this aspect of the proposal?</p>
HW.1.12	Applicant	<p><b>Disability Discrimination/Equalities Duty</b>            In light of the comments from different interest groups regarding access to the area through the PRow network can you provide an explanation as to how you have sought to address the competing interests of the different user groups in coming to the conclusions you have?</p>
HW.1.13	Applicant	<p><b>Disability Discrimination/Equalities Duty</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>In order to fully understand how the public would be able to use the various PRowS during construction and once the road is operational please provide details of the proposed finishes of the different routes across the site and where this is stipulated to be carried out and when within the dDCO or OEMP.</p> <p>English Heritage in [RR-1725] request details to include the surfaces and extent of proposed Non-Motorised User (NMU)/PRow routes, fencing, signage, lighting, street furniture, the portals, articulation and form of the cutting and walls and the green bridge (within the WHS) design and any other significant changes/introductions.</p>
HW.1.14	Applicant	<p><b>Equalities Duty</b></p> <p>A significant number of RR express concern in respect of the loss of the view of the Stones from the A303 and the impact this would have on their enjoyment of the area. They go on to suggest that this would prevent a view of the stones without having to pay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Is this correct?</li> </ul> <p>In light the duty to consider Human Rights and to comply with the Equalities Act:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. How has the loss of the view of the Stones been taken into account?</li> <li>iii. How have the impacts the people perceive this would have on their wellbeing been taken into account?</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		iv. How have the impacts on the the Outstanding Universal Value accredited to the site been taken into account?
HW.1.15	Applicant	<p><b>Impact on Health and Wellbeing</b></p> <p>There is a recognition that access to recreation and the outdoors is beneficial to human health. The Trail Riders Fellowship have expressed concern that the implications of the current proposals would result in a negative impact upon the Rights of Way Network; which implicitly could adversely affect human health.</p> <p>How do you respond to these concerns?</p>
HW.1.16	Applicant	<p><b>Impact on the Stonehenge Community</b></p> <p>[RR-1703] expresses concerns that the grassing of the A303, the planned reduction of byways open to all traffic (BOAT) to restricted byways/footpaths, render impossible the 'since time immemorial' gatherings meaning equitable access to the WHS would be lost.</p> <p>How do you consider the proposal responds to these concerns?</p>
HW.1.17	Applicant	<p><b>Impact on the Stonehenge Community</b></p> <p>Concerns have been expressed (eg [RR-1731]) about the potential adverse effects of the proposal on the community of general public, pilgrims, travellers, Druid Orders etc. who celebrate regularly the Solstices, Equinoxes, solar, lunar and seasonal ceremonies on the WHS.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		How has the proposal taken into consideration the views of these groups and how do you consider the proposals address these concerns?
HW.1.18	Applicant Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Disability Discrimination</b></p> <p>Concern has been expressed [RR-1731] in respect of ongoing disabled access to the WHS considering it continues to be threatened if the tunnel is approved. In light of the failed balancing exercises by Wiltshire Council which resulted in excluding disabled via an experimental traffic regulation order (ETRO) quashed by Justice Swift on 21st December 2018, there is a fear that WHS Stakeholder Management WHSSM would now apply again for a Permanent WHS TRO despite Judge Behrens' ruling in 2009 and reinforced by the 2011 Public Inquiry Decision by Alan Boyland BEng (Hons).</p> <p>How do you respond to these concerns?</p>
HW.1.19	Applicant	<p><b>Impact on Health and Wellbeing</b></p> <p>The scheme claims to be "<i>Creating public rights of way</i>", but from a recreational motorised user or a horse and carriage drivers perspective it seeks to extinguish long held public access rights.</p> <p>How do you respond to these concerns?</p>
HW.1.20	Applicant	<p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <p>In light of the concerns expressed by a substantial number of RRs about adverse impacts, can you identify where you have set out compliance with</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		the terms of the NPPF in ensuring you have considered reasonable opportunities to deliver environmental and social benefits?
HW.1.21	Helen Hatt	<p><b>Disability Discrimination</b></p> <p>Please provide further detail on why you consider the scheme discriminates against disabled visitors and in your view restricts rights of access by disabled parties to the WHS.</p>
HW.1.22	Applicant	<p><b>Health and Wellbeing/Noise</b></p> <p>The scheme proposes a construction compound to the east of several residential properties on Countess Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What mitigation would be in place to ensure that the residential amenity of these properties would be safeguarded throughout the project?</li> <li>ii. How is this delivered through the dDCO?</li> </ul>
HW.1.23	Applicant	<p><b>Health and Wellbeing</b></p> <p>The Lords Walk is a pedestrian connection from the north side of Amesbury but to the south of the A303 going through what is called Amesbury Country Park. This creates a pleasant connection alongside the River Avon and crosses the A303.</p> <p>How has the effect on this area been addressed and what regard has there been for the benefits currently enjoyed by walkers and other users?</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>		
	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
HW.1.24	Applicant	<p><b>Health and Wellbeing/Equalities</b></p> <p>Concern has been expressed about the potential impact upon the observation of the winter solstice.</p> <p>Could you provide evidence of what impact there would be during construction and post construction on the ability to continue to observe these rituals?</p>
<b>LV.1</b>	<b>Landscape and visual</b>	
<p><b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual.</b></p> <p>The professional assessments of effect made in the ES are not necessarily accepted and may be questioned later in the Examination.</p>		
LV.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Para 7.3.16(e): Visual Receptors</b></p> <p>Why have vehicle occupants not been included as a category?</p>
LV.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Para 7.6.4: Landform</b></p> <p>It is stated that Parsonage Down NNR is only 80m AOD. Is this correct?</p>
LV.1.3	Applicant	<p><b>Para 7.6.121: Prominent ridges and panoramic views</b></p> <p>i. Where is Windmill Hill?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		ii. Has full account been taken of the possibility of significant views from elevated viewpoints both within and outside the study area, such as Beacon Hill and the location of the nearby radio masts?
LV.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>Para 7.6.137: Oatlands Hill</b></p> <p>Why was the viewpoint at Hill Farm Cottages been chosen to illustrate views across to Longbarrow Roundabout from elevated landform at Oatlands Hill?</p> <p>The summit of Oatlands Hill is higher at 128m AOD, as against 120m AOD at Hill Farm Cottages where VP10 was taken, and it is nearer the new junction.</p>
LV.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>Para 7.9.6 et seq: Landscape construction</b></p> <p>Has thought been given to the phasing of the earthworks to allow early landscape planting, thus going some way towards mitigating adverse landscape effects during construction?</p>
LV.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>Para 7.9.79: Significant adverse landscape effects remaining at 15 years</b></p> <p>This para notes that significant adverse effects would only remain for LLCA 05 – Upper Till Floodplains and Meadows (large adverse) due to the continued presence of the River Till viaduct. However, the permanent presence of the Countess flyover points to a higher adverse rating than given for LLCA 20 – Countess Farm Dry Valleys and LLCA 21 – Avon</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Valley Slopes. Greater mitigation through attention to detailed design should be considered here.
LV.1.7	Applicant	<p><b>Para 7.9.79: LLCA 11 – Oatlands Hill and ES Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives, Table 3.11/3.12: Longbarrow junction options</b></p> <p>The form of the junction is strongly symmetrical. Although generally sunk below existing ground levels and with tree cover, it is of a motorway pattern alien to the local landscape. It could well exercise a strong presence through the arrangement of land form, hedgerows, and other planting, reflecting the large scale symmetry of the junction, dominating the picturesque, rolling landscape and, pointing to a higher adverse rating than given.</p> <p>Will attempts be made to break up the symmetry through measures such as the regrading of land form around the junction and a less regular arrangement of hedgerows flanking the slip roads?</p>
LV.1.8	Applicant	<p><b>Para 7.9.80 et seq: Visual effects during construction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What mitigation measures would be employed to counter adverse visual effects experienced by footpath users and other receptors?</li> <li>ii. During what time period would each receptor be subject to adverse effects? Specify the colour finishes of compound buildings, hoardings, etc.</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
LV.1.9	Applicant	<p><b>Photomontages</b></p> <p>Provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please make 360-degree CGI visualisations available to the Examination.</li> <li>ii. Please convert RVPs 9, 28, and 31 to photomontages.</li> <li>iii. Please adapt VP 9 and VP 13 to show the works compounds including the slurry treatment plant (STP) and haul roads.</li> <li>iv. Photomontage from the high point (the tumulus) to the south east of VP6, looking south east.</li> <li>v. Photomontage looking northwards towards the B3083 from a position south of the proposed A303 bypass, taking in Green Bridge 1 and the B3083 underbridge.</li> <li>vi. Photomontage from the summit of Oatlands Hill, looking north-east towards the new Longbarrow junction.</li> <li>vii. Photomontage taken from a point to the west of Green Bridge 2, looking eastwards along the carriageway.</li> <li>viii. Photomontage taken from the southern roundabout of the new Longbarrow junction, looking north-eastwards.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ix. Photomontage taken from the eastern edge of Green Bridge 4, looking eastwards along the cutting towards the western portal.</li> <li>x. Photomontage taken from the western edge of Green Bridge 4, looking westwards along the cutting towards the new Longbarrow junction.</li> <li>xi. Photomontage taken from c.285m east of the junction of Church Street and High Street, Winterbourne Stoke, looking north, taking in the view of the Conservation Area and the River Till viaduct described in Appendix 6.9, Cultural Heritage Settings Assessment 6015, bottom of page 108.</li> <li>xii. Photomontage taken from the junction of the tracks to the east of Half Moon Clump, looking southwards.</li> <li>xiii. Photomontage from the tumulus by the radio antennae to the north east of Countess roundabout.</li> <li>xiv. Photomontage as CH23, but without the mature vegetation.</li> <li>xv. Photomontage looking northwards from Blick Mead.</li> <li>xvi. Photomontage of the worst-case view in winter, associated with the listed buildings, taken from the northern part of Amesbury Conservation Area towards Countess roundabout.</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		xvii. Please provide winter night photomontages illustrating conditions in artificial lighting, including vehicle headlights, in existing, constructional, and operational states of VP 8, RVP 9, VP 13, photomontages identified in points 4, 13, and 15 above, VP30, VP31, CH07, and CH23. The constructional states should include works compounds and a realistic assessment of haul roads.
LV.1.10	Applicant	<p><b>Photomontages</b></p> <p>Landscape Institute Advice Note 01/11 lists information to be provided on the template. The site and viewpoint location map and distance to site have not been given on the submitted VVMs.</p> <p>Please comment.</p> <p>Although not part of Advice Note 01/11, it would also have been helpful if the VVMs had been labelled with the location of proposed features of the Scheme within the view, much as existing features are labelled on the winter version of each RVP.</p>
LV.1.11	Applicant	<p><b>Photomontages</b></p> <p>How were the Limits of Deviation (LoD) taken into account in the preparation of the VVMs?</p>
LV.1.12	Applicant	<p><b>Photomontages</b></p> <p>i. Are the VVMs to be viewed at A1 or A3 size?</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		ii. Does 'comfortable arm's length refer to A1 or A3 versions?
LV.1.13	Applicant	<p><b>Landform shown in the Environmental Masterplan</b></p> <p>i. Please confirm the gradients to be achieved in the earthworks integrated into the existing landform and those of land to be returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>ii. Could these gradients, and other mitigation, be achieved within the Order limits were the maximum LoDs adopted?</p>
LV.1.14	Applicant	<p><b>Paras 7.4.3/4: Screening</b></p> <p>What action would be taken if the planting failed to provide the height of screening assumed in the assessment of visual effects?</p>
LV.1.15	Applicant	Would the viaduct over the River Till and associated roadway be lit at night?
LV.1.16	Natural England	<p><b>Baseline information</b></p> <p>i. Are you content with the recording of baseline information in the LVIA and the approach to the LVIA assessment?</p> <p>ii. Do you have observations on the LoDs proposed in the scheme?</p> <p>iii. Are you content with the detailed mitigation measures set out in the Environmental Masterplan drawings, the ES text, and the OEMP?</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>		
	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
LV.1.17	Stonehenge Alliance	<p><b>European Landscape Convention</b></p> <p>Please provide more detail to support your view that the scheme would be contrary to the aims of the European Landscape Convention.</p>
LV.1.18	Stonehenge Alliance	<p><b>L VIA concerns</b></p> <p>Please provide further detail of the concerns outlined in the RRs.</p>
LV.1.19	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Para 7.6.88: Future baseline</b></p> <p>Is the Council content with the list of committed or planned developments taken into account in assessing the future baseline?</p>
<b>ES Appendix 7.2: LVIA methodology</b>		
LV.1.20	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Explain how the analysis combines the guidance in GLIVIA 3 and IAN 135/10 and moves from one to the other.</li> <li>ii. Also, explain the connection between Table 7.2.11: IAN 135/10 Significance of landscape and visual effect categories, and Table: IAN 135/10 Landscape and visual typical effect descriptions. The first table seems to have been arrived at through a step by step process of professional judgment which is then ditched at the second table, where a separate professional judgment process is embarked upon.</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
LV.1.21	Applicant	<p><b>Limits of Deviation</b></p> <p>How were the LoDs taken into account in assessing the extent of visibility, the landform gradients, and the loss of existing trees?</p>
LV.1.22	Applicant	<p><b>Green Bridges</b></p> <p>What assumptions have been made in the LVIA as to the locations and heights of the green bridges?</p>
<b>ES Appendix 7.3: Area of search</b>		
LV.1.23	Applicant	<p><b>Para 7.3.9: The parts of the construction activity likely to be most visible</b></p> <p>These are considered by the ES to be the construction compounds and the STP. However, construction haul activity is also likely to be very visible, comprising the use of haul roads exposing white chalk, and frequent large moving vehicles, possibly accompanied by dust disturbance.</p> <p>Please comment.</p>
LV.1.24	Applicant	<p><b>Para 7.3.45: Verification of the ZTVs through fieldwork</b></p> <p>Tells us that the fieldwork concluded that many of the locations would not experience a significant effect because of distance, intervening landform, buildings and vegetation. However, features such as the STP or projecting</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>road signs may well attract attention from very large distances within a wide panorama, as does a distant church steeple. Although photographs generally flatten and suppress this effect, it can be seen in Montage VP 08 where the road furniture appears prominent above the horizon, albeit at year 15 it appears shielded in summer by foliage.</p> <p>Please comment.</p>
LV.1.25	Applicant	<p><b>ZTV construction phase</b></p> <p>Please confirm that the ZTV for the construction phase shown at Appendix 7.3 has been modelled on the assumption that the main construction compound and the Countess compound would be 10m AGL rather than being single storey buildings as stated at para 7.4.2 of Chapter 7?</p>
<b>ES Appendix 7.5: LLCAs and LTCAs</b>		
LV.1.26	Applicant	<p><b>Sensitivity ratings for LLCAs</b></p> <p>Some of the sensitivity ratings appear doubtful. For instance, LLCA 11: Oatlands Hill, where susceptibility is reduced from high to medium resulting in medium sensitivity because the area is already crossed by the A303 and the A360. Since the base sensitivity without the existing roads is high, arguably this should be the starting point for assessment of the effect of the changes proposed otherwise the opportunity to minimally harm or even enhance the landscape could be lost.</p>



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
LV.1.27	Applicant	<p><b>Sensitivity rating for LLCA02: Parsonage Down dry Valley</b></p> <p>Why is this LLCA given a medium sensitivity rating whilst the other LLCAs within the chalk down land are in the main assessed as being of high sensitivity?</p>
LV.1.28	Applicant	<p><b>Assessment of LTCAs</b></p> <p>Many of the LTCAs are characterised by high value and susceptibility historic cores or conservation areas, and low value and susceptibility adjacent areas. In combination, the overall ratings are down-graded. Perhaps these component areas should be assessed separately.</p>
<b>ES Appendix 7.6: Visual baseline</b>		
LV.1.29	Applicant	<p><b>Analysis of VPs</b></p> <p>Some of the analyses are questionable and are not necessarily accepted. For instance, that for VP30 results in low sensitivity, based on vehicle users as the sole receptor and common highway components of low value. However, the proposal has a marked effect on the visual aspects of the setting of the Countess Farm group of listed buildings, a high value component. Pedestrians using the A345, together with those within curtilages adjacent to the A345, would experience much the same view but would be highly susceptibility to the changes proposed.</p> <p>Please comment.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>		
	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
LV.1.30	Applicant	<p><b>Chapter 13, para 13.3.22: Driver views</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What are the significance criteria for the assessment of effects based on?</li> <li>ii. Why have views along the A303 towards Stonehenge not been assessed?</li> </ul>
<b>ES Appendix 7.10: Arboricultural Impact Assessment</b>		
LV.1.31	Applicant	<p><b>Executive Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. How is the distinction made between trees and tree groups?</li> <li>ii. Can a tree group contain any number of trees?</li> <li>iii. Can a tree feature be either a tree or a tree group?</li> <li>iv. Where do hedgerows fit into this picture?</li> <li>v. Are any statutorily protected trees affected?</li> </ul>
LV.1.32	Applicant	<p><b>Annex 7.10.2: Tree Survey Schedule</b></p> <p>Does the schedule encompass hedgerows?</p>
LV.1.33	Applicant	<p><b>Annex 7.10.3: Tree Removal Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Is there a key plan? It is impossible to identify the trees which would be removed, either on the A3 plans or at maximum</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>enlargement on the screen. Please supply the information in a usable form.</p> <p>ii. Also, please confirm the appropriate scale at A3 size. Is it 1:5,000 or 1:2,500, since the title block indicates 1:1,000 at A1 size?</p>
LV.1.34	Applicant	<p><b>Para 9.11: Summary</b></p> <p>This para tells us that the scheme would require the full removal of 182 tree features and 13 tree groups. However, the Executive Summary gives the figures as 178 and 13.</p> <p>Please clarify.</p>
LV.1.35	Applicant	<p><b>Planting scheme</b></p> <p>i. Do outline planting layouts and schedules exist?</p> <p>ii. Without them, how were the photomontages assembled?</p>
LV.1.36	Applicant	<p><b>Outline maintenance programme</b></p> <p>Is there an outline maintenance programme for the planting?</p>
<b>ES Chapter 3: Assessment of alternatives</b>		
LV.1.37	Applicant	<b>Table 3.4: Western portal approach options</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Option (a), vertical retaining walls, is regarded as the less preferable option in landscape/visual terms because it provides a hard-engineered landscape from close viewpoints.</p> <p>Is this not an example of the failure to appreciate the often critical effect of considering detailed design approach options at an early stage?</p> <p>Options such as use of a planted living wall could successfully soften the hard landscape allowing it to be visually absorbed more easily into the natural surroundings.</p>
LV.1.38	Applicant	<p><b>Table 3.6: Countess junction options</b></p> <p>Have alternatives other than the severe horizontal to the top edge of the noise barrier, depicted in VP 30 been considered?</p> <p>This does violence to the soft irregular backdrop and foreground of trees and, as in the question above, points to the importance of having in mind at an early stage outline strategies for detailed design, which remain flexible throughout the design process.</p>
Ns.1	<b>Noise and vibration</b>	
Ns.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>What agreements have been made with the relevant Environmental Health Authorities regarding permissible levels of noise and vibration?</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Ns.1.2	Applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What agreement has been reached with relevant Environmental Health Authorities on working hours?</li> <li>ii. Can the Applicant explain why there is no specific requirement within the dDCO to secure the general provisions relating to working hours as set out in the OEMP?</li> <li>iii. Given the apparent importance of noise and vibration management plans set out in the OEMP for both preliminary and main works, can the Applicant explain why these are not a stipulation under dDCO Requirement 4?</li> <li>iv. Can the Applicant explain why no draft noise and vibration management plans have been prepared as part of the application documents?</li> </ul>
Ns.1.3	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>Temporary adverse effects are recognised to occur on residential properties in close proximity to Countess roundabout and the northern edge of Winterbourne Stoke.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What is meant by northern edge?</li> <li>ii. What is meant by close proximity?</li> <li>iii. Can these be defined?</li> </ul>
Ns.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Paragraph 9.3 .7 of the ES Chapter 9 [APP-047] states that the noise and vibration assessment is an estimate based on information which includes the number and type of machinery likely to be required for each activity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. How can it be ensured in those circumstances that the worst-case scenario has been considered and the noise and vibration generating activities would fall within the scope of the ES?</li> <li>ii. How would the OEMP and/or the dDCO provide enough control for the worst-case scenario and meet the requirements of the NPSNN? (ie how does the OEMP/dDCO provide sufficient assurance that the assumed construction plant fleet presented in Appendix 9.2 [APP-268] are not exceeded?).</li> </ul>
Ns.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>It appears that there is an assumption that only continuous flight auger or cast <i>in situ</i> piles would be used (Paragraph 9.3.12 of the ES).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Can you confirm this would need to be added to the dDCO as a requirement or if not?</li> <li>ii. How would the ES be revised to accommodate alternative forms of piling?</li> <li>iii. What would the effect be on affected premises?</li> </ul>
Ns.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Paragraph 9.3.22 of the ES [APP-047] indicates that at this stage full information is not available regarding the time periods during which construction activities causing vibration would occur.</p> <p>How can the obligations under the PA2008 be satisfied without this information?</p>
Ns.1.7	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>Paragraph 9.3.36 of the ES [APP-047] indicates that a full assessment would still need to be completed once the design has been finalised to assess which properties would qualify under the noise insulation regulations.</p> <p>In light of the need for transparency in decision making, how are the parties to be informed of this and how would this be delivered and secured by the dDCO?</p>
Ns.1.8	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>In Chapter 13 13.9.82 [APP-051] The assessment of effects in respect of noise conclude that there would be significant adverse effects experienced by residents of some properties due to proximity to the construction activities and or construction traffic routes.</p> <p>Why is the mitigation required to ameliorate this not within the dDCO?</p>
Ns.1.9	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Paragraph 9.10.1 of the ES Chapter 9 [APP-047] confirms that the OEMP would set out monitoring to be undertaken during construction. It is also specified however in section 9.8 that the specific operational mitigation measures would be confirmed at the detailed design stage.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. How could it be ensured that satisfactory standards would be delivered?</li> <li>ii. What is the proposed monitoring of potential significant effects which might occur?</li> <li>iii. In the event monitoring indicates significant adverse effects, what is the strategy for dealing with this?</li> <li>iv. Based on the outcomes of the assessment, figures 9.4 -9.5 and Appendix 9.2, why has the Applicant not prepared a framework for the likely specification and location of noise and vibration monitoring?</li> </ol>
Ns.1.10	Applicant	<p><b>Vibration</b></p> <p>At 9.9.20 of ES Chapter 9 [APP-047] An estimate of 14 days tunnelling is suggested when in close proximity to Stonehenge Cottages – with a gap between the east and westbound tunnelling taking place. The OEMP – requires vibration surveys – to verify the predictions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What is meant by 'in close proximity'?</li> <li>ii. What do you propose to do if the predictions are incorrect?</li> </ol>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		iii. How do you propose to ensure the vibration experienced at the Stonehenge Cottages remains at an acceptable level? iv. How would this be achieved and monitored?
Ns.1.11	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration monitoring</b></p> <p>Notwithstanding the specification within MW-NO16 of the OEMP:</p> i. Who would the contractor report the monitoring to? ii. How frequently and under what circumstances would this take place? iii. In the event a problem was being encountered ie vibration or noise above an agreed standard – what is the outcome? iv. What process would be in place to resolve or arbitrate on such issues?
Ns.1.12	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>Please clarify the summer and working hours as set out in the OEMP particularly in respect of the earthworks working hours.</p>
Ns.1.13	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>Could the Applicant indicate where in the dDCO the requirement for noise absorbent finish to the walls of the entrance/exits of the tunnel and Green Bridge 4 Referred to in Section 9.8 of ES Chapter 9 [APP047] is set out?</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Ns.2.14	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Could the Applicant indicate where in the dDCO is it provided that the thin noise surface shown to be used in paragraphs 9.7.8 and 9.9.80 of Chapter 9 of the ES [APP047] would be so used?</li> <li>ii. How would this be delivered?</li> </ul>
Ns.1.15	Applicant, Wiltshire Council, Historic England	<p><b>Vibration</b></p> <p>The application documentation indicates tunnel boring machine vibrations could impact on a long barrow. It is suggested that the situation would be monitored but no remedy is offered for damaging impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Is there potential for damage to archaeological known or unknown remains, such as fragile inhumations, on or close to the tunnel?</li> <li>ii. How has the impact of vibration been taken into consideration relative to the sensitivity of the historic environment?</li> <li>iii. The tunnel workings indicate a degree of settlement what implications would this have for the surrounding archaeology and the historic environment?</li> <li>iv. What mitigation is proposed, how would this be monitored?</li> <li>v. What degree of tolerance would be regarded as appropriate to minimise or avoid any adverse effects?</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Ns.1.16	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>Could the Applicant provide a plan with measurements and justification for the distinction in working hours in the proximity of Countess Roundabout, and River Till Viaduct so that the ExA can understand what is understood by 'in the vicinity of'?</p>
Ns.1.17	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>Could the applicant provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Details of where the mitigation identified as required in 9.8.14 (d)-(h) is set out as a requirement in either the dDCO or OEMP.</li> <li>ii. To the ExA an explanation as to why an absorptive material is proposed at the Countess Roundabout but not the River Till viaduct; and</li> <li>iii. An explanation of what is to be understood by the term maximising in (e)?</li> </ul>
Ns.1.18	Wiltshire Council Environment Agency	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Do you agree that statutory exemption to nuisance should apply across the whole site and the whole scheme for the whole period of the construction?</li> <li>ii. If not, what elements do you consider should be excluded and why?</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Ns.1.19	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>A number of RRs refer to the potential risk that either the construction works, or the subsequent operation of the road would cause vibrations such that the stones would/could be destabilised.</p> <p>Could you provide a comment/evidence to refute this?</p>
Ns.1.20	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>In the event that the tunnel is at its maximum length within the defined degree of deviation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. How would this affect the likelihood/frequency of ventilation fans being operated?</li> <li>ii. What impact would this have on the noise assessment?</li> <li>iii. Would this remain within the scope of the current ES?</li> </ul>
Ns.1.21	Applicant	<p><b>WHO Noise Guidelines</b></p> <p>The WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region were published in October 2018.</p> <p>Could the Applicant confirm whether these guidelines have any implications on the noise assessment conclusions within the ES Chapter 9 Noise and Vibration [APP-047]?</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Ns.1.22	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>Since the construction of both the Countess flyover and the River Till Viaduct are regarded as having adverse effects during construction and post operation, is it appropriate to assess the effect of the scheme as neutral?</p>
Ns.1.23	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. In light of the need for openness and transparency of decision making can you advise of the standard of noise attenuation that can be expected by the provision of screens at both the Countess Roundabout and River Till Viaduct?</li> <li>ii. What is the timing of the installation of these noise screens and how would this be delivered to ensure the anticipated noise mitigation would be achieved?</li> </ul>
Ns.1.24	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>Paragraph 9.8.7 of Chapter 9 of the ES refers to a referral system for complaints in respect of noise and vibration.</p> <p>How would this be managed independently to ensure no conflict of interest?</p>
Ns.1.25	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Paragraph 9.8.13 of Chapter 9 of the ES states that "<i>vibration surveys would be undertaken at Stonehenge Cottages commencing when the TBM is approaching the cottages</i>".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What does 'approaching' mean?</li> <li>ii. What distance could be regarded as a safe distance to ensure adverse effects would not be occurring?</li> <li>iii. How has this been assessed?</li> </ul>
Ns.1.26	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>The use of a thin surfacing system is referred to to reduce noise impacts. Please provide a plan showing the lengths of road this is proposed for.</p>
Ns.1.27	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>The surface finish of the retaining walls to both the tunnels and the Countess Flyover is referred to as being designed to reduce reflection of noise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What noise reduction would be achieved?</li> <li>ii. How would this be secured as a requirement for the scheme?</li> </ul>
Ns.1.28	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		In light of the properties identified C1 – C19 please advise which properties you consider are eligible for insulation in line with the Noise Insulation Regulations.
Ns.1.29	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>A series of adverse effects are identified through both construction and operation of the new road. Mitigation to ensure the road meets the standards expected in the NPSNN for the road to be regarded as sustainable are therefore required. To date Noise and Vibration Management Plans have not been prepared.</p> <p>What is before the ExA which provides evidence of compliance with the NPSNN and that the appropriate mitigation would be provided in a timely manner and subsequently maintained?</p>
Ns.1.30	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>Paragraph 9.3.10 refers to assessments of impacts along existing roads. Can you clarify whether this includes new routes for example Ratfyn Road to the proposed site compound to the north east of the Travel Lodge?</p>
Ns.1.31	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>According to the information provided no noise monitoring was undertaken to the north of the A303 near either Ratfyn Farm or Ratfyn</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Farm Cottages or to the rear of the residential properties off Countess Road.</p> <p>As these are likely to be adversely affected throughout the construction period can you explain the reason for this?</p>
Ns.1.32	Applicant	<p><b>Vibration</b></p> <p>In light of the recognition in paragraph 9.3.14 that ground borne vibration is highly dependent on the nature of the intervening ground and the sensitivity of Stonehenge Cottages and the Stones at Stonehenge themselves what assessment of the ground conditions between the proposed tunnel and these two receptors has been undertaken to assess the extent of sensitivity, and the potential harmful effects?</p>
Ns.1.33	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>In Chapter 9 para 9.3.12 <i>"the proposed method of piling is continuous flight auger (CFA) or cast in situ piles"</i> whilst in Table 8.4 you specify <i>"There would be no piling works within the channel of the River Till (or Avon)"</i>.</p> <p>Within the OEMP PW-NO14 <i>"Activities requiring an appraisal could include tunnelling, vibratory compaction, <b>impact</b> or vibratory piling."</i></p> <p>Please confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. That there would be no piling within either river and confirm this is to be added to the OEMP or dDCO.</li> </ul>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		ii. The method of piling within the development and this is to be specified within the OEMP or dDCO.
Ns.1.34	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>In Chapter 8 para 8.8.26 you consider that the OEMP would safeguard the identified impacts to ecology. Within the OEMP under Noise and Vibration you state that <i>"should the application of BPM at source not prove effective and noise exposure exceeds the relevant trigger level the contractor <b>may</b> offer noise insulation or temporary housing."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Why should the ExA consider this sufficiently robust a remedy?</li> <li>ii. How does this address potential impacts on ecological receptors?</li> <li>iii. In light of the requirements of the NPSNN (paragraph 5.194-5.195) how does this achieve the necessary standards?</li> </ul>
Ns.1.35	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>What is meant by <i>"will use low vibration and noise piling methods as described in the OEMP"</i> as stated in 8.9.17 of Chapter 8 of the ES?</p>
Ns.1.36	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain whether the impacts of piling or other construction over the River Till has been assessed in the event the river is not seasonally dry.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>It would appear that it is proposed to undertake works over the River Till when this section of the river is likely to be dry.</p> <p>ii. What are the consequences should the river not be dry at the point the works are due to take place?</p> <p>Paragraph 8.9.101 suggests that the low noise technique is only required when there is flow in the river.</p> <p>iii. Please state clearly the method of construction and the mitigation necessary to ensure no adverse impacts occur or if they do how they are proposed to be mitigated.</p>
Ns.1.37	Applicant	<p><b>OEMP</b></p> <p>The language used could be regarded as imprecise – ‘may’, ‘generally’.</p> <p>In light of the fact that you seek to rely on this as the foundation on which CEMPs would be prepared what confidence can the ExA or the Secretary of State have that this would actually set a clear basis for the works to go ahead within the terms of the PA2008, the need for transparency of decision making and the lack of oversight the current phraseology facilitates.</p>
Ns.1.38	Applicant	<p><b>Baseline</b></p> <p>i. Can the Applicant explain the extent to which relevant consultation bodies were engaged in agreeing the appropriate baseline data?</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		ii. Can the Applicant also explain the extent to which they consider the baseline assessment to accurately represent the entirety of the noise assessment study areas?
Ns.1.39	Applicant	<p><b>Baseline</b></p> <p>Can the Applicant explain whether there has been a vibration baseline undertaken, and confirm the extent to which this has been agreed with relevant consultation bodies?</p>
Ns.1.40	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>In assessing vibration and the need for mitigation, what has been done in terms of assessing and subsequently mitigating potential harm to archaeology?</p>
Ns.1.41	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>In light of the recognition of the noise profile across the River Till please explain why you do not propose a noise barrier on the north side of the viaduct when this creates an opportunity to improve the environment and the sustainability of the scheme</p>
Ns.1.42	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>Please clarify which property you are referring to when you talk about 'a single receptor north of Winterbourne Stoke'.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Ns.1.43	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>Indicative periods for impacts on individual receptors are set out in Appendix 9.2 Construction Noise [APP-269].</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What construction programme is this based on?</li> <li>ii. What degree of confidence can the ExA have in the periods of time the effects are indicated to occur?</li> </ol>
Ns.1.44	Applicant Natural England	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>In order to ensure there is no adverse effect on the fish population of either the River Till or the River Avon provide construction method statements that specify how these effects would be controlled in order to ensure any effects during construction are kept within agreed tolerances, how this would be monitored throughout the construction process?</p>
Ns.1.45	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>The Noise Policy Statement for England Policy Aims seek to achieve three elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life;</li> <li>• Mitigate and minimise adverse impacts on health and quality of life; and</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where possible, contribute to the improvement of health and quality of life.</li> </ul> <p>In light of this how has the Proposed Development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Sought to avoid significant adverse impacts particularly in respect of residents in Amesbury and users of the PRoW network in the River Till Valley?</li> <li>ii. Minimised adverse effects across the project area?</li> <li>iii. Contributed to an improvement to quality of life?</li> </ol>
Ns.1.46	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>In light of the preceding question and the current recognition there would be adverse effects on the community of Amesbury through an increased noise environment both during construction and during operation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What in the DCO requires the final design to meet noise standards which achieve the policy requirements of the NPS and consequently the NPSNN?</li> <li>ii. When would the noise barriers be provided and how is this facilitated in the DCO?</li> <li>iii. What standard of mitigation would these barriers achieve?</li> <li>iv. Where is it stipulated when this would be provided and how would it be maintained throughout the operation of the proposed road?</li> </ol>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Ns.1.47	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>The River Till Viaduct is recognised as creating an adverse effect on the noise environment within the River Till valley. To date only mitigation is proposed on the southern side of the viaduct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Explain how this meets the requirements of the Policy as set out in the NPS and NPSNN.</li> <li>ii. How would the mitigation be provided for in the DCO?</li> <li>iii. What standard of mitigation would it achieve?</li> <li>iv. Where is it stipulated when this would be provided and how would it be maintained throughout the operation of the proposed road?</li> </ul>
Ns.1.48	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>To date no information has been provided as to the detailed construction programme or consequently the number or location of haul routes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Provide information on these haul routes, in respect of location, timing of construction and reinstatement.</li> <li>ii. Explain where and how this falls within the scope of the current ES.</li> </ul>
Ns.1.49	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>The NPSNN at paragraph 5.198 bullet point 2 refers to "<i>low noise road surfacing</i>". The ES refers to "<i>thin surfacing</i>".</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Explain the difference in terminology and whether thin surfacing would result in the same standard of noise reduction.</p>
Ns.1.50	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>The NPSNN at paragraphs 5.194 seeks schemes to demonstrate that through the optimisation of layout noise emissions would be minimised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. How has the layout been optimised to minimise noise emissions?</li> <li>ii. In light of the fact that there is not to date a detailed design what measures would be in place to ensure that the final design would meet this requirement? Where is this set out?</li> <li>iii. How would this be delivered through both the construction and operational phases?</li> </ul>
Ns.1.51	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>The NPSNN (paragraph 5.1.93) refers to the NPS for England, the NPPF and associated planning guidance on noise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Do you agree the ES demonstrates compliance with these requirements? If not, please explain where there is disagreement.</li> <li>ii. Do you agree the assessment has been done in accordance with the appropriate British Standards to meet the requirements of NPSNN paragraph 5.191? If not, please explain where there is disagreement.</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Ns.1.52	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>Within Table 5 (5.195) of the Case for the Scheme and NPS Accordance reference is made to STP and SPLL which are not included within the Glossary of Terms.</p> <p>To what do these two acronyms refer?</p>
<b>SE.1</b>	<b>Socio-economic Effects</b>	
SE.1.1	Wiltshire Council Environment Agency Natural England	<p><b>Socio-environmental impacts</b></p> <p>Would the local authority, the EA and Natural England state whether the Proposed Development complies with the need to be designed to minimise social and environmental impacts and improve quality of life in accordance with para 3.2 of the NPSNN?</p>
SE.1.2	Wiltshire Council Environment Agency Natural England	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>Would the local authority the EA and Natural England state the extent to which the summaries of key economic, social and environmental impacts are agreed, with evidence to support any disagreement?</p>
SE.1.3	National Farmers' Union Countryside Solutions Howard Smith MRICS	<p><b>Clarification</b></p> <p>Would the National Farmers' Union and other parties state the extent to which the assessment methodology of the effects upon the different holdings as set out in Chapter 13 of the ES and Table 13.22 (during</p>



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Fowler Fortescue Berwick Down Ltd Biddesden House Farm Partnership Carter Jonas LLP Affected farms and firms representing farms/ agricultural businesses	construction) and 13.23 (during operation/post construction) are agreed and provide evidence to support any disagreement?
SE.1.4	Applicant	<b>Socio-economic effects</b> What provision is there in the dDCO for ensuring appropriate liaison with land owners and restoration/aftercare/monitoring after completion of the restored land?
SE.1.5	Fatih Turk	<b>Socio-economic effects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Can you provide evidence to the ExA why you consider the scheme would prevent you from continuing to operate your business, what your business is and the number of people you consider it could affect?</li> <li>ii. Do you consider your business would be affected just through the construction process, or does the concern also relate to the period after construction was completed?</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
SE.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>The ES identifies a moderate significant residual effect from impacts to agricultural land (BMV) and agricultural holdings more generally during construction. It suggests that the OEMP [APP-187] and 'appropriate liaison' are measures which should be secured to address these impacts.</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain how such measures are secured and in formulating a response consider points raised by National Farmers' Union regarding the role of an Agricultural Liaison Officer?</p>
SE.1.7	ICOMOS	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>Can you advise the ExA on your intentions in respect of the WHS and whether the current proposal would lead to a revaluation of the WHS status?</p>
SE.1.8	Applicant National Trust English Heritage Historic England	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>What consideration has there been in respect of the status of the site as a WHS, the economic value this brings to the area, and the degree of risks the works as currently proposed have to the future status of the site as a WHS?</p>
SE.1.9	Applicant	<p><b>Potential impact on operation of PAC – Electricity Supply</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Project Allenby Connaught (PAC) is a MOD PFI with Aspire for the Garrisons on Salisbury Plain (Tidworth, Larkhill, Bulford). The Garrisons electricity supply is taken from the National Grid at Ratfyn.</p> <p>PAC require confirmation that any A303 Works do not affect this supply and it's supporting infrastructure, including communication fibres.</p>
SE.1.10	Applicant	<p><b>Potential impact on operation of MOD Boscombe Down</b></p> <p>MOD seek reassurance that proposal would facilitate abnormal loads to Boscombe Down, access is currently via Allington track.</p> <p>Please confirm how this would be facilitated both during construction and post construction.</p>
SE.1.11	Applicant	<p><b>Baseline socio-economic effects/impacts</b></p> <p>A number of RRs raise the question as to the financial/economic benefits the scheme would bring. The CPRE report (<a href="http://www.cpre.org.uk/what-we-do/transport/roads">www.cpre.org.uk/what-we-do/transport/roads</a>) questions the approach and justification for the broader strategy.</p> <p>What evidence can you provide to refute this?</p>
SE.1.12	CPRE South West	<p><b>Baseline socio-economic effects/impacts/policy compliance</b></p> <p>Please provide evidence to support your comments:</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. That you consider the scheme to be contrary to relevant national planning policy, local plan policy and the WHS management plan, and to national and international legislation and conventions.</li> <li>ii. Why you consider there is a paucity of evidence and analysis to provide for informed responses, and to justify the suggested 'benefits', including benefit or disbenefit to local communities.</li> <li>iii. Why you consider the scheme would be damaging to local tourism businesses and the local economy.</li> <li>iv. Why you consider the predicted increase in traffic on the route ranges from 20% to 40% or more and what you consider the implications are of this.</li> </ul>
SE.1.13	Applicant	<p><b>Baseline socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>In light of the RR from CPRE South West can you provide evidence to respond to the concerns identified in relation to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The degree of assessment of the cumulative effects of the programme in terms of increased traffic and emissions.</li> <li>ii. The Infrastructure Commission identified the need for connectivity improvements, and Highways England's own statistics show that the need is for better sub regional business and leisure connections.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		iii. The benefits of highway and public transport options and whether these have been considered together.
SE.1.14	Dr Ken Taylor	<b>Socio-economic effects</b> What evidence can you provide as to the degree of effect on the local economy of the possible loss of WHS status that you indicate may occur?
SE.1.15	Dr M Tillbrook	<b>Socio-economic effects</b> i. Why do you consider the commercial case presented by Highways England to be flawed? ii. What evidence can you provide to support your concerns?
SE.1.16	Applicant	<b>Socio-economic effects</b> A significant number of RRs refer to the loss of view of the Stones which they perceive would prevent the stones being viewed without having to pay. i. Is this correct? ii. In the event this is correct, what regard have you had for low income groups being able to view the Stones? iii. What implications would this have for the broader tourism industry in the locality?

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
SE.1.17	David Holland Smith	Please explain why you consider the drawings do not accurately reflect the current situation at the Countess Roundabout.
SE.1.18	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>In light of the sensitivity of the archaeological environment through which the scheme is proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What allowance has been taken into account to fully assess the archaeological findings, and what effect this would have on the time frame of this for the scheme?</li> <li>ii. Should the scheme be delayed as a consequence of the need to develop more slowly in light of archaeological sensitivity what account within the scheme has there been for impacts on the local community economically, socially, and environmentally?</li> <li>iii. How does this remain within the scope of the ES?</li> </ul>
SE.1.19	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>Do the socio-economic benefits as calculated rely on each of the proposed sections of improvement to the A303 going ahead or are they dealt with in isolation?</p>
SE.1.20	Nigel Wright	<b>Socio-economic effects</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Why do you consider the proposal does not meet Highways England's own economic criterion?
SE.1.21	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. There would clearly be significant disruption during the construction process, how are you ensuring that this is minimised so that local business, people and communities suffer the least disruption?</li> <li>ii. Where is this set out?</li> </ul>
SE.1.22	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>In Table 13.2.6 Access to Work and Training [APP-287] it is indicated that having a 'local employment and procurement policy' would help to promote employment by underrepresented groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Is it intended to have such a policy for the contract?</li> <li>ii. If so where is this set out as a requirement?</li> </ul>
SE.1.23	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>[RR-1725] from English Heritage identifies concerns in respect of the ease that people would be able to continue to visit the Stonehenge Visitor Centre, both during the construction phases and after the scheme is finished. Ease of access and signage to the Stonehenge Visitor Centre is key to this. English Heritage do not consider the dDCO and application papers give any detail on what road signage would be installed to ensure</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>it is clear and intuitive for drivers wanting to visit Stonehenge. In addition, there is a lack of detail on the temporary infrastructure for the construction period therefore English Heritage is unable to assess its impact on the WHS and our visitor operation.</p> <p>In light of the fact that this is the major tourist attraction in the area and a significant part of the tourism economy please provide information to address this concern.</p>
SE.1.24	Applicant Esso Petroleum Company Ltd	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>In light of the Comment from Esso [RR-1726] relating to the pipeline and <i>"barring infrequent maintenance, the pipeline operates on a continual 24/7 basis and interruption to its operation would have a significant impact on fuel supply in the south west of England"</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please advise of the latest position of the parties and if agreement has now been reached.</li> <li>ii. In the event that matters are not resolved please advise of the effects of a potential impact on the pipeline.</li> </ul>
SE.1.25	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>Reference in Paragraphs 5.1.22/23 refer to a peer reviewed assessment Has this been provided as part of the evidence to the ExA? If so can you clarify where.</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>In light of the importance of the rationale behind the figure associated with the monetised benefit associated with the removal of the A303 from the WHS and the considerable degree of concern that has been identified by RRs in this respect. It is essential for the Ex A to understand the veracity of this figure.</p>
SE.1.26	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>In Paragraph 5.1.14 of Document 7.5 Combined Modelling [APP-298] you specify a transport user benefit of £370 million at 2010 prices.</p> <p>In Table 6.1 of the same document you set out a calculation of the cost benefit which has a Transport Economic Efficiency benefit of £252 million, the Executive Summary refers to two different values £262 million and £257 million</p> <p>Explain the distinction in the terms and the difference in the figures.</p>
SE.1.27	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>i. In light of a number of concerns expressed both by the National Farmers' Union, land agents and farm businesses what assessment has been carried out of the implications of the effects on the farm businesses that would be affected through the construction of the project:</p> <p>(a) During Construction?</p> <p>(b) Post construction?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		ii. In light of the Government Policy to facilitate growth and create jobs, how have the specific impacts on these businesses been addressed in the overall impacts of the scheme?
SE.1.28	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>A number of parties suggest that (eg [RR-1732]) the economic case is extremely weak and very strongly depends on a manufactured heritage "<i>benefit</i>" expressed in monetary terms.</p> <p>In light of the importance that you put on the delivery of the removal of the current A303 from the WHS and the benefits you consider this brings to the overall OUV of the WHS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Where in the dDCO is the removal/adaption/improvement of the A303 set out?</li> <li>ii. When would it be delivered?</li> <li>iii. What is the trigger for its delivery?</li> </ul>
SE.1.29	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>It has been suggested that official economic estimates give over optimistic assessments of the value and benefit of transport projects.</p> <p>Have reviews been undertaken post construction of other schemes to validate the estimates of improved economic performance which assist in validating such forecasts/estimates?</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
SE.1.30	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>There is an indication that the project would create in the region of 300 construction jobs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Where is it anticipated that the workers would be accommodated during the predicted five-year life of the project?</li> <li>ii. What proportion of construction jobs do you seek to accommodate from the local area? How would this be achieved?</li> </ul>
SE.1.31	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>[RR-0389] expresses concern about the reliance on the Halcrow Study to show the benefits of the proposal. The RR suggests that this lacked substantive evidence and that Highways England did not properly justify the scheme relative to alternatives which were available.</p> <p>How would you respond to these concerns?</p>
SE.1.32	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>How has the project assessed the potential of a knock-on effect on the Avebury Heritage Site to the north both in terms of the consequences of heritage impacts but also the socio-economic impacts which could occur?</p>
SE.1.33	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>A number of land owners and their representatives have expressed concern in respect of the economic impacts upon their individual holdings.</p> <p>What degree of sensitivity testing has been undertaken to establish the accuracy of the level of effect that is currently suggested in Chapter 13 of the ES?</p>
SE.1.34	Jonathan Morris	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>The NPSNN provides the basis for determining the submission of this scheme.</p> <p>In the event you have evidence on the merits of the scheme and the value you consider it can bring to the local community this should be presented to the ExA for consideration.</p>
SE.1.35	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>In light of the importance of Stonehenge and the WHS to the local economy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What mitigation is proposed to be put in place to minimise impacts to the attractiveness of the site as a tourist attraction during a potential five-year construction programme?</li> <li>ii. How would the construction programme be monitored to ensure the mitigation was achieving the desired effects?</li> <li>iii. How would this be achieved through the DCO?</li> </ul>

ExQ1		
Question to:	Question:	
SE.1.36	Applicant	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>Should the attractiveness of the WHS be adversely affected during the construction programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What are the implications for local businesses during this period?</li> <li>ii. How will any adverse economic effect be minimised?</li> </ul>
SE.1.37	Applicant National Trust Historic England	<p><b>Socio-economic effects</b></p> <p>If the scheme is completed, it is argued that the WHS will become more attractive, reuniting the historic landscape currently divided by the A303.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Have any plans been prepared to cater for this?</li> <li>ii. How would this be managed to continue to safeguard the future of the WHS?</li> </ul>
<b>Tr.1</b>	<b>Traffic and transport</b>	
Tr.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Sustainable travel</b></p> <p>The Transport Assessment (TA) Executive Summary states that the scheme will encourage sustainable and accessible travel choices, amongst other things.</p> <p>Is this a reference to the non-motorised user (NMU) network proposals, or does it also apply to public transport options?</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Tr.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Traffic flow</b></p> <p>Para 3.2.7 of the TA states that the Longbarrow junction would accommodate free-flowing traffic movements between the A360 and A303.</p> <p>How is this consistent with the use of traffic lights referred to in paragraph 3.2.8?</p>
Tr.1.3	Applicant	<p><b>Departures</b></p> <p>Section 3.6 is concerned with Departures from Standard. In this case HE is both the promoter of the scheme and the authority responsible for administering standards.</p> <p>What arrangements are in place to ensure that independent consideration is given to proposals for Departures to ensure administrative fairness and impartiality?</p>
Tr.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>Pedestrian crossings</b></p> <p>Para 3.4.4 refers to the two existing subways between the proposed eastern tunnel portal and Countess junction which would be removed. Two new pedestrian crossings would be created around the existing Countess roundabout to provide north/south connectivity along Countess Road under the A303.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Would these be usable by all NMUs or are they intended specifically for pedestrian use?</li> <li>ii. How would they compare in safety/usability terms with the existing underpasses to be removed?</li> </ul>
Tr.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology/Modelling</b></p> <p>Para 4.3.1 of the TA states that information from the SW Regional Transport Model has been augmented with the local demand data, local traffic counts and network refinements pertinent to the single scheme being taken forward. Para 4.4.6 gives more information about the additional data used to update the traffic model at PCF Stage 3.</p> <p>Please provide further explanation of the approach to the development of the model and provide details of the augmented data and how it has been derived, what stakeholder bodies were consulted in the development of the model, and any peer review/validation process that has been carried out.</p>
Tr.1.6	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Methodology/Modelling</b></p> <p>Please confirm that you are content with the methodology and results of traffic modelling that has been carried out to support the assessment of the scheme, and in particular whether the validation which has been undertaken represents an industry standard approach to traffic modelling.</p>
Tr.1.7	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology/Modelling</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Please explain why it was determined to be inappropriate/unnecessary to include Warminster and Wilton in the area of detailed modelling (AODM), since these are locations with significant existing congestion influencing the operation of the local road network (Para 4.3.10 of the TA).
Tr.1.8	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology/Modelling</b></p> <p>The busy day model represents an average Friday-Sunday from 15 July to 28 August, but is also considered representative of other busy times of year. Please detail the occurrence/frequency of 'other busy times of year'. Are there any week days other than Fridays which might fall into this category at particular times of year (Para 4.4.3 of the TA)?</p>
Tr.1.9	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology/Modelling</b></p> <p>Para 4.7.1 of the TA refers to the use of VISSIM to determine the operational impacts on the network of the scheme during normal operation, during tunnel incidents/maintenance periods and during construction phases.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm that this is an industry standard model in common use in the appraisal of road improvement schemes?</p>
Tr.1.10	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology/Modelling</b></p> <p>Para 4.7.9 d of the TA refers to 'rubbernecking' on the busy day on the stretch of carriageway by Stonehenge as drivers view the stones. Vehicles</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>were observed going extremely slowly past the Stones with large headway to the vehicle in front.</p> <p>Is this considered to be a significant contributor to the incidence of delay/congestion at busy times in addition to traffic volumes, junction capacity and merging issues?</p>
Tr.1.11	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology/Modelling</b></p> <p>Para 4.7.10 of the TA indicates that in the neutral month no obvious congestion was observed on the network, in either direction during the AM and interpeak periods. Figure 4.8 shows that the average journey time on this stretch of the road does not exceed 20 minutes on more than 265 days of the year.</p> <p>Could it be inferred from this that the capacity of the A303 hereabouts does not act as a significant brake on economic activity in the SW Region except at busy times, which generally occur at weekends and holidays?</p>
Tr.1.12	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology/Modelling</b></p> <p>Para 4.7.16 of the TA states that the matrix development methodology (based on MCTC data) "<i>means that the baseline traffic flows in the operational models do not exactly match those derived from the strategic model. This is typical considering the differences in model type and function.</i>"</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please provide further explanation of the reason for employing the different models and clarification of the extent and significance of the discrepancy between the data used in the different model types.
Tr.1.13	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology/Modelling</b></p> <p>Please provide clarification of the statement in para 4.8.3 of the TA that "<i>while the journey time is not represented to the WebTAG tolerances in the busy day, the model does appropriately represent substantial delay from traffic congestion</i>".</p> <p>Please explain why it is considered acceptable to depart from WebTAG tolerances in this instance?</p>
Tr.1.14	Wiltshire Council Test Valley Borough Council	<p><b>Traffic forecasts</b></p> <p>With regard to Para 5.2.5 and Table 5.2 of the TA do you consider that the Applicant has identified all significant future developments which may have an influence on traffic growth and the operation of the road network in future?</p>
Tr.1.15	Applicant	<p><b>Traffic forecasts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. In Row 1 of Table 5-3 does Construction Traffic equate with HGV traffic?</li> <li>ii. In Table 5.3 does the data represent all construction related trips, or only those using the public highway?</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		iii. If so, can the Applicant point to where in the TA and ES chapters the impacts of traffic using internal haul routes have been specifically assessed given the volumes of material to be moved between the tunnel portals and Parsonage Down?
Tr.1.16	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Traffic forecasts</b></p> <p>Does the Council broadly endorse the predicted change in daily traffic (AADT) with the scheme at 2041 set out in Figure 6 – 3 of the TA and the assessment of traffic effects in paras 6.3.12 – 6.3.20 of the TA??</p>
Tr.1.17	Applicant	<p><b>Traffic forecasts</b></p> <p>Table 6.1 shows volume over capacity on the A303 at Stonehenge in 2041, with and without the scheme. With the scheme the A303 would be operating at 50% capacity or under at 'non-busy' times, even in the am or pm peaks. On busy days the scheme would reach 56% volume over capacity Eastbound and 54% Westbound.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. While it is true that this would represent a substantial improvement in traffic capacity as a result of the scheme, is this an indication of over-specification, with considerable 'spare' capacity remaining unused, even at the busiest times?</li> <li>ii. Given the concern of a number IPs (eg [RR-0361], [RR-1031], [RR-1731]) that the DCO scheme is over-engineered, does not represent value for money, and would deprive the region of other much-needed investment in transport infrastructure, what</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		consideration was given to a the development of a lower-cost scheme with a closer match between forecast traffic demand and capacity?
Tr.1.18	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Impacts on the local road network</b></p> <p>Para 6.7.1 of the TA refers to "<i>an update to the Longbarrow junction in order to reduce queuing resulting with the original design</i>". The redesign involves provision of a dedicated left turn lane from the A360 to the eastbound on-slip.</p> <p>Does the Council agree that this would result in a significant reduction in the potential for queuing under these conditions?</p>
Tr.1.19	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Impacts on the local road network</b></p> <p>Para 6.10.4 indicates that the northern roundabout at Solstice Park will experience southbound queuing on Salisbury Road (from the north) by 2041 during weekday peak periods. In the AM period the model shows queues approaching 1km, and the PM period queue lengths exceed 300 m. These queues are forecast to occur with or without the scheme. Para 6.10.10 and Figure 6.15 identifies an issue that the average 'busy day' journey times will experience delay of approximately three minutes due to the congestion on Solstice Park Avenue extending onto the westbound mainline.</p> <p>Does the Council agree the resolution of these issues through junction upgrades is not a mitigation requirement of the scheme and that it would</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		be appropriate to leave delivery of improvements in connection with future development proposals within Solstice Park?
Tr.1.20	Applicant Wiltshire Council British Horse Society Wiltshire Ramblers Cycling Opportunities Group for Salisbury Other Stakeholders	<p><b>Road Safety – Walking, cycling and horses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Paragraph 7.2.3 of the TA refers to proposed provision of Pegasus crossings at Longbarrow south roundabout. On the A360 road and on the former A303, Kent carriage gates will be provided at all access points to link prevent access by motor vehicles. Do the stakeholders consider that this satisfactorily addresses the needs of NMUs in this location?</li> <li>ii. Paragraph 7.2.4 of the TA refers to risks to personal safety, particularly for wheel chair users. Is it acceptable not to provide lighting to underpasses because they are in a rural area and not on lit routes?</li> <li>iii. What if any provision is intended to be made for a safe north-south crossing of the A303 at the western end of the scheme at Yarnbury Castle, as sought by Winterbourne Stoke Parish Council?</li> </ul>
Tr.1.21	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Road safety</b></p> <p>Para 7.3.1 of the TA states that the scheme will result in safety benefits through providing a safer road design than the existing road.</p> <p>Does the Council agree with the forecast reduction in the number of accidents and casualties set out in Table 7-1?</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Tr.1.22	Applicant	<p><b>Rights of Way and NMUs</b></p> <p>The scheme includes the creation of a new restricted byway with agricultural access on the northern side of the new alignment, west of Winterbourne Stoke to Yarnbury Castle, which will tie in to PRow SLAN3 north of the A303. A number of RRs (including Winterbourne Stoke Parish Council) have queried the necessity and justification for Green Bridge No 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain the function of the route and why this alignment was chosen.</li> <li>ii. What consultation has been carried out with stakeholders and landowners regarding the need for and location of Green Bridge no. 1?</li> </ul>
Tr.1.23	Applicant	<p><b>Rights of Way and NMUs</b></p> <p>Please provide a response to the request by Berwick Down Ltd [RR-1977] for Green Bridge no. 1 to be moved further west to minimise the need for a long diversion for farm traffic.</p>
Tr.1.24	Applicant	<p><b>Rights of Way and NMUs</b></p> <p>The scheme includes the creation of a new NMU route, part BOAT and part restricted byway along the southern side of the new alignment, which will tie in with PRow SLAN3 south of the A303.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain the function of the route and why this alignment was chosen.</li> <li>ii. What consultation has been carried out with stakeholders and landowners?</li> </ul>
Tr.1.25	Applicant	<p><b>Rights of Way and NMUs</b></p> <p>The scheme includes a new bridleway, east from Winterbourne Stoke to the new Longbarrow Junction, connecting with the new restricted byway through the WHS via Green Bridge no. 2 to the east of the existing Longbarrow junction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain the function of the route and why this alignment was chosen.</li> <li>ii. What consultation has been carried out with stakeholders and landowners?</li> <li>iii. Please provide a commentary on the request by Winterbourne Stoke Parish Council (and landowners) for this new bridleway to be re-routed from the north side of the A303 to the south side, and also that a Green Bridge crossing of the A360 at Longbarrow should be provided as a critical safety feature in place of the proposed light-controlled crossing for equines, cyclists and pedestrians.</li> <li>iv. Please also comment on the feasibility/desirability of the suggestion by Wiltshire Ramblers [RR-0859] that this route should start at the</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		junction of the existing A303 and footpath WST04 to cross the River Till on its own footbridge north of the present A303.
Tr.1.26	Applicant	<p><b>Rights of Way and NMUs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide a commentary on the requests by the British Horse Society [RR-0380] for the provision of a suitable safe crossing system (preferably a bridge) at the new Longbarrow roundabout for the new bridleway leading out of Winterbourne Stoke.</li> <li>ii. Is there any potential for provision of an off-road link for all NMUs from north of Rolleston Crossroads to the restricted byway at the Visitor Centre?</li> </ul>
Tr.1.27	Applicant	<p><b>Rights of Way and NMUs</b></p> <p>Please respond to the suggestion by Fowler Fortescue (obo Robert Turner) [RR-1606] that the existing Byway WST06B should be downgraded to improve the quality of the PRoW network and improve the tranquillity of the WHS landscape.</p>
Tr.1.28	Applicant	<p><b>Rights of Way and NMUs</b></p> <p>The scheme includes the creation of a new restricted byway open to NMUs, agricultural and statutory utility vehicles through the WHS along the route of the existing A303, connecting with Stonehenge Road at the eastern end of the scheme. A number of RRs, including the Trial Riders Federation, object strongly to the proposed extinguishment of vehicular</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>rights over the section of the A303 between BOATS AMES 11 and AMES 12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide a detailed justification for the omission of the earlier proposal to provide a new BOAT link for motorised users between AMES11 and AMES12 north of the Normanton Down Barrow Group.</li> <li>ii. What evidence is there that the provision of such a link for use by motorised traffic would be harmful to heritage and landscape interests, in the light of the retention of AMES12 as a BOAT through the WHS?</li> <li>iii. Please provide a commentary on Trial Riders Federation's view that turning AMES 11 into a cul de sac by removal of the link along the A303 would be unlawful in the absence of provision for a convenient alternative.</li> </ul>
Tr.1.29	Applicant	<p><b>Rights of Way and NMUs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What consideration has been given to the conclusions of the Inspectors in previous Inquiries in 2005 (HA61/4/3) and 2011 (DPI/T3915/11/20) in respect of rights of access for motorised users of the existing BOAT network?</li> <li>ii. How have their conclusions been taken into account in finalising proposals for the DCO scheme?</li> <li>iii. How has the Applicant attempted to balance the competing interests of user groups, for example [RR-1741] (Green Lanes</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Federation), [RR-1742] (GLEAM), [RR-1907] (Trail Riders Fellowship) and [RR-0380] (British Horse Society)?
Tr.1.30	Applicant	<p><b>Rights of Way and NMUs</b></p> <p>A number of objectors (eg [RR-0059] (Ben Davey) [RR-1485] (Maryam Halcrow) [RR-1731] (Francis Stoner)) consider that removal of the link along the A303 would result in discrimination against groups who rely on motorised transport to gain access to the countryside and the WHS.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain how the duties under the Equalities Act have been taken into account in finalising the DCO proposals in this regard.</li> <li>ii. How does the scheme reflect the commitment in paragraph 3.19 of the NPSNN to 'creating a more accessible and inclusive transport network' which takes account of accessibility requirements of all those who use, or are affected by, national networks infrastructure including disabled users?</li> </ol>
Tr.1.31	Applicant	<p><b>Rights of Way and NMUs</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide a detailed response to Wiltshire Council's view that the DCO scheme should make provision for a prohibition of driving order as associated development along this section of the A303 current alignment.</li> <li>ii. Would the extinction of rights for motorised users result in a breach of the Council's statutory duty under s130 of the Highways Act</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		1980 to prevent, as far as possible, the stopping up of highway rights with the lack of any mitigation measures?
Tr.1.32	Applicant	<p><b>Rights of Way and NMUs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide a response to the objection by English Heritage (EH) to the section of the proposed restricted byway running alongside the A360 within the boundary of the Stonehenge Visitor Centre complex, creating a 4-metre wide byway for pedestrians, cyclists and carriages within the boundary of the Stonehenge Visitor Centre.</li> <li>ii. Please explain the function of the route and why this alignment was chosen. What consultation has been carried out with stakeholders and landowners?</li> <li>iii. How have EH's concerns regarding visitor safety, security, visitor management, impact on the Visitor Centre and recent investment in car parking been taken into account?</li> <li>iv. Please respond to the suggestion by EH that an alternative route outside the boundary of the Visitor Centre would not give rise to these adverse impacts.</li> </ul>
Tr.1.33	Applicant	<p><b>Rights of Way and NMUs</b></p> <p>Please respond to the suggestion by Wiltshire Ramblers that byway AMES 2 should be kept open with a footbridge across the A303 to avoid the</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		need for users of Allington Lane or AMES1 to make an unreasonably inconvenient diversion to the west.
Tr.1.34	Applicant	<p><b>Rights of Way and NMUs</b></p> <p>Please respond to the suggestion by PFA Consulting obo Amesbury Property Co and ClassMaxi Limited that it would be cheaper to continue AMES 1 as far as the diverted Allington Track as an alternative to the current DCO proposal.</p>
Tr.1.35	Applicant	<p><b>Rights of Way and NMUs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain the function and alignment of the proposed footpath along the line of the stopped-up Byway between the new link to the Allington Track and A303, the need for which has been questioned by an IP (Countryside Solutions obo Beacon Hill Land Limited).</li> <li>ii. What consultation has taken place with landowners and stakeholders?</li> </ul>
Tr.1.36	Applicant	<p><b>Rights of Way and NMUs</b></p> <p>What arrangements are to be put in place for the treatment of the stopped up Allington Track, the removal of the metal surface, and subsequent land ownership and maintenance?</p>
Tr.1.37	Applicant	<p><b>Alternative modes</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Paragraph 8.5.4 of the TA suggests that there is very limited scope for coach travel to replace long distance journeys on the A303 and Paragraph 8.5.7 of the TA concludes that analysis of the potential for modal transfer to rail, assuming a hypothetical step-change in rail facilities, showed that traffic flows on the A303 could only be reduced by in the order of 11%. Further detail is set out in the Technical Note Appendix 8.5 to the TA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What is meant by 'a step-change' and what are the prospects of such investment in the rail network occurring?</li> <li>ii. Would the upgrading of the network necessarily facilitate modal shift such that there would be a significant reduction in forecast traffic flows on the A303 in the do-minimum scenario?</li> <li>iii. Would traffic reduction meet the other principal objectives of the scheme?</li> </ul>
Tr.1.38	Applicant	<p><b>Construction traffic impact assessment</b></p> <p>Table 9-1 of the TA sets out estimated daily HGV movements during construction phases. The inclusion of 74 tunnel related concrete deliveries in Phase 1 appears to be contrary to the broad phasing set out in para 9.2.1 which suggests that the construction of the tunnel is the primary construction activity in Phase 2, from 2024 onwards. Additionally it is suggested that excavation spoil from the tunnel will be used in the construction of earthworks associated with the phase 1 activities ie the construction of Winterbourne Stoke By-pass, Longbarrow junction and Countess roundabout flyover.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please provide further clarification of the phasing and routing of expected HGV movements, particularly in relation to the construction of the tunnel and the distribution of tunnel spoil.
Tr. 1.39	Applicant	<p><b>Construction traffic impact assessment</b></p> <p>Para 9.4.5 of the TA states that travel plans will be in place, and an assumption of an average vehicle occupancy of three has been made. Is there any independent evidence which corroborates this assumed occupancy rate?</p>
Tr. 1.40	Applicant	<p><b>Construction traffic impact assessment</b></p> <p>Figures 9-3 and 9-4 show differences between construction scenarios AADT &amp; 2026 without scheme AADT for Phases 1 &amp; 2 respectively. Paras 9.5.3/4 indicate during construction there is forecast to be a decrease in flows on the A303 mainline near the scheme as traffic re-routes to avoid increases in journey time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Can it be assumed that the majority of re-routing will take place during peak hours and if so how will this interact with construction staff traffic arriving and departing at the construction compounds?</li> <li>ii. How has the additional impact of diversions from the A303 on affected communities eg Shrewton been assessed?</li> </ul>
Tr. 1.41	Applicant	<p><b>Construction traffic impact assessment</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Table 9-3 shows that an increase of 13% is forecast at Netton during Construction Phase 1.</p> <p>Please explain why this is not considered to be significant.</p>
Tr.1.42	Applicant	<p><b>Construction traffic impact assessment</b></p> <p>Para 9.5.9 and Table 9.4 indicate that there is a forecast increase in journey times through the A303 of between 2 and 4 minutes in construction Phase 1, principally due to the speed limit in place during the construction phase. In Construction Phase 2, with Winterbourne Stoke bypass and Countess Flyover in place, delays are predicted to be shorter.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What degree of confidence can be placed in these forecasts?</li> <li>ii. How likely is it that increased diversion rates would result from longer delays on the main-line and would the impact on affected communities still be assessed as acceptable?</li> </ol>
Tr.1.43	Applicant	<p><b>Construction traffic impact assessment</b></p> <p>Figure 9-5 indicates an increase in AM Peak queue length southbound on the A360 into Longbarrow junction during both phases of construction, up to 700 m in phase 1 and 400 m in Phase 2.</p> <p>How has the effect of additional delay and inconvenience for drivers heading on into Salisbury on the A460 been taken into account in the assessment?</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Tr.1.44	Applicant	<p><b>Construction traffic impact assessment</b></p> <p>Para 9.7.6 states that in both AM and PM operational models the signals have been adjusted to minimise queuing and journey time increases through Countess Roundabout.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Is this likely to have an adverse effect on journey times for non-A303 traffic passing through Countess roundabout at peak and busy times?</li> <li>ii. How has this been taken into account in the assessment of scheme benefits and costs?</li> </ul>
Tr.1.45	Applicant	<p><b>Construction traffic impact assessment</b></p> <p>The overall conclusion on construction traffic (Para 9.7.7) is that impacts will be of an acceptable level and will be short term. The Construction period is due to last 68 months in total.</p> <p>While disruption during Phase 2 is predicted to be lower than Phase 1, does this give full weight to the disruption experienced by drivers, particularly for those using the network for regular journeys to work?</p>
Tr.1.46	Applicant	<p><b>Construction traffic impact assessment</b></p> <p>Paragraph 9.1.1 refers to the production of a Traffic Management Plan, to outline the traffic management strategies for construction, operation and emergency situations, to be prepared by the successful contractor. Relevant information is set out in the TA Appendix 9.1 – Technical Note</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>022: Scheme assumptions for DCO Construction Traffic Management Modelling.</p> <p>In order to assist understanding of the likely impacts of construction traffic on the local road network and how mitigation measures will be secured in the DCO, can the Applicant provide a draft TMP showing main construction routes, location of compounds, operating lanes, speed limits, carriageway closures, diversion routes, weight restrictions, and traffic management measures and arrangements for busy periods?</p>
WM.1	<b>Waste and materials management</b>	
WM.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>On-site reuse of tunnel arisings</b></p> <p>There is an apparent contradiction between the plans presented within Figure 4-1 [APP-285] and Work Plan (Work No. 8) [APP-008] in respect of how the land east of Parsonage Down NNR has been represented.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm the correct area for the placement of the 500,000m<sup>3</sup> of tunnel arisings; and what, if any, effect the anomalous detail in the plans has on the assessments in the ES?</p>
WM.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>On-site reuse of tunnel arisings</b></p> <p>With reference to [APP-267] OLEMP section 5.6, can the Applicant:</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Provide information detailing the processes involved in how the 500,000m<sup>3</sup> of tunnel arisings will be placed on the land east of Parsonage Down NNR?</li> <li>ii. Explain the extent to which the placement of the 500,000m<sup>3</sup> of tunnel arisings and associated vehicle movements could disturb un-recorded archaeological assets?</li> <li>iii. Outline any mitigation that would be required?</li> </ul>
WM.1.3	Applicant	<p><b>On-site reuse of tunnel arisings</b></p> <p>Can the Applicant provide information detailing the processes involved in how the 400,000m<sup>3</sup> of tunnel arisings will be placed to provide the embankments for the Winterbourne Stoke Bypass?</p>
WM.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>On-site reuse of tunnel arisings</b></p> <p>If a phased approach is utilised for the placing the 900,000m<sup>3</sup> of tunnel arisings can the Applicant provide a plan setting out how the phased earth works will occur and state any anticipated significant effects associated with a phased approach?</p>
WM.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>On-site reuse of tunnel arisings</b></p> <p>If a phased method will not be implemented, can the Applicant state if and where the excavated materials will be stored, and any significant effects likely to occur from storing the soils, with respect to potential loss</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		of soil nutrients and in-combination effects with [APP -044] Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects and [APP-045] Chapter 8: Biodiversity?
WM.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>On-site reuse of tunnel arisings</b></p> <p>Can the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Describe the methods to be used to manage noise and dust emissions associated with the placement of 500,000m<sup>3</sup> of tunnel arisings on the land east of Parsonage Down NNR?</li> <li>ii. Explain how this would avoid significantly impacting the biodiversity within the Parsonage Down NNR?</li> <li>iii. Explain how any measures would be secured through the DCO?</li> </ul>
WM.1.7	Applicant	<p><b>On-site reuse of tunnel arisings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please indicate what consideration was given to soil stripping, stockpiling, stockpile management and subsequent redistribution for the existing top soil at land east of Parsonage Down NNR.</li> <li>ii. Please justify why this approach has been discounted (expanding upon the current reasoning given, as the implementation of this approach for other projects does not necessarily mean it is the most appropriate approach for the proposed development).</li> </ul>
WM.1.8	Applicant	<p><b>Off-site disposal of tunnel arisings</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Notwithstanding the information provided in the Tunnel Arisings Management Strategy [APP-285] and the MW-GEO7 of the OEMP [APP-187], can the Applicant explain the disposal processes (including storage and transportation) that would be implemented in the event that not all of the 900,000m<sup>3</sup> of excavated tunnel material can be re-used within the Order limits?</li> <li>ii. How would this be secured through the DCO?</li> </ul>
WM.1.9	Environment Agency	<p><b>Off-site disposal of tunnel arisings</b></p> <p>The EA supports the Applicant's commitments for the re-use of excavated materials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please explain the EA's position in the event that not all of the excavated tunnel materials could be re-used within the Order limits?</li> <li>ii. What would be the implications for the CL:AIRE code of practice?</li> <li>iii. Do you consider that any additional controls would be required within the DCO?</li> </ul>
WM.1.10	Applicant	<p><b>Off-site disposal of tunnel arisings</b></p> <p>Can the Applicant provide justification for why the potential effect of a 10-300% increase in HGV movements for off-site disposal of tunnel arisings is classified as small adverse in [APP-285]?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>In providing the answer please consider the potential effects from noise, air pollution and traffic that may occur from a 300% increase in HGV movements.</p>
WM.1.11	Applicant	<p><b>Off-site disposal of tunnel arisings</b></p> <p>For a worst-case scenario where off-site disposal of the tunnel arisings is required, can the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Describe the measures that would be used to mitigate the adverse air quality, traffic and noise effects on receptors along the route; and</li> <li>ii. set out how the measures would be secured?</li> </ul>
WM.1.12	Applicant	<p><b>Off-site disposal of waste</b></p> <p>In respect of the depositing of excavated material, can the Applicant state the locations of the sensitive noise receptors assessed within [APP-285] TAMS Appendix B?</p>
WM.1.13	Applicant	<p><b>Off-site disposal of waste</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Can the Applicant provide a robust justification for utilising the entirety of the waste management and infrastructure sites within the South West and South East regions, (as set out in [APP-050] section 12.4) as the study area?</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Why was a smaller, more localised waste infrastructure study area/ region, not utilised?</li> <li>iii. If a smaller study area were utilised what effect would this have on the significance of the environmental effects associated with the transportation of waste?</li> <li>iv. Can the Applicant explain how it proposes to assess the impact of utilising waste infrastructure across the whole of the South West and South East regions in terms of transport and traffic, air quality, and noise and vibration?</li> </ul>
WM.1.14	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Off-site disposal of waste</b></p> <p>In respect of waste:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide details of the Council's waste policies (including any supporting text) in the adopted development plan relevant to the proposed development.</li> <li>ii. Provide an assessment of the development against these policies (if this is not to be included in the Local Impact Report).</li> <li>iii. Provide details of any relevant emerging policies.</li> <li>iv. Does the Council have any estimate of the waste management capacity within the county throughout the anticipated construction period, and, if so, please provide details?</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
WM.1.15	Applicant	<p><b>Waste management</b></p> <p>The ES confirms that professional judgement has been applied to estimate the quantity of waste likely to arise as a result of the development. Can the Applicant explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What, if any, assumptions were made in applying this judgement and if any uncertainties in the findings exist?</li> <li>ii. The extent to which the assessment is sensitive to the assumptions applied (and whether any sensitivity analysis has been undertaken on this basis).</li> <li>iii. If, during construction, it became apparent that there had been an underestimation, what, if any mitigating measures would be required and how would this be secured through the DCO?</li> </ul>
WM.1.16	Applicant	<p><b>Use of materials</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Can the Applicant explain whether it considered applying the higher South East region target for alternative materials (secondary and recycled aggregates) to the design of the Proposed Development?</li> <li>ii. In addition, can the Applicant also explain the extent to which the higher target would be achievable for the Proposed Development?</li> </ul>
WM.1.17	Applicant	<p><b>Use of materials</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The ES confirms that professional judgement has been applied to estimate the quantity of materials required for the construction of the development. Can the Applicant explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What, if any, assumptions were made in applying this judgement and if any uncertainties in the findings exist?</li> <li>ii. The extent to which the assessment is sensitive to the assumptions applied?</li> <li>iii. If, during construction, it became apparent that there had been an underestimation, what, if any mitigating measures would be required and how would this be secured through the DCO?</li> </ul>
WM.1.18	Applicant	<p><b>Use of materials</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. If the National and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020 is updated prior to the start of construction, has the Applicant considered the need to alter the alternative materials targets (secondary and recycled aggregates)?</li> <li>ii. In addition, has any assessment been made for the potential that a higher percentage of alternative materials is required to that set out in ES Chapter 12 Table 12.4?</li> <li>iii. If not, please provide this and set out how this matter could be secured as part of the DCO?</li> </ul>



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
WM.1.19	Applicant	<b>Use of materials</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. Can the Applicant state the confidence they have in achieving the target of using 22% secondary or recycled aggregates?</li><li>ii. What would be the implications if this target could not be reached and, if so, would any mitigation need to be secured?</li></ul>

**ANNEX A**

<b>AADT</b>	Annual Average Daytime Traffic
<b>AODM</b>	Area of Detailed Modelling
<b>AQA</b>	Air Quality Assessment
<b>AQMA</b>	Air Quality Management Area
<b>BOAT</b>	Byway Open to all Traffic
<b>CEMP</b>	Construction Environmental Management Plan
<b>CSM</b>	Conceptual Site Model
<b>CWS</b>	County Wildlife Site
<b>DAMS</b>	Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy
<b>dDCO</b>	Draft Development Consent Order
<b>DDCMS</b>	Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport
<b>EA</b>	Environment Agency
<b>EHO</b>	Environmental Health Officer
<b>ES</b>	Environmental Statement
<b>ETRO</b>	Experimental Traffic Regulation Order

<b>ExA</b>	Examining Authority
<b>GHG</b>	Greenhouse Gas
<b>HEMP</b>	Handover Environmental Management Plan
<b>HGV</b>	Heavy goods vehicle
<b>HIA</b>	Heritage Impact Assessment
<b>HMAG</b>	Heritage Monitoring and Advisory Group
<b>HMP</b>	Heritage Management Plan
<b>HRA</b>	Habitats Regulations Assessment
<b>ICOMOS</b>	International Council on Monuments and Site
<b>IP</b>	Interested Party
<b>LoD</b>	Limits of Deviation
<b>LTCA</b>	Local Townscape Character Area
<b>LLCA</b>	Local Landscape Character Area
<b>LVIA</b>	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
<b>MCTC</b>	Manual Classified Turning Counts
<b>MOD</b>	Ministry of Defence

<b>NE</b>	Natural England
<b>NMU</b>	Non-motorised user
<b>NNR</b>	National Nature Reserve
<b>NO<sub>2</sub></b>	Nitrogen dioxide
<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	Nitrogen oxide
<b>NPPF</b>	National Planning Policy Framework
<b>NPS</b>	National Policy Statement
<b>NPSNN</b>	National Policy Statement for National Networks
<b>OAMS</b>	Outline Archaeological Management Strategy
<b>OEMP</b>	Outline Environmental Management Plan
<b>OUV</b>	Outstanding Universal Value
<b>OWSI</b>	Outline Written Scheme of Investigation
<b>PA2008</b>	Planning Act 2008
<b>PRoW</b>	Public Right of Way
<b>REAC</b>	Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments
<b>RIS</b>	Road Investment Strategy

<b>RR</b>	Relevant Representation
<b>SAC</b>	Special Area of Conservation
<b>SPA</b>	Special Protection Area
<b>SSSI</b>	Site of Special Scientific Interest
<b>SSWSI</b>	Site Specific Written Scheme of Investigation
<b>SuDS</b>	Sustainable urban drainage system
<b>TA</b>	Transport Assessment
<b>TRO</b>	Traffic Regulation Order
<b>VVM</b>	Verified View Montage
<b>WCAS</b>	Wiltshire Council Archaeological Services
<b>WebTAG</b>	Web based Transport Appraisal Guidance
<b>WFD</b>	Water Framework Directive
<b>WHO</b>	World Health Organisation
<b>WHS</b>	World Heritage Site
<b>ZTV</b>	Zone of Theoretical Visibility