

A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down

TR010025

Deadline 4

**8.30.3 - Written summaries of oral submissions put at
Landscape and Visual hearing on
7th June 2019**

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

June 2019



Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure)

Rules 2010

A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down

Development Consent Order 20[**]

**Written summaries of oral submissions put at Landscape and
Visual hearing on 7th June 2019**

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(g)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010025
Application Document Reference	8.30.3
Author:	A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	21 June 2019	Deadline 4 Issue

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	1-2
2	Written summary of oral submissions	2-3
3	POLICY AND GUIDANCE, INCLUDING THAT OF:.....	2-3
4	ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT CHAPTER 7 – ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES.....	2-6
5	EFFECTS ON LANDSCAPE CHARACTER.....	2-12
6	VISUAL EFFECTS	2-14
7	ARBORICULTURE.....	2-16
8	DESIGN.....	2-18

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This document summarises the oral submissions made by the Applicant at the Issue Specific Hearing on Landscape and Visual Effects held on Friday 7 June 2019.
- 1.1.2 Where the Examining Authority requested further information from the Applicant on particular matters, or the Applicant undertook to provide further information during the hearing, the Applicant's response is set out in this document.
- 1.1.3 This document does not purport to summarise the oral submissions of parties other than the Applicant, and summaries of submissions made by other parties are only included where necessary in order to give context to the Applicant's submissions in response, or where the Applicant agreed with the submissions of another party and so made no further submissions itself (this document notes where that is the case).
- 1.1.4 The structure of this document follows the order of items as set out in the agenda for the issue specific hearing on landscape and visual effects ("Agenda"). Numbered agenda items referred to are references to the numbered items in the Agenda.

2 Written summary of oral submissions

3 POLICY AND GUIDANCE, INCLUDING THAT OF:	
Agenda Item	Highways England response
<p><i>i. ICOMOS/UNESCO.</i></p> <p><i>ii. The National Policy Statement for National Networks.</i></p> <p><i>iii. Wiltshire Council</i></p>	<p>Reuben Taylor QC, on behalf of Highways England (the Applicant) identified that the relevant National Policy Statement for National Networks (“NPSNN”) paragraphs in relation to landscape and visual impact assessment and design matters can be found in the Environmental Statement Chapter 7 – Landscape and Visual Effects (“LVIA”) [APP-045] Table 7.2.1. Mr Taylor QC stated that the conformity of the scheme with those paragraphs is addressed in detail in the Case of the Scheme [APP-294], in particular the summary provided in Appendix B and Table 7.1. on page 7-43. In relation to the relevant Development Plan Policies, Mr Taylor QC advised that those are identified in in the LVIA [APP-045], paragraph 7.2.3 and also addressed in Appendix B of the Case for Scheme. Mr Taylor QC highlighted of particular relevance policies 51, 52 and 57 of the Core Strategy and noted that Wiltshire Council’s Local Impact Report provides information to confirm compliance with those three policies.</p> <p>In relation to ICOMOS guidance on heritage impact assessments, Mr Taylor QC referred to paragraph 5.2 which states that impact assessments have the tendency to see impacts as primarily visual. Mr Taylor QC stated that the ICOMOS guidance guards against this by stating that there are many other matters of relevance, and therefore the Applicant’s Heritage Impact Assessment (“HIA”) process is much wider than just landscape and visual matters. Mr Taylor QC highlighted that this is explained in the HIA [APP-195] at section 3.4, and Table 3, which sets out the assessment of the Scheme on the elements that the guidance requires to be addressed.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC emphasised the need to ensure there was no confusion between the two separate processes.</p> <p>The Examining Authority queried whether the HIA regarded the immediate area outside the World Heritage Site as the equivalent of a buffer zone.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC confirmed that whilst the HIA takes into account a buffer zone around the World Heritage Site, the HIA explains in 3.4 that you have to be careful and aware of the precise nature of the process it is looking at. He gave an example from paragraph 3.4.4 which states that the HIA addresses impacts on the site and associated sites but not the full length of the Scheme.</p>
<p><i>iv Published landscape assessments</i></p>	<p>Richard Hammond on behalf of the Applicant explained that published landscape character assessments had been used in the LVIA [APP-045] as they identify key characteristics and distinctive features as well as providing recommendations for the management of future change in the landscape, and it is in accordance with policy (NPSNN paragraph 5.144 and Wiltshire Core Policy 51: Landscape) to use published landscape character assessments. Mr Hammond confirmed that the use of these is explained in the LVIA [APP-045] paragraph 7.6.102 onwards.</p>

	<p>Mr Hammond confirmed that the Applicant has reviewed and considered the following in the LVIA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At a national level, Natural England’s National Character Area 132 Salisbury Plain and West Wiltshire Down, as shown in paragraph 7.6.106 onwards; 2. At a county level, the Wiltshire County Landscape Character Assessment has been referenced for landscape character types and landscape character areas, as set out in paragraph 7.6.109 onwards and illustrated on Figure 7.6 [APP-084]; 3. At a district level, the Salisbury District Landscape Character Assessment has been referenced for landscape character areas and landscape character types as set out in paragraph 7.6.111 onwards and illustrated on Figure 7.7. [APP-085]; 4. Also at district level, the Salisbury District Setting Assessment, which focuses on Amesbury, Bulford and Durrington as set out in paragraph 7.6.113 onwards; and 5. At a local level, the principal landscape areas identified in the Stonehenge and Avebury World Heritage Site Management Plan have been referred to. The Management Plan identifies principal landscape areas as a means to informing the local landscape and townscape character areas as set out in paragraph 7.6.117 <p>Mr Hammond noted that more detailed information is provided on these in the Environmental Statement Appendix 7.4, Published Landscape Character Assessments [APP-224].</p> <p>The Examining Authority queried the process of forming these local landscape character areas and how this related to landscape character assessments that the Applicant has gone through.</p> <p>Mr Hammond advised that the Applicant had taken the published assessments as its starting point, reviewing the boundaries and the key characteristics and the features that they identify. He confirmed that as these cover a larger area than the Scheme and the study area for it, the Applicant decided to identify and refine local landscape and local townscape areas, based on a review of the published studies and its own fieldwork in order to provide a finer level of detail at a more local level, specific to the scheme. These character areas were drawn up based on this work for the purpose of providing more detail proportionate to the scale of the Scheme and its position in the landscape.</p> <p>The Examining Authority asked what approach the Applicant took, and what it took from each hierarchy and how it decided.</p> <p>Mr Hammond stated that if a published study had identified, for example, the River Till Valley corridor as a landscape character area that extended from Shrewton to Stapleford that was taken as a top tier scale. Mr Hammond explained that this was then broken down further based on professional judgement and site work.</p>
	<p>Susan Denyer of ICOMOS UK made submissions on the relevant documents related to World Heritage. She stated that these are the World Heritage Convention, the Operational Guidelines for implementation of convention, and the ICOMOS guidance on HIA.</p>

	<p>Mr Taylor QC confirmed that the operational guidelines that were referred to by ICOMOS are addressed fully in the HIA [APP-195] for example at paragraph 6.6.14. Regarding points made by Ms Denyer on disassociation of heritage assets from the landscape, Mr Taylor QC submitted that with over 1,000 references to landscape, a reader of the 700 plus pages of the HIA could not reasonably form that judgement. He confirmed that the relationship of the assets to the landscape is addressed throughout the HIA, which is inevitable when addressing the assessment of the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value (“OUV”), as well as its authenticity and integrity. As an overall point, Mr Taylor QC stated that the scope of the HIA embraces very clearly the relationship between the historic assets, the historic landscape and landscape generally. He advised that the scope of the methodology followed was accepted by the WHC/ICOMOS Advisory Mission as appropriate.</p> <p>Responding to comments from the Stonehenge Alliance, Mr Taylor QC stated that the purpose of the hearing was to discuss the LVIA that had been produced, not heritage matters. Although the Applicant recognised that there is an inter-relationship between the LVIA and HIA, Mr Taylor QC stated that the Applicant had set this out in the HIA. Mr Taylor QC commented that the criticism of the approach of having a HIA and separate LVIA is in the opinion of the Applicant entirely misplaced, because the two documents do different things. He reiterated that the approach adopted by the Applicant arises out of the Environmental Statement methodology, the scope of which was agreed with the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>Sarah Simmonds, Stonehenge and Avebury World Heritage Site Coordination Unit advised that whilst the HIA is in many ways exemplary, she had concerns over adding up impacts on different asset groups and balancing elements on the whole cultural landscape.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC responded stating that this had been addressed in Issue Specific Hearing 2. He confirmed that the ICOMOS guidance on heritage impact assessments requires an overall view of impact to be provided having regard to the benefits and impacts of the scheme, in accordance with the methodology it sets out. Mr Taylor QC advised that all the Applicant had done is follow the requirements of the guidance. He added that although different parties have different views on what the outcome of that balance should be, no one other than the Applicant had presented their own balance, looking at all of the assessment requirements that are required through the HIA methodology process.</p>
<p>iv. Published Landscape Assessments.</p> <p>v. Comments on Local Landscape Character Assessment</p>	<p>The Examining Authority noted that the local landscape character areas listed at paragraph 7.6.125 of the LVIA does not equate with Figure.7.8, which shows more areas than those listed and sought clarification on the reason for this.</p> <p>Mr Hammond stated that the list in paragraph 7.6.125 just provided a summary of those areas the Applicant identified itself. Any omission was not intentional as the areas should be illustrated on the corresponding figure as provided in the LVIA. Mr Hammond stated that the landscape character areas listed in paragraph 7.6.125 took as a basis, areas that had been defined at a larger scale within the world heritage site management plan, as principal landscape character areas.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC advised that 7.6.125 lists the landscape character areas directly within the red line boundary, whereas Figure 7.8 shows all those within the study area.</p>

<p>vi. Comments on Townscape Character Assessments.</p>	<p>The Examining Authority noted that the townscape character assessment for the Conservation Areas, and remainder of the town, for Amesbury and Winterbourne Stoke have been considered and assessed as a unit. The Examining Authority asked for the Applicant's view on whether effectively the contribution of the Conservation Areas is downgraded by this.</p> <p>Mr Hammond referred to the Applicant's response to Written Question LV.1.28. He advised that the Applicant looked at the settlement pattern as a whole as it was considered proportionate to the scale of the assessment being undertaken. Mr Hammond advised that because the conservation areas were specifically assessed within the cultural heritage assessment, to avoid duplication it was decided that they were best covered in that assessment and therefore in landscape and townscape terms, the landscape assessment would assess the settlement pattern as a whole.</p>
<p>4 ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT CHAPTER 7 – ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES</p>	
<p>Agenda Item</p>	<p>Highways England response</p>
<p>i. Compatibility of GLVIA 3 and Interim Advice Note 135/10.</p>	<p>The Examining Authority enquired on the compatibility of GLVIA 3, which is taken to assess sensitivity of areas, with Interim Advice Note 135/10, which was used for the rest of the assessment, and why the Applicant had not used one or the other completely.</p> <p>Mr Hammond explained that GLVIA 3 is referenced in NPSNN footnote 102. He said that the advantage it has over IAN 135/10 is that it is more current, having been published in 2013. Mr Hammond stated that the sensitivity assessment for value and susceptibility as used by the Applicant is the current industry practice, however, the advantage of IAN135/10 is that it is specifically for road schemes and provides definitions of impact, magnitude and significance of effects in relation to such projects. He noted that combining both is compatible, as IAN 135/10 makes reference to GLVIA 2, current at the time of IAN135/10, and both documents look at the same thing, namely who are the landscape and visual receptors, their sensitivity, the magnitude of impact, and what is the likelihood of significant effects.</p> <p>The Examining Authority asked whether this is the normal way that landscape is assessed with road schemes.</p> <p>Mr Hammond confirmed that it was the way that he had undertaken his assessment on a number of occasions, and that he knew of professionals in other companies who also undertook assessments in the same manner, given that GLVIA 3 is more current and in line with industry practice in identifying sensitivity, but IAN 135/10 contains the tables and definitions for a road scheme.</p> <p>The Examining Authority asked whether IAN 135/10 is sensitive to extremely important landscapes.</p> <p>Mr Hammond stated that it does allow for high sensitivity, and for consideration of cultural matters, and also avoids double counting between landscape and cultural heritage assessments. Mr Hammond noted that ultimately, as guidance, one can still interpret as one would like, highlighting that the experts reviewing cultural heritage chose to look at sensitivity ratings of very high, whereas for this assessment he had used a sensitivity rating that was high. Mr Hammond confirmed that this reflects guidance in GLVIA in terms of value and susceptibility of receptors.</p>

<p>ii. Design of matrices. Baseline assumptions.</p>	<p>The Examining Authority noted that the GLVIA 3 avoids matrices because of the acceptance that one size does not fit all, and enquired whether it was appropriate to use IAN 135/10, as Table 3 only has low, moderate and high.</p> <p>Mr Hammond confirmed that it is an appropriate tool, because the methodology for the landscape and visual impact assessment allows for the person undertaking the assessment to assign a significant effect to any of those sensitivity groups. Mr Hammond explained that the matrix linking the sensitivity of the receptor to a magnitude of impact is only a guide and it is for the discretion of the person undertaking the assessment to assess how they consider that receptor to be affected, and the likelihood of significance. Mr Hammond said therefore that having a 3-tiered approach is appropriate to take the receptor through the process of identifying likely significant affects.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC noted that the methodology deployed in the LVIA was agreed with relevant consultees. He added that the Examining Authority could refer to the Applicant's response to written question LV.1.20 in relation to the inter-relationship between GLVIA 3 and IAN135/10.</p>
<p>iv. Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) – assumptions and anomalies in outcomes.</p>	<p>The Examining Authority asked why there is no information for an investigation relating to construction compounds and haul roads.</p> <p>Mr Hammond advised that Environmental Statement Appendix 7.3 Area of Search [APP-223] sets out Zones of Theoretical Visibility (“ZTVs”) for aspects of the construction phase including the location of compounds and the slurry treatment plants. He noted that these were modelled as ‘bare earth’, which means that the structures, such as the slurry treatment plant, is shown in relation to existing landform, not including existing vegetation and buildings. Mr Hammond also advised that that the same document contains bare earth ZTVs for various aspects of the Scheme such as the flyover, or the River Till viaduct when in operation. Mr Hammond confirmed that the ZTVs were used to inform field work and identification of a study area for the LVIA.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC added that the Applicant's response to LV.1.25 explains that the ZTV used to establish the parameters for the study area and which was produced at an early stage of design and assessment process was based upon the assumption that the main construction compound and the Countess compound would be at 10 metres above ground level whereas now the Applicant has determined that these will be one storey. Therefore, the modelling done to produce the ZTV at the construction phase took a very precautionary approach.</p> <p>The Examining Authority asked about a high element at the Slurry treatment plant.</p> <p>Mr Hammond confirmed that the Applicant had modelled the tallest element of the slurry treatment plant at 20 metres height.</p> <p>The Examining Authority asked for confirmation of when bare earth ZTVs, and those which take account of the built environment are used.</p> <p>Mr Hammond confirmed that the bare earth type is appropriate for identifying a study area, as the assessment would be of a worst case scenario, and this approach enables field work to be undertaken across a wide area that has been mapped at that theoretical visibility due to the lack of barriers. He noted also that at that stage the bare earth type can be fed back to the design process, which</p>

	<p>is a useful tool. Mr Hammond stated that once the actual assessment starts, the ZTV has served its purpose and the field work and onsite observations become the assessment process.</p> <p>Mr Hammond stated that vegetation or existing buildings would be included to better ground truth the mapping exercise in reality, as there will likely be a discrepancy between the bare earth modelling, which assumes nothing else in the landscape and the barriers in the theoretical modelling, which is also based on assumptions.</p> <p>In summary, Mr Hammond stated that in all instances, whether bare earth ZTV or ZTV with barriers, they remain theoretical guides, which are not assessed in themselves. He advised that the guidance is clear that the ZTV is a desk-based process or exercise used to assist the fieldwork. It is the interrogation of this fieldwork which forms the assessment process.</p>
<p><i>v. Range of photomontages and choice of receptors.</i></p>	<p>The Examining Authority highlighted it had requested a range of photomontages at Deadline 2 but that the Applicant was unable to provide them. In terms of landscape and the night sky, the Examining Authority noted that it would have been informative to see visual imagery in relation to that.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC responded to comments from the Examining Authority, Sarah Simmonds, Stonehenge and Avebury World Heritage Site Coordination Unit, Kate Fielden of Stonehenge Alliance and Susan Denyer of ICOMOS UK as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In relation to a request for night sky montages, Mr Taylor QC highlighted the response to written question LV.1.19 which outlines that the Applicant's concern is whether it could produce anything that would be reliable. He noted that the request had been raised, so confirmed that the Applicant would take the point away and reconsider whether it could provide something reliable for the Examining Authority. Following the hearing, the Applicant noted that it would not be able to provide reliable night time imagery. 2. In relation to the other photomontage locations that were suggested by the Examining Authority in its written questions, Mr Taylor QC confirmed that the Applicant would attempt to produce photomontages where it is possible to do this on a reliable basis. He advised that for certain viewpoints suggested in mid-air the Applicant will look at the use of drones, but some of the views are below existing ground level and so could not be done. The ability to take the photos will be subject to landowners' consent and could be difficult but the Applicant is reviewing the position and subject to the above, will do its best to supplement what has been already provided. 3. In terms of dynamic views requested by Ms Fielden, Mr Taylor QC advised that the Applicant would consider what could be done that would be both reliable, and which could be produced within the examination timetable. 4. 360 degree visualisations will be provided at Deadline 4. 5. In relation to the spread of photomontages already submitted, Mr Taylor QC advised that it is important to recognise that these were produced on the basis of an agreement with relevant stakeholders as being representative and that they provide an appropriate basis of assessment to identify impact. Mr Taylor QC submitted that suggestions that locations have been chosen to hide the Scheme misunderstand the basis on which the viewpoints have been selected.

	<p>6. On the relationship between the HIA and the consideration of photomontages, Mr Taylor QC referred to paragraph 5.3.47 and Table 1 of HIA. He advised that paragraph 5.3.47 explains that photomontages have been created from 17 key views from a range of asset groups, which were agreed with the Heritage Monitoring and Advisory Group. Mr Taylor QC explained that Table 1 describes the views and the locations of them, and that those views were then carefully taken into account with 360 degree visualisations, and pages of discussion about photomontages in the HIA. Therefore, he advised that the Applicant rejects the idea that photomontages have not played a role in the HIA, as it is clear from the document that they have been taken into account.</p>
	<p>Mr Hammond added that the locations for the photomontages in the LVIA were chosen to give representative views for visitors, motorists, from the road, residents and tourists and were agreed with Wiltshire Council. He advised that the visit to Hill Farm on the accompanied site visit had been made as the Applicant felt that it gave an elevated position to look over the landscape. Mr Hammond stated that the idea that the Scheme was hidden was down to the merit of the design of the Scheme being low in the landscape and in the cutting. He highlighted that a photomontage had been prepared from Winterbourne Stoke looking north to the River Till viaduct so that the embankments are visible, and that there are a number of photomontages which had been prepared within the World Heritage Site including from the northern end of the Winterbourne Stoke group (VP13 and VP14). Mr Hammond reiterated that these were agreed, and that the idea is that they are representative of a spread of locations.</p> <p>Mr Garwood suggested use of a layby as a means to prepare a montage for the eastern portal.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC responded to this point by highlighting that there is a 360 degree view reference CH16 page 88 of HIA from a location on the east of King Barrow Ridge looking to the portal. He noted that the graphic shows the decommissioning of the A303 to the east, and that there is a further 360 degree view (reference CH19) from a location in the centre of A303/The Avenue, which takes in the eastern portal and approach.</p>
<p><i>vi. Limits of Deviation (LoD) – effects on assessments and visual representations.</i></p>	<p>The Examining Authority noted that the limits of deviation do not appear in photomontages, so asked the Applicant to demonstrate how they were taken into account.</p> <p>Mr Hammond confirmed that the limits of deviation were taken into consideration by means of the Applicant looking at application drawings and considering the maximum area of land that was anticipated to be required, and then referring to limits of deviation in Table 2.1 of Chapter 2 of Environmental Statement – The Proposed Scheme [APP-040]. The two sets of information were combined in order to assess the worst-case scenario of upwards and lateral limits of deviation as opposed to downwards limits of deviation. Mr Hammond referred to the Applicant’s answer to written question LV.1.21, stating that this also meant the Applicant was looking at landform gradients being slightly steeper as a result of the maximum upwards limits of deviation.</p> <p>Mr Hammond responded to an Examining Authority question by stating that the Applicant had looked at the combination of works plans, the indicative general arrangements plans, and engineering section drawings to form the worst-case scenario to be assessed. He confirmed that the portal locations were also the minimum of limits of deviation rather than the fuller westward or eastward extensions, so these were assessed as the worst-case scenario.</p>

<p>vii. Landscape Scheme:</p> <p>a) How is it to be produced and agreed before submission to the Secretary of State?</p>	<p>The Examining Authority asked how the landscaping scheme is to be produced and agreed before submission to Secretary of State, and how it is secured through the DCO.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC advised that the landscaping scheme is to be secured by Requirement 8 to be approved by Secretary of State. He confirmed that the process provides for consultation with relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>The Examining Authority enquired whether the iterative consultation process is set out anywhere.</p> <p>Gordon McCreath for the Applicant confirmed that Requirement 8 secures the landscaping scheme, currently with provision for consultation with the local planning authority. He advised that there is no detailed description of the iterative consultation process, stating that the obligation is to consult, meaning necessarily that the views are listened to and due regard had to those. If that was not the case, the legal obligations under the requirements would not have been complied with.</p> <p>Mr McCreath highlighted the new Requirement 11, which makes provision for a mini consultation report to be included with the package of items for approval by the Secretary of State. He advised that the mini consultation report will make note of the views that were put across during the consultation and to the extent the views are not implemented in the final landscaping scheme, in this case, then explanation will be given as to why not.</p> <p>Mr McCreath stated that while Requirement 8 is the principal obligation, there are also obligations in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (“OLEMP”) in item MW-LAN1, and also MW-G7 which refers to the obligation to consult in relation to the OLEMP with Wiltshire Council, Historic England, English Heritage and the National Trust on matters related to their functions in relation to the OLEMP. Mr McCreath stated for clarification that the Applicant will consult with Historic England in relation to landscaping to the extent it affects the World Heritage Site, and that the only question remaining is how to crystallise the obligation to consult Historic England.</p> <p>The Examining Authority sought clarity that the consultation would be with Historic England related to the World Heritage Site, Wiltshire Council generally but not the National Trust.</p> <p>Mr McCreath confirmed that was the case and that an amendment to Requirement 8 was being considered to secure this agreement.</p> <p>The Examining Authority asked whether the Outline Environmental Management Plan (“OEMP”) was being looked at again in relation to landscaping consultation.</p> <p>Mr McCreath confirmed that was the case.</p>
<p>b) How is this process secured in the Development Consent Order (DCO)?</p>	<p>The Examining Authority asked what stage of the process this would take place.</p> <p>Mr McCreath advised that the obligation was pre-commencement. He confirmed that the contractual obligation would be on the contractor to prepare the Construction Environment Management Scheme (“CEMP”) and the OLEMP. Mr McCreath noted that this process would have to start early, given that consultation was required, which would need to be gathered and considered, updates produced and the mini consultation report under Requirement 11 prepared.</p>

	<p>Paul Brown QC for Wiltshire Council sought clarification on the point of pre-commencement. He noted that Requirement 8 says 'no part' of the authorised development is to commence until the landscaping scheme has been submitted and approved in writing by the Secretary of State so enquired if this meant that landscaping had to be provided on a part by part basis, not the whole Scheme.</p> <p>Mr McCreath confirmed that was correct.</p> <p>The Examining Authority asked how the parts would be broken up and related to the whole, and if there would be an overview of how the parts can be broken down and fitted together.</p> <p>Mr McCreath advised that the Applicant will take this point away and consider it.</p> <p>Sarah Simmonds, Stonehenge and Avebury World Heritage Site Coordination Unit noted that as part of the Management Plan there are governance structures with local committees for Stonehenge and Avebury, and an overarching World Heritage Site partnership panel, which is deemed to have representatives of key stakeholders, including curatorial organisations and members of the local community. Ms Simmonds stated that this committee has the duty to sign off the management plan and review its implementation. She asked if there could be meaningful consultation with those groups.</p> <p>Mr McCreath noted that consultation is focussed on key statutory stakeholders. He highlighted however that consultation over the years had gone much wider than that, and that could be expected to continue. Mr McCreath advised that having due regard to the Management Plan is now secured as one of the design principles in section 4 of the updated OEMP submitted at Deadline 3 [REP3-006] along with principles to drive and ensure appropriate design of the landscape is being delivered. Mr McCreath said that this obligation combined with ongoing informal consultation should satisfy those points.</p> <p>Graham Burgess requested that the palette for the trees is to be looked at, highlighting the value of the trees being the same as they were in the past.</p> <p>Mr Garwood expressed concerns over the number of details being left to the contractor, and not put forward to the examination for full scrutiny.</p> <p>Christiaan Zwart on behalf of Historic England referred to the break down of the project into parts and the need in Requirement 8 for clearly defined parameters to enable the Secretary of State to make a rational decision. He stated that Historic England anticipate that Requirement 8 will form the outline parameter for such a requirement, with the Environmental Masterplan [APP-059] distilling key parameters.</p>
	<p>Mr McCreath addressed the points in turn:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On Mr Burgess's point, Mr McCreath highlighted that there are a variety of design principles at page 89 of the updated OEMP submitted at Deadline 3 [REP3-006]. Mr McCreath highlighted item PG01 which makes clear that detailed design of material elements of the scheme needs to take into account the considerations, aims and policies of the World Heritage Site management plan. Specifically on materials, Mr McCreath noted that on page 90 of the OEMP, items PLE 01, 02 and 03 deal with the planting strategy, stating this must have regard to the management plan. He added that directly in point with Mr Burgess's views these provisions ensure that new landscaping must reflect and integrate the original landscape and the detailed

	<p>design approach is to be in keeping with surrounding landscape. Mr McCreath stated that the intention alluded to in Section 4 of the OEMP is that there will be more detail on palettes and colouring that have already been under discussion with key stakeholders, but this was not ready for submission at deadline 3, therefore the intention is that this will be submitted in due course.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Responding to Mr Garwood, Mr McCreath stated that the Applicant's intention is that while there will be necessary element of flexibility within the design, such flexibility will be relatively tightly regulated by framework documents like the OEMP and the Detailed Archaeological Mitigation strategy [REP2-038], which set out parameters within which detailed design must occur. 3. Replying to Mr Zwart, Mr McCreath confirmed that the Applicant agreed with his suggested approach for Requirement 8. Mr McCreath stated that Requirement 8 requires the landscaping scheme is based on mitigation measures set out in Environmental Statement, of which the Environmental Masterplan is part. <p>The Examining Authority asked why the Environmental Masterplan was not a certified document.</p> <p>Mr McCreath noted that the Environmental Masterplan was a certified document, since it is an Appendix to the Environmental Statement (please see schedule 12 of the dDCO submitted at Deadline 4).</p>
5 EFFECTS ON LANDSCAPE CHARACTER	
Agenda Item	Highways England response
<p><i>i. Effects overall on the spatial character of the World Heritage Site (WHS) landscape ('a landscape without parallel') during construction and operation.</i></p>	<p>The Examining Authority referred to paragraph 5.4.3 of the Design and Access Statement [APP-295] ("DAS"), which provides a list of specific design principles for WHS and its setting. The Examining Authority requested comments regarding item d).</p> <p>Susan Denyer of ICOMOS UK noted that the phrase 'landscape without parallel', and discussed the uniqueness of the site in this regard.</p> <p>Mr Garwood raised concerns over the changes the Scheme would make to the landscape.</p> <p>David Field made submissions on spoil on Parsonage Down, and the effects on future archaeological works. He also raised points on the western portal, noting the long barrows and that it is possible to see activity before and after bronze age. Mr Field also noted that attention needs to be given to the length of Winterbourne Stoke Barrow Cemetery and allow access to and from it.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC addressed these points in turn:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regarding the Examining Authority's point on landform arising out of the DAS, Mr Taylor QC advised that the design principles included in the OEMP [REP3-006] include principle PLE02, which deals with this issue as it provides for new landscaping to reflect and integrate the original landscape, but not seek to imitate the monuments within the landscape.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. On the reference made to the phrase “<i>landscape without parallel</i>” Mr Taylor QC submitted that care is needed in using that phrase, as its origin is in the statement of OUV, and has to be seen in the context within which the statement is made and the purpose of that document. He added that understanding the nature and the use of the word ‘landscape’ had to be viewed in that context. Mr Taylor QC noted that the implications of the Scheme have been addressed very carefully against the attributes in the OUV in the HIA, for example in relation to Attribute 6, in HIA the overall view was that the Scheme would be slightly beneficial. 3. Responding to comments on the Longbarrow Junction, Mr Taylor QC noted that the implications of that junction had been carefully assessed, including its implications for the historic landscape and landscape character. He referred in particular to the HIA paragraph 11.1.26 to 11.1.27 which identifies positive and negative effects. 4. Responding to points about connection to landscape, Mr Taylor QC noted this is addressed in detail in the HIA; and the implications of the scheme in both reconnecting the relevant heritage assets generally with one another, and the potential disbenefits are carefully evaluated in that document.
<p>ii. Effects on particular landscape receptors.</p>	<p>Andrew Nicholson on behalf of Cycling Opportunities Groups and Cycling UK stated concern over the lack of detail about cycle tracks.</p>
<p>iii. The effects on tranquillity during construction and operation.</p>	<p>Kate Logan on behalf of English Heritage commented that English Heritage believe that in the operational phase, the final scheme will significantly improve the tranquillity of the central part of the World Heritage Site.</p> <p>In terms of construction, Ms Logan stated that English Heritage flagged potential impacts of construction compound and did not feel they have enough detail yet to fully assess the impact.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC addressed the points raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regarding the cycle route issues, Mr Taylor QC highlighted the additional detail provided in the latest OEMP [REP3-006] in particular reference D-CH26, which he noted explains that any bound surface within the World Heritage Site shall be a maximum of 3 metres wide, and public rights of way shall be suitably coloured to be integrated into the surroundings. In addition, Mr Taylor QC referred to reference PROW1, which sets out the intention to use a bound surface where appropriate, with areas within the World Heritage Site being sympathetic to their surroundings, including use by cyclists and other users. Mr Taylor QC highlighted the additions to the new OEMP which addressed the use of the existing A303, including reference D-CH2 and D-LAN1. 2. Mr Taylor QC confirmed that the Applicant is aware of concerns raised by English Heritage in relation to construction effects and advised that discussions are ongoing regarding the detail. <p>The Examining Authority asked for when an update on the progress of the English Heritage discussions would be available</p>

	<p>Mr Taylor QC responded that as and when there are matters to report, this would be reported back, citing the example of the updates to the OEMP showing that the Applicant is keeping the Examining Authority up to date.</p> <p>Mr Hammond stated that tranquillity is addressed in the LVIA [APP-045], and that the Applicant had responded to matters raised by the Stonehenge Alliance in its Deadline 2 representation on this point [REP2-132]. Mr Hammond stated that the definitions of tranquillity were taken from IAN 135/10 paragraph 2.13, which defines tranquillity as <i>“the remoteness and sense of isolation, or lack of it, within the landscape, which is often determined by the presence or absence of built development and traffic.”</i>. Mr Hammond advised that the definition in GLVIA 3 had also been referred to, which notes that <i>“noise and movement of vehicles are operational aspects of a scheme that may affect perceptions of tranquillity”</i>.</p> <p>Mr Hammond advised that the Applicant had also reviewed CPRE published information, baseline data published in the Environmental Statement Chapter 9 – Noise and Vibration [APP-047] and other published work on tranquillity, for example that undertaken by Cranbourne Chase and West Wiltshire AONB.</p> <p>In summary, Mr Hammond outlined that the landscape assessment concluded that there would be an adverse impact on tranquillity within the scheme boundary during the construction phase, and that this has been taken into account in the assessment of impacts and effects on the local landscape character areas.</p> <p>Regarding operation, Mr Hammond confirmed that the landscape assessment predicted that there would be adverse impact on tranquillity on the western end of the scheme through to the Longbarrow Junction area, due to the new road, aspects such as the River Till Viaduct and the scale of Longbarrow Junction. Mr Hammond stated that the exception is in Winterbourne Stoke, where it was assessed that the removal of the existing A303 from the village would be beneficial to the tranquillity of that local townscape character area.</p> <p>Mr Hammond stated that the landscape assessment also set out that there would be beneficial impacts to the World Heritage Site due to the tunnel, visual and audio reduction of vehicles, and the change of the A303 to a restricted byway. He added that Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement states the reduction of traffic will have major beneficial effect on vehicle noise in the World Heritage Site.</p> <p>Mr Hammond confirmed that in this respect the proposed Scheme responds positively to stated issues within the World Heritage Site Management Plan (2015), particularly paragraph 11.1.4 where it states:</p> <p><i>“the road and traffic represent visual and aural intrusion and have a major impact on the tranquillity of the World heritage Site.”</i></p>
<p>6 VISUAL EFFECTS</p>	
<p>Agenda Item</p>	<p>Highways England response</p>
<p><i>i. Effects overall on the visual character of the WHS</i></p>	<p>Mr Nicholson requested to contribute to the design principles.</p>

<p>landscape, during construction and operation.</p>	<p>Mr Taylor QC requested that Cycling UK provide the Applicant with a summary of what it would like to see in the principles, and confirmed that these would be discussed with other stakeholders and taken into account.</p> <p>Ms Logan stated that English Heritage is unclear about the negative visual impacts of construction on the visitor centre and Stonehenge, specifically if the construction compounds and slurry treatment plant would be visible from the visitor centre.</p> <p>Mr Hammond directed English Heritage to the LVIA, Table 7.8, where visual receptor group number VR12 represents Tourists and Visitors to the Stonehenge Visitor Centre. Mr Hammond explained that the LVIA predicted a moderate adverse, significant effect to views during construction. He stated that this is set out in more detail in the appendices to the LVIA, which give further narrative.</p> <p>Responding to an Examining Authority query, Mr Hammond advised that the Applicant had submitted at Deadline 3 a wire line from the Winterbourne Stoke clump group (Figure 7.73 [Rep3-030]), in which wirelines were included for the slurry treatment plant and also the main construction compound, to give an idea of the spatial relationship and the scale for those in relation to that part of the World Heritage Site.</p> <p>The Examining Authority turned to the issue of hoardings, site fencing, colours and finishing, and asked whether these are referenced in the OEMP.</p> <p>Mr Hammond highlighted the Applicant's response to written question LV.1.8, which refers to colour finishes to compound buildings and hoardings, and in turn refers to the OEMP paragraphs MW-G28, MW-CH3, MW-G8 which restrict compound buildings to one storey, rendered in a suitable colour approved by the local planning authority to fit in with the landscape, as well as the same for hoardings. Mr Hammond added that MW-CH3 concerns fencing in the WHS.</p> <p>The Examining Authority raised concerns about the visual effects of haul roads.</p> <p>Mr Hammond replied that the haul roads would be visible and would contribute to significant adverse effects to receptors. He referred to the Applicant's response to written question LV.1.23.</p>
<p>ii. Effects on particular visual receptors.</p>	<p>Mr Garwood raised points on the the old A344, which he stated has a bright green surface, which he believes has a large visual impact.</p> <p>Ms Fielden raised queries over whether there would be hoardings around the digging of the cuttings, and whether there would be lights in the evenings.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC responded to the points in turn:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regarding the A344 surface, he advised that as this is outside of the Order Limits for the Scheme it could not be addressed here. 2. Mr Hammond added that the LVIA for the Year 1 assessment considered how areas such as land East of Parsonage Down would look, as well as considered and assessed Countess Flyover and River Till Viaduct.

	In relation to hoardings, Mr Taylor QC referred to the OEMP MW-G28 which states that these will be defined by the main works contractor in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (“ CEMP ”). He clarified that the contractor would be required to give consideration to the World Heritage Site context and to environmental constraints.
<i>iii. The effects on the night sky during construction and operation.</i>	<p>Mr Nicholson raised the issue of the need for lighting for cyclists.</p> <p>The Examining Authority queried the lighting policy during construction and different times of the year.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC confirmed that the slurry treatment part of compound will be lit 24 hours a day, due to the fact that the tunnel boring machine will be operating 24 hours a day, and so the material it produces has to be processed. Mr Taylor QC referred to MW-G29 of the OEMP.</p> <p>Responding to Mr Nicholson, Mr Taylor QC advised that as set out in OEMP P-ER-OW3, no lighting would be provided along any public right of way in the scheme. He confirmed that the design ethos is to limit lighting, particularly in the World Heritage Site, so that the only lighting in the World Heritage Site would be within the tunnel portals and in relation to Green Bridge 4, which would only be during the day. Mr Taylor QC stated that lighting is an aspect where the scheme delivers benefits, as is apparent from the submission of the UK Government in the State of Conservation Report 2018, which is extracted in HIA 7.3.24, where the Government states the scheme will deliver a positive impact on dark sky compared to the existing surface A303.</p>
7 ARBORICULTURE	
Agenda Item	Highways England response
<p><i>i. Adequacy of the tree survey.</i></p> <p><i>ii. Professional judgment on tree categories and whether to fell.</i></p>	<p>The Examining Authority sought current thoughts on the way the site was covered in trees.</p> <p>Colin Shell commented that under the policy within the World Heritage Site management plan, trees should be removed to open landscape to allow people to appreciate this and planting should be avoided.</p> <p>Ms Simmonds noted that the World Heritage Site Woodland Strategy had been produced following tree surveys and modelling of landscape to identify where trees could be managed better to improve OUV, and to meet those aims in coordination with landowners as this is voluntary guidance. Ms Simmonds noted that this strategy could be provided to the Examination.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC stated that the tree planting position is recognised in HIA paragraph 5.3.30, which refers to the World Heritage Site management plan, which recognises that much of the existing tree coverage was introduced in the 20th century. He added that the management plan recognised that much of that woodland impacted negatively on the OUV of the World Heritage Site, and that it refers to the aspiration for woodland management. Mr Taylor QC highlighted that the woodland strategy seeks to encourage positive management of existing woodlands and to ensure that proposed new planting is sensitive to the World Heritage Site landscape. Mr Taylor QC highlighted two relevant commitments in the OEMP, the most important being WM-LAN4, which explains that no new trees will be planted in the World Heritage Site unless required for ecological or visual mitigation, and provided that the planting does not</p>

	<p>adversely impact on the visual relationship between monuments. He added that the OEMP at P-LE01 requires any planting strategy to have regard to World Heritage Site management plan where that does not conflict with ecological or visual mitigation.</p> <p>Mr Taylor confirmed in response to a question from the Examining Authority that all proposed planting around the Longbarrow junction (bordering the WHS) and Countess roundabout (part within the WHS) has been considered to accord with the principles of the WHS management plan.</p> <p>Mr Hammond answered an Examining Authority question advising that the Environmental Masterplan and the design indicated in that document show woodland planting proposed north of Scotland Lodge. He also mentioned woodland planting for the approach embankments to River Till viaduct, also at the Long Barrow junction to the west of the World Heritage Site and between the slip roads and flyover at Countess Roundabout within the existing highways boundary. Mr Hammond stated that throughout the course of the design, there had been discussions about offsite planting within the grounds of Countess Farm.</p>
	<p>Mr Shell asked for confirmation of whether the Applicant is subject to regulations relating to planting in sensitive areas under The Environmental Impact Assessment (Forestry) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC responded that those regulations relate to particular forestry consents, whereas the current application is for a DCO, which is subject to separate environmental impact assessment regulations.</p> <p>Ms Fielden stated her belief that there were finds in the farmyard at Countess Farm, so there could be archaeological sensitivity for tree planting.</p> <p>Patrick Robinson on behalf of the National Trust explained in response that the discussion about planting at Countess Farm includes archaeological mitigation as well.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC confirmed the National Trust's point, and referred to MW-LAN4 in the OEMP, which specifically states that planting that does come forward in the World Heritage Site should be appropriately archaeologically mitigated.</p> <p>The Examining Authority asked about the tree survey, where the trees to be felled are identified, and the connection to the DCO power to fell and lop trees.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC stated that the Applicant will return to that point.</p>
<p>iii. Planting scheme – how produced, agreed and secured in the DCO?</p>	<p>The Examining Authority asked about when the planting scheme will appear, what is the process for agreement and how is it secured.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC confirmed that the planting scheme forms part of the landscaping scheme to be developed as part of detailed design regulated under Requirement 8. This would, he advised, be signed off by Secretary of State after consultation with the local planning authority, and Historic England in relation to the World Heritage Site. Mr Taylor QC referred to answers to written questions LV.1.5 and LV.1.14 submitted at Deadline 2.</p>

<p><i>iv. Assumptions made in photomontages in the absence of a planting scheme.</i></p>	
<h2>8 DESIGN</h2>	
<h3>Agenda Item</h3>	<h3>Highways England response</h3>
<p><i>i. The need for an overall vision in such an important scheme and the need to consider the detailed design of critical aspects at an early stage.</i></p> <p><i>ii. Indicative themes in the development of detailed design.</i></p> <p><i>iii. The dangers of leaving the design to the contractor.</i></p> <p><i>iv. The process of design development and agreement with key stakeholders</i></p>	<p>Ms Simmonds stated that having design principles in place for development beyond scheme and maintenance and control changes in the future would be useful, and asked the Applicant if that was part of the framework. She cited the example of Avebury, where a set of such principles were in place as a legacy around design and palette.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC confirmed maintenance is addressed in the OEMP. Regarding a wider set of design principles, Mr Taylor QC confirmed that the DCO is not a development plan, and such plans would be other processes.</p> <p>Mr Garwood raised concerns that the design will be left to a contractor and that tunnel design is dangerous. He stated that this is unique chalk with many voids and we don't have the information in the public domain.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC responded highlighting that tunnelling through chalk using tunnel boring machines in the UK is very well-understood, for example the Crossrail project. Mr Taylor QC also mentioned that the Thames Tideway Tunnel and the Northern Line extension are all in chalk at some point, and that modern engineering means we have the ability to drive tunnels through chalk. He confirmed that all material relied upon for the Environmental Statement is in the public domain.</p>
<p><i>v. Confirmation of the basic dimensions, on which LoDs are based, of key elements of the Proposed Development, for proper assessment of visual effects.</i></p>	<p>The Examining Authority stated its belief that there had been some confusion around this issue, in terms of the level of view, and deferred to the Applicant to confirm this.</p> <p>Mr Taylor QC confirmed the Examining Authority's understanding of the basic dimensions for the Scheme, which are as set out in Environmental Statement Table 2.1, the engineering drawings, and Article 7 of draft DCO. Mr Taylor QC referred to the explanation in response to questions LV.1.3 and LV.1.21.</p> <p>Regarding the visual effects, Mr Taylor QC advised that Mr Hammond has explained that the Environmental Statement did assume the maximum upward lateral deviation permissible in the limits of deviation in the draft DCO.</p>

If you need help accessing this or any other Highways England information, please call **0300 123 5000** and we will help you.

© Crown copyright 2017.

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence: visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/ write to the **Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU**, or email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This document is also available on our website at www.gov.uk/highways

If you have any enquiries about this publication email info@highwaysengland.co.uk or call **0300 123 5000**.*

*Calls to 03 numbers cost no more than a national rate call to an 01 or 02 number and must count towards any inclusive minutes in the same way as 01 and 02 calls. These rules apply to calls from any type of line including mobile, BT, other fixed line or payphone. Calls may be recorded or monitored.