

## **Application by Highways England for an Order Granting Development Consent for the A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down**

### **The Examining Authority's Second Written Questions and requests for information (ExQ2)**

**Published 5 July 2019**

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) Second Written Questions and requests for information – ExQ2. The ExA's First Written Questions (ExQ1) were issued on 11 April 2019 [PD-008].

Questions in ExQ2 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 (see 'Citation of questions', below). 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 6 (26 July 2019) in the Examination Timetable<sup>2</sup>.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Available here: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/TR010025-000575>

<sup>2</sup> Available here: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-west/a303-stonehenge/?ipcsection=exam>

## **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 obtained from the following link:

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

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

## **Citation of questions**

The unique reference numbers are constructed as follows:

*Topic identifier: ExQ round: question number*

eg 'LV.1.1' refers to the first question in the first round of ExQs related to landscape and visual effects.

<b>ExQ1</b>		
	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>Ag.2</b>	<b>Agriculture</b>	
Ag.2.1	Applicant Environment Agency	<p><b>Groundwater abstractions/ private water supplies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please provide a response to the representation made by Fowler Fortescue on behalf of the Turner family in respect of the abstraction licence and the locations of the wells and boreholes [REP4-057].</b></li> <li><b>ii. What implications does the new licence to abstract water have in respect of the development and assessments carried out?</b></li> <li><b>iii. What, if any additional monitoring or mitigation would be required?</b></li> </ul>
Ag.2.2	Applicant National Farmers' Union	<p><b>Private water supplies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please explain why the term "<i>at the contractor's option</i>" has been included in MW-COM6 of the Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) [REP4-020].</b></li> <li><b>ii. Please set out what this is intended to mean and the practical implications of this both for the contractor and the farmers/ landowners.</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>iii. Could this wording be removed or amended to provide clarity in respect of the responsibilities for the provision of alternative water supplies?</b></p>
Ag.2.3	Applicant	<p><b>Private water supplies</b></p> <p><b>i. Please provide a detailed response to the request by the National Farmers Union (paragraphs 3.2.2 and 3.2.3) that additional details be provided in the OEMP in respect of private water supplies [REP4-052].</b></p> <p><b>ii. Please outline any additions to the OEMP [REP4-020] you consider to be necessary and/ or provide reasons why you consider this to be unnecessary?</b></p>
Ag.2.4	Applicant National Farmers' Union Howard Smith on behalf of Mr Moore	<p><b>Deposition of tunnel arisings – impact on agricultural operations</b></p> <p><b>i. Please set out the implications of the deposition of tunnel arising on land east of Parsonage Down NNR including the financial and practical implications for the farming business.</b></p> <p><b>ii. What, if any, measures could be secured to mitigate this impact?</b></p>
Ag.2.5	Applicant Howard Smith on behalf of Amesbury Farms	<p><b>Agricultural access</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>Please provide an update in respect of access to Countess Road for Park Farm West Amesbury and West Amesbury Farm for the movement of large agricultural vehicles/ equipment?</b>
Ag.2.6	Applicant	<b>Agricultural Liaison Officer</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please provide a response to the matters raised by the National Farmers Union [REP4-052] at paragraph 3.1.1 in respect of the request for additional detail to be set out in the OEMP for the role of the Agricultural Liaison Officer.</b></li> <li><b>ii. What, if any, updates to the OEMP [REP4-020] do you consider to be necessary and/ or provide reasons why you consider these details are not necessary?</b></li> </ul>
Ag.2.7	Applicant	<b>Field drainage</b> In [REP4-052] the National Farmers' Union has set out detailed suggested additions to the OEMP in respect of field drainage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please provide a detailed response as to whether you consider such additions to be necessary.</b></li> <li><b>ii. In responding please address the reporting criteria as for MW-COM7 there does not currently appear to be any with the responsibility falling only to the main works contractor and the Agricultural Liaison Officer?</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Ag.2.8	National Farmers' Union	<p><b>Field drainage</b></p> <p>In [REP4-052] you have set out detailed suggested additions to the OEMP in respect of field drainage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please consider whether more succinct wording could deal with this matter?</b></li> <li><b>ii. If so, please provide suggested wording and if not, please provide reasons.</b></li> </ul>
Ag.2.9	Applicant	<p><b>Field drainage</b></p> <p>In [REP4-052] the National Farmers' Union has requested the provision of an Outline Soils Management Plan to establish the general principles for how soils will be managed. The OEMP commits to the preparation of a Soils Management Strategy (MW-G7) [REP4-020].</p> <p><b>Please provide your view, with reasons, as to whether it would be necessary for an outline version of this strategy to be provided at this stage. In responding please address the reporting/ consultation/ approval criteria for this strategy.</b></p>
Ag.2.10	M and R Hosier	<p><b>Impact on agricultural operations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please set out why you consider the current measures in the OEMP [REP4-020], including those relating to private water supplies and the provision of an Agricultural Liaison Officer, would be insufficient to mitigate potential effects on your</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>pig enterprise such that you consider it possible it would need to cease.</b></p> <p><b>ii. Please provide details of any additional measures you consider to be necessary to minimise the impact on these farming operations?</b></p>
Ag.2.11	Applicant	<p><b>Impact on agricultural operations</b></p> <p><b>Please provide a response to the concerns set out by M and R Hosier in [REP4-094] in respect of the impact on their agricultural operations?</b></p>
<b>AQ.2</b>	<b>Air quality and emissions</b>	
AQ.2.1	Applicant	<p>The Applicant's response to First Written Question (ExQ1) AQ.1.16 states that the correct figure for the predicted decrease in vehicles AADT on the A36 (860) has been used in the traffic modelling.</p> <p><b>Please point to where this can be found in the TA and clarify how this has been transposed for the purposes of the traffic data used in the air quality assessment.</b></p>
<b>AL.2</b>	<b>Alternatives</b>	

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
AL.2.1	Applicant	<p>The response to ExQ1 AL.1.5 indicates that the project retains its status in the current RIS (2015-2020) and it is currently envisaged that it will not be necessary to carry it over into the next RIS period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Does that still represent the current position or is it likely that there would be a carry over to the next RIS period and a further assessment for its inclusion within that?</b></li> <li><b>ii. If so, does that have any implications for compliance with the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN), and hence the ExA’s approach to the consideration of alternatives?</b></li> </ul>
AL.2.2	Applicant	<p>The response to ExQ1 AL.1.6 provides details of the costings which supported the decision to reject the longer tunnel route options.</p> <p><b>Have there been any changes to those costings since that time or to the pro-rata comparison per metre of the different tunnel length options?</b></p>
AL.2.3	Applicant	<p>The response to ExQ1 AL.1.29 states that:</p> <p><i>“There is no evidence that the additional investment required to extend the tunnel length would deliver meaningful additional benefits to the WHS that would justify the additional cost”.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Has the Applicant’s position changed in relation to the additional benefits to the WHS that an extension of the</b></li> </ul>



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>tunnel length would achieve during the course of the examination?</b></p> <p><b>ii. Please confirm that the figures of an additional £264 million for the cut and cover option and £578 million for the bored tunnel extension represent up-to-date costings.</b></p>
<b>CH.2</b>	<b>Cultural heritage</b>	
CH.2.1	Applicant All Interested Parties	<p><b>Consultation/ agreement/ approval</b></p> <p>The ExA considers that every effort should be made to reach agreement with Heritage Monitoring Advisory Group (HMAG) and Wiltshire Council Archaeology Service (WCAS) on the form and content of the Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (DAMS) [REP4-024].</p> <p>In the event of disagreement, it considers that the statutory bodies should fulfil their normal role in having the final decision on the form and content of the DAMS. Given the unsurpassed international importance of the site it is vital that this role remains with the nationally authorised statutory bodies, who carry the greatest expertise and who operate in a completely independent and objective manner.</p> <p>Similarly, during the preliminary and main works, with regard to fieldwork issues of mitigation, unexpected finds, the signing off of sites, and so on, every effort should be made to reach agreement. In the event of a</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>dispute, it is unlikely that reference to the SoS would be practicable and it considers that the statutory bodies should again fulfil their normal role.</p> <p>The statutory role of Wiltshire Council and Historic England is confirmed in the DL4 version of the DAMS.</p> <p><b>Please comment.</b></p>
CH.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Extent of the Mitigation Area covered by the DAMS [REP4-024]</b></p> <p>Some stretches of proposed road line appear not to be covered as mitigation areas in the DAMS.</p> <p><b>Why is this so?</b></p>
CH.2.3	Applicant	<p><b>Pre-commencement works</b></p> <p>How will pre-commencement works be controlled prior to certification of the OEMP [REP4-020]?</p>
CH.2.4	Applicant	<p><b>Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (OAMS)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. What is the role of the OAMS [APP-220] after the emergence of the DAMS?</b></li> <li><b>ii. When will it be uncoupled from the OEMP [REP4-020]?</b></li> </ul>
CH.2.5	Applicant All Interested Parties	<p><b>Archaeological loss</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>Please confirm the location and area of land which would be archaeologically sterilised under the Proposed Development.</b>
CH.2.6	Applicant All Interested Parties	<b>Geophysical techniques</b> <b>Discuss the reliability of the investigation results of different geophysical techniques and the need to compare data sets across different techniques.</b>
CH.2.7	Blick Mead Project Team	<b>Occurrence of burials</b> The Applicant's written summary of ISH2, at agenda item 5(ii), page 2-12, notes that Professor Parker Pearson appears to have considered the potential occurrence of burials across the whole of the western approaches as opposed to the area affected by the cutting [REP4-030]. <b>Please comment.</b>
CH.2.8	Applicant All Interested Parties	<b>Blick Mead, Vespasian's Camp, and Amesbury Park RPG Settings</b> At the ASI it was clear that, despite the early summer foliage, visibility and aural connection exists between these historic assets and areas to the north. During autumn and winter, with the loss of foliage, the visual and aural link is almost certain to be greater. In any event, we cannot be sure the tree screen will remain in its present form. The settings of the assets, therefore, extend to the north and, at present, contribute to their significance through the enclosing backdrop they offer.

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>The Proposed Development may well harm the settings of these historic assets through greater visual prominence of traffic which would be elevated on the flyover, even if noise levels are contained. Also, as was clear at the site visit that the eastern portal, from which traffic would emerge on a rising incline, would be visibly intrusive, particularly at night with upward angled headlights. It would be likely to have an impact on the existing character and significance of Vespasian's Camp.</p> <p><b>Please comment.</b></p>
CH.2.9	All Interested Parties	<p><b>DAMS DL4 Version [REP4-024]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Comments are invited on the expanded sections of the Archaeological Research Strategy, including the Research Questions. Can any light be shed on theories concerning changing populations over time, and the idea of a funary zone to the west characterised by lithics, and a living zone to the east characterised by ceramics?</li> <li>ii. Comments are invited on paras 5.2.7 and 5.2.8, which include detail on Tunnel movement monitoring stations. Should movement parameters be specified and trigger points set for the instigation of remedial measures to be put forward by the Contractor for agreement? Should movement monitors also be located elsewhere to safeguard archaeology, and should similar measures be put in place for vibration risks?</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. Comments are invited on para 5.2.11, Handling, storage and placement of excavated topsoil. Why should the first bullet point apply only to topsoil from within the WHS? Who judges whether topsoil could contain archaeological artefacts in the second bullet point?</li> <li>iv. Comments are invited on paras 5.2.43 and 5.2.54, Geotechnical and other intrusive surveys.</li> <li>v. Comments are invited on para 6.1.16, Archaeological Clerk of Works. Should it be monitor rather than co-ordinate archaeological site works – responsibility for co-ordination would probably fall to the contractor.</li> <li>vi. Para 6.1.17, Unexpected finds. The ExA suggests that if agreement is not forthcoming on the significance of the find and the appropriate course of action, approval of the Wiltshire Council/ Historic England is sought as statutory bodies.</li> <li>vii. Comments are invited on para 6.1.20, Interruptions and delays – who makes the decision regarding the cessation or resumption of work?</li> <li>viii. Comments are invited on paras 6.3.14 to 6.3.16 regarding ploughzone sampling.</li> <li>ix. Comments are invited on paras 6.3.42 and 6.3.43, Tree hollows.</li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>x. Comments are invited on Section 8.1 Communications Strategy, Section 8.2 Progress Reporting, and Section 8.3 Monitoring of Post Excavation Works.</li> <li>xi. Para 8.4.2: the ExA suggests 'approved by the TPA in agreement with HMAG/ WCAS'.</li> <li>xii. Comments are invited on Table 11.3, Summary of proposed mitigation areas, and Appendix D Action Areas: Proposed archaeological fieldwork areas and preservation in situ areas.</li> <li>xiii. Flowchart A2, Archaeological Mitigation: phases and roles – should the box heading Project supervision read, Project inspection and monitoring, since the archaeological contractor will supervise his work team and the TPA project manager will inspect, monitor and approve?</li> <li>xiv. Flowcharts A3 to A9, should the double headed arrows linking the top tiers of boxes signify agreement?</li> <li>xv. Further comments, if any, are invited on the DAMS provisions for the treatment of archaeology buried under arisings, that affected by haul roads and compounds, and that subject in other ways to vibration, compression, crushing, or distortion [REP4-024].</li> </ul>
<b>De.2</b>	<b>Design</b>	
De.2.1	Applicant	<b>OEMP, Chapter 4: Detailed Design [REP4-020]</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	All Interested Parties	<p>Chapter 4 of the OEMP is headed 'Development of detailed design in the WHS'. However, para 4.4.4 deals with matters outside of the WHS, quite rightly in the ExA's view, since the detailed design aspects should be matters of concern and consistency throughout the whole Scheme.</p> <p><b>Therefore, should the title of the chapter be amended, and its scope widened?</b></p>
De.2.2	Applicant All Interested Parties	<p><b>OEMP, Chapter 4: Detailed Design - Design Vision [REP4-020]</b></p> <p>Section 4.3, Design Principles – intended guidance indicated in para 4.3.2 (a), (b), and (c); and in Table 4.1, in particular P-G01, and P-LE01 to 03: The ExA endorses the aim set out in the DAS of minimising the visibility of new structures within the WHS (para 4.4.3), and responding to two sensitive landscapes; the heritage landscape and the wider setting (para 4.4.9), without competing with them or providing an alternative focus. Overall, an understated approach of restrained visual impact and elegance is appropriate.</p> <p>Despite the proposed guidance intended to achieve this, an imaginative input through an overall design vision is necessary. This is absent from the Scheme at present and, in a Scheme of international importance such as this, it is not appropriate to leave the design to the contractor.</p> <p><b>Do the parties agree?</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
De.2.3	Applicant All Interested Parties	<b>OEMP, Chapter 4: Detailed Design [REP4-020]</b> Para 4.4.3: Should consultation also take place on the fencing, or other safety measures, preventing access to the cutting?
De.2.4	Applicant All Interested Parties	<b>OEMP, Chapter 4: Detailed Design [REP4-020]</b> <b>Para 4.4.4: Should consultation also take place on:</b> <b>i. River Till viaduct?</b> <b>ii. Countess flyover?</b> <b>iii. Green Bridges?</b>
De.2.5	Applicant All Interested Parties	<b>OEMP, Chapter 4: Detailed Design [REP4-020]</b> Para 4.4.14: Notes that it is appropriate that the final decision on detailed design remains the Applicant's preserve, using its expertise and knowledge as to what would be appropriate and operationally feasible in the context of the Scheme.  However, matters such as operational geometry and other matters of highway functionality would be defined in the OEMP and elsewhere, and would have been confirmed during the development of the design process well before the final decisions are made on detailed design. Wiltshire Council is the statutory body regarding planning matters, including design approvals, and has expertise and knowledge as to what would be appropriate.



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>In the exceptional event of it not being possible for the SCG and The Authority to reach agreement after escalation of the matter, should not the final decision on detailed design rest with Wiltshire Council?</b>
De.2.6	Applicant	<b>Illustrative drawings</b> How can reliance be placed on drawings which are merely 'illustrative'?
<b>Ec.2</b>	<b>Biodiversity, ecology and biodiversity</b> (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))	
Ec.2.1	Applicant Natural England RSPB	<p>The landowners of Normanton Down reserve have stated that they would not agree to the erection of enhanced fencing to deter trespass and to manage the risk of increased visitor pressures in the southern part of the World Heritage Site (ie south of the existing A303) impacting adversely on the breeding success of protected species such as the stone curlew.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please explain how this could be addressed, and what other measures could be put in place; and how such measures would be secured.</b></li> <li><b>ii. In the absence of such agreement in respect of enhanced fencing, what are the consequences in terms of any assumptions made in the HRA and ES that this solution would be successfully delivered.</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Ec.2.2	Applicant	<p>The Stonehenge Alliance remain concerned about the volume of work in progress which may have a bearing on the assessment of impacts of the scheme on the Salisbury Plain SPA and River Avon SAC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please provide a progress update on the status of the HRA technical note and the proposed s253 legal agreement to secure the provision of mitigation plots for Stone Curlew.</b></li> <li><b>ii. Please ensure that all HRA information that may be relevant to the question of Appropriate Assessment (if needed) is clearly identified and collated in respect of any supplementary information to [APP-266].</b></li> </ul>
Ec.2.3	Applicant RSPB Natural England	<p>4.1 to 4.3 of the SoCG with RSPB refer to ongoing discussions around mitigation delivery and monitoring in respect of stone curlew, including <i>"in the unlikely event that the need for additional plots is triggered by unsuccessful mitigation"</i> [REP2-017].</p> <p><b>Noting that these matters may be considered in the HRA technical note being prepared, can the Applicant, RSPB and Natural England comment in particular on how the need for additional plots would be triggered and how they would be delivered.</b></p> <p><b>In particular, the ExA is concerned about being satisfied 'beyond reasonable scientific doubt' whilst uncertainty remains (as demonstrated by the phrase <i>"in the unlikely event that"</i>) and the acknowledgement that further mitigation might be necessary</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>(where the proposed mitigation proves “unsuccessful”) to address potential effects of the Proposed Development.</b>
Ec.2.4	Applicant	<b>With reference to OEMP MW BIO8 [REP4-020], please clarify what specific and appropriate measures might be undertaken to avoid disturbance of nesting Great Bustard during the construction phase, and whether or not such measures/ options are intended to be stipulated in the wording of the OEMP.</b>
<b>CC.2</b>	<b>Climate change</b>	
CC.2.1	Applicant	<p>The Applicant’s written summaries of oral submissions put at the Open Floor Hearings held on 22 and 23 May comments on the submissions made in response to Mr Mike Birkin [REP3-013].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. As regards the reference to the Government’s Road Investment Strategy (2015) does the assessment of annual CO2 impacts from delivering a programme of investment on the Strategic Road Network take into account the latest set of UK Climate Projections and/ or Government carbon reduction targets? If not, how does this affect the assessment?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Likewise, does the paragraph 2.4.3.5 reference to the ES Chapter 14 assessment of carbon emissions (GHG) take into account the latest set of UK Climate Projections and/ or</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>Government carbon reduction targets? If not, how does this affect the assessment?</b>
CC.2.2	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 2.4.3.5 of the written summaries of oral submissions put at the Open Floor Hearings held on 22 and 23 May also states that <i>"in the context of the overall UK GHG emissions the magnitude of the increase will not have a material impact on the government meeting its carbon reduction targets"</i> [REP3-013].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Does that take into account the latest Government pronouncements on carbon reduction targets? If not, how would that affect the position?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Please comment upon contribution made by the scheme to the cumulative impact together with other schemes on overall UK GHG emissions in the light of the latest set of UK Climate Projections and/</b></li> <li><b>iii. or Government carbon reduction targets?</b></li> </ul>
CC.2.3	Mike Birkin, Friends of the Earth	<p>In the light of your oral submissions to the Open Floor Hearing held on 22 May 2019:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please explain further your concerns as regards the cumulative impacts of transport investment decisions and transport policy as a whole and the significance of this scheme in that context.</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>ii. Please also explain further why the use of cleaner or electric vehicles alone would not bring about the necessary reductions in GHG emissions and why overall road traffic would need to be reduced?</b></p> <p><b>iii. How and to what extent would the scheme itself impact upon the achievement of net-zero GHG emissions by 2050?</b></p>
CC.2.4	Applicant	<p>The response to ExQ1 CC.1.1 states that <i>“the Applicant is familiar with, and has undertaken a review of, UKCP18 to assess whether the latter data would affect the conclusions of Chapter 14 of the ES”</i> [REP2-028].</p> <p><b>Please provide further details of that review to support the assertion <i>“that the new projections do not affect the conclusions of Chapter 14, which is that none of the potential impacts are identified as significant”</i>.</b></p>
CC.2.5	Applicant	<p><b>Please provide an update to the response to ExQ1 CC.1.6 (ii) in the light of the latest Government pronouncement in relation to achieving net-zero GHG emissions by 2050.</b></p>
<b>CA.2</b>	<b>Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations</b>	
<b>The scope of the Compulsory Acquisition powers sought</b>		
CA.2.1	Applicant	<p>The response to ExQ1 CA.1.1 refers to the impracticalities of drafting the dDCO Schedule 1 to distinguish the associated development aspects of</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>the development. The 'Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects' (Department for Communities and Local Government) recognises that it may not be practicable to identify parts of a scheme as associated development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Whilst there may be aspects of the development that may be impractical to identify are there no parts of this scheme which are obviously associated development and which can be so identified?</b></li> <li><b>ii. What attempt has the Applicant made to comply with the guidance on this topic?</b></li> <li><b>iii. ExQ1 CA.1.1 (iii) requested the Applicant to identify which categories of the Statement of Reasons (SoR), paragraph 2.3.1, a. to u. could be identified as Associated Development [REP2-029]. The response indicates that the Applicant was not able to identify which items a. to u. were associated development and relied upon the answer given to ExQ1 DCO.1.4. Does that response apply to items m to s? Can none of the items listed be readily identified as associated development?</b></li> <li><b>iv. Can the Applicant categorise SoR paragraph 2.3.1 m – 'Conversion of part of the existing A303 into a new restricted byway'? If associated development, explain how</b></li> </ol>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>would that help address the impacts of the scheme and comply with the associated development guidance?</b>
CA.2.2	Applicant	ExQ1 CA.1.3 (iii) sought information relating to the progress of discussions with relevant landowners to minimise any impact upon existing surface activities [PD-008].  <b>Please provide an update on the progress of discussions with the Affected Persons and whether any agreements have been finalised?</b>
CA.2.3	National Trust	<b>Please explain any outstanding concerns as regards the proposed limits of deviation (LoD) generally and, in particular, as regards the potential for variation in relation to the portal entrances.</b>
CA.2.4	National Trust	<b>Please provide details of any outstanding concerns as regards the scope for restrictions to be imposed upon the use of the land above the tunnel.</b>
CA.2.5	National Trust	<b>Please comment on the Applicant's response to ExQ1 CA.1.9 and explain any outstanding concerns in relation to the extent of the National Trust land sought to be subject to powers of Temporary Possession [REP2-029].</b>
CA.2.6	Applicant	ExQ1 CA.1.7 (ii) requested a description of the nature of the restrictive covenants sought together with a justification for their imposition [PD-

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		008]. The response indicates that the exact nature or the restrictions or rights remains to be determined. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Does that represent a reasonable approach?</b></li> <li><b>ii. How can the reasonableness and necessity for the power granted be assessed in the absence of such detail?</b></li> </ul>
<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.2.7	Applicant	The response to ExQ1 CA.1.10 makes reference to the scheme being part of a wider package of proposals for the A303/ A358 corridor designed to transform connectivity to and from the south west of England [REP2-029]. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please confirm that this is a fundamental aspect of the Applicant's need case and indicate the weight placed upon the wider package of proposals being delivered?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Are all elements of the 'need' case, including the protection of the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation, relied upon equally to justify the proposed Compulsory Acquisition?</b></li> </ul>
CA.2.8	Applicant	The response to ExQ1 CA.1.11 in relation to the assessment of the private loss to individual Affected Persons relies upon the ES Chapter 13 assessment of the effects of the scheme on individual agricultural and other land interests [REP2-029].



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>Please explain in detail why that represents a sufficient and proportionate assessment of private loss that would be experienced by individuals should the powers of Compulsory Acquisition sought be exercised?</b>
CA.2.9	Applicant	<p>The response to ExQ1 CA.1.11 indicates that the Applicant considers that private losses may be fairly and appropriately compensated through the payment of statutory compensation [REP2-029]. In terms of the balancing exercise undertaken, that considered the private loss after compensation upon individual landowners and occupiers against the benefits the scheme would deliver.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please indicate if separate exercises were undertaken in the case of each individual Affected Person?</b></li> <li><b>ii. What weight was attributed to private loss after compensation was taken into account?</b></li> </ul>
<b>Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored</b>		
CA.2.10	Applicant	<b>In relation to modifications to the scheme suggested by Affected Persons in the course of this examination with a view to minimising land use impact, please explain in each case why these proposals could not be accommodated and/ or would not provide a reasonable alternative to Compulsory Acquisition?</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CA.2.11	Applicant	<p><b>Please provide an update on the progress of negotiations with each Affected Person to acquire the various land/ rights in question subsequent to the DL2 submission of the Land Acquisitions and Temporary Negotiations Schedule (Revision 2) [REP2-042].</b></p>
<b>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</b>		
CA.2.12	Applicant	<p>The revised Funding Statement submitted at DL2 estimates the capital cost of the main scheme at £1.7 billion [REP2-005].</p> <p><b>Is the Applicant aware of any matters that have arisen since DL2 that might lead that estimate to change or impact upon the deliverability of the scheme in financial terms?</b></p>
CA.2.13	Applicant	<p>The revised Funding Statement confirms that Option 1 is now precluded and the means of finance would be by way of Option 2, namely, solely public finance [REP2-005].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please comment upon the National Audit Office report of May 2019 as regards the value for money provided by the scheme and whether there are any implications arising therefrom for the availability of public funds for the project?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Can the Applicant provide any timeline for the scrutiny of the business case for the project by the Government?</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>iii. <b>Please explain how the road investment strategy (RIS) funding system works in practice, for example, from which RIS is it likely that the scheme would be funded?</b></p> <p>iv. <b>What would be the implications for the funding of the project if it is not included in RIS 2 when RIS period 1 ends in March 2020?</b></p> <p>v. <b>Please comment on the recent Public Accounts Committee report – Transport Infrastructure in the South West - which included consideration of the funding of the project.</b></p>
CA.2.14	Applicant	<p>The Funding Statement, section 4, states that should any future claims for blight arise as a consequence of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition of land, or rights in land, affected by the Scheme, the costs of meeting any valid claim will be met by Highways England [REP2-005].</p> <p><b>How can the ExA be assured that these resource implications have been accurately assessed and would be provided for?</b></p>
CA.2.15	Applicant	<p><b>Has any blight notice from any property owner been served to date and is the Applicant aware of any potential claims in the offing? If so, please provide details.</b></p>
<p><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></p>		

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CA.2.16	Applicant	<p>Neither paragraph 5.4 and section 6 of the SoR [APP-023] nor the response to ExQ1 CA.1.19 [REP2-029] explains the degree of importance attributed to the existing uses.</p> <p><b>The response acknowledges the value of the existing land uses but please explain further how the Applicant has actually assessed that value?</b></p>
CA.2.17	Applicant	<p>The response to ExQ1 CA.1.22 indicates that the DCO, if made, would grant powers for the permanent acquisition of rights at the surface, including the imposition of restrictive covenants in relation to the properties known as 1 and 2 Custodian Cottages [REP2-029].</p> <p><b>i. Could the proposed restrictions potentially prevent the carrying out of extensions or alterations to those properties or the carrying out of permitted development within their curtilages?</b></p> <p><b>ii. If so, would the Article 8 rights of the occupants of those properties potentially be infringed?</b></p>
CA.2.18	Applicant	<p>The response to ExQ1 CA.1.24 explains how the Applicant has complied with its duties under section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 [REP2-029].</p> <p><b>i. Please indicate whether any Affected Person has been identified as having protected characteristics since that response was provided?</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>		
<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>	
		<p><b>ii. Please explain further how during engagement with Affected Persons there has been consideration of and offers to meet any needs or requirements of individuals or groups?</b></p>
<p><b>The accuracy of the Book of Reference, Land Plans and points of clarification</b></p>		
CA.2.19	Applicant	<p><b>Please confirm that the updated Book of Reference, as submitted for DL2 [REP2-007] is now complete and accurately sets out the various plots and interests.</b></p> <p><b>If not, please identify any inaccuracies that have come to light since DL2 and provide an update to the Book of Reference.</b></p>
CA.2.20	Applicant	<p>The response to ExQ1 CA.1.26 (ii) indicates that physical factors relating to vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, artificial lighting and discharge of solid or liquid substance onto the land were not considered to give rise separately to a potential claim for compensation as a result of the scheme [REP2-029].</p> <p><b>i. Please explain further why the discounting of such physical factors represents a precautionary approach in relation to owners of additional properties outside of the close vicinity of the scheme (as potential Category 3 parties)?</b></p> <p><b>ii. Please provide further justification for the adoption of a 10m buffer zone and explain in greater detail how the areas of</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>		
<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>	
		<b>land required to construct, operate and maintain the scheme were identified?</b>
CA.2.21	Applicant	The response to ExQ1 CA.1.27 makes reference to Highways England's ongoing data monitoring and updating process [REP2-029]. <b>Please explain what that entails in practice?</b>
<b>The acquisition of Statutory Undertakers' land – s127 of the PA2008</b>		
CA.2.22	Applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please provide further details as to why plot 09-31 in the ownership of SSE is proposed to be included in the DCO application?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Why is its acquisition necessary to ensure that the proposed extension to the existing substation could be delivered without impediment?</b></li> </ul>
CA.2.23	Applicant	<b>Please provide an update on the present state of any negotiations with all Statutory Undertakers, including whether the Protective Provisions in Schedule 11 and/ or asset protection agreements between the various parties been agreed?</b> <b>If not, please identify any outstanding areas of disagreement.</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>		
<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>	
CA.2.24	Applicant	<b>If agreement with any Statutory Undertakers has not yet been reached please provide further details to show that compliance with section 127 PA2008 could nevertheless be achieved?</b>
<b>The extinguishment of rights, and removal of apparatus of statutory undertakers – s138 of the PA2008</b>		
CA.2.25	Applicant	<p>The response to ExQ1 CA.1.32 indicates that the Applicant hopes to be able to agree the drafting of protective provisions with the relevant statutory undertakers and electronic communications operators [REP2-029].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. 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.</b></li> <li><b>ii. Notwithstanding the response to ExQ1 CA.1.32, please explain why the extinguishment or the relevant right or removal of the relevant apparatus is necessary in each case for the purpose of carrying out development to which the DCO relates.</b></li> </ul>
<b>Esso Petroleum</b>		

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CA.2.26	Applicant	<b>Please provide an update on the present state of negotiations with Esso Petroleum as regards both the Protective Provisions and the diversion agreement</b>
CA.2.27	Esso Petroleum	<b>Please provide an update on the present state of negotiations with the Applicant as regards both the Protective Provisions and the diversion agreement.</b>
<b>The acquisition of rights over special category land comprising open space</b>		
CA.2.28	Applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please provide an update in respect of plots 10-18, 10-19, 11-04 and 11-05 as regards compliance with section 132(3) PA2008 and whether agreement has been reached with the relevant landowners.</b></li> <li><b>ii. Please provide further details of the new rights sought over the land in order to assess compliance with section 132(3) PA2008.</b></li> </ul>
CA.2.29	PFA Consulting on behalf of Amesbury Property Company Ltd	<b>Please identify and explain any remaining areas of disagreement in respect of plots 10-18 and 11-05 as regards compliance with section 132(3) PA2008.</b>
CA.2.30	Greggs plc	<b>Please identify and explain any remaining areas of disagreement in respect of plots 10-19 and 11-04 as regards compliance with section 132(3) PA2008.</b>



<b>ExQ1</b>		
<b>Question to:</b>		<b>Question:</b>
<b>Crown land</b>		
CA.2.31	Applicant	<b>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 and, in view of the provisions of section 135(2) PA2008, indicating when it is anticipated that these consents will be forthcoming?</b>
<b>Special category land – land owned by the National Trust</b>		
CA.2.32	Applicant	<b>In the light of section 130 PA2008, please provide an update as regards the discussions on this matter being held with the National Trust.</b>
CA.2.33	National Trust	<b>Please identify any outstanding concerns in relation to the proposed LoD and the scope for restrictions to be imposed upon the use of the land above the tunnel.</b>
<b>Related applications, orders and consents</b>		
CA.2.34	Applicant	<b>Please provide an update to the Consents and Agreements Position Statement {APP-022} and identify the progress made by the Applicant in its discussions with the relevant bodies.</b>
<b>Objections to the grant of powers of Compulsory Acquisition</b>		

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CA.2.35	PFA Consulting on behalf of The Amesbury Property Company Limited (APC) and Classmaxi Limited (CML)	<b>What is the current state of progress of negotiations with the Applicant?</b>
CA.2.36	Applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. What is the current state of progress of negotiations with APC and CML to agree their proposed mechanism to avoid excessive land-take?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Please explain further how the proposed powers of Compulsory Acquisition of their land would comply with section 122(2) PA2008?</b></li> <li><b>iii. Why are the works proposed on CML's land necessary to achieve the scheme's objectives?</b></li> <li><b>iv. Why does the alternative course of action proposed by CML not represent a reasonable alternative to acquisition?</b></li> </ul>
CA.2.37	Countryside Solutions on behalf of Beacon Hill Land Limited	<p>The Applicant's response to ExQ1 CA.1.46 asserts that the provision of safer Non-Motorised User connections would contribute to the Scheme's objectives of helping to conserve and enhance the WHS and provide a positive legacy for local communities [REP2-029].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please comment on the Applicant's justification for seeking the exercise of powers of Compulsory Acquisition in this respect.</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>The Applicant indicates that it could agree not to implement its permanent acquisition powers over the land subject to it having been voluntarily dedicated as a public footpath by the landowner.</p> <p><b>ii. Please indicate whether that course of action represents an acceptable alternative solution and whether any agreement has been reached in this respect?</b></p>
CA.2.38	National Farmers' Union	<p><b>Please provide further details to support the comments made in your Written Representation in relation to the Allington Track to the effect that the acquisition of this land is not necessary to achieve the stated objectives of the scheme [REP2-012].</b></p>
CA.2.39	Applicant	<p>The Applicant's comments on the Written Representation of Beacon Hill Land Ltd provides some information in relation to this aspect of the scheme [REP3-013]. In addition, the response to ExQ1 CA.1.46 indicates that the power to acquire land permanently in this area would give Highways England the ability to extinguish existing rights over AMES1 to enable this byway to be changed status from a byway open to all traffic to a public footpath [REP2-029]. Notwithstanding the information provided to date:</p> <p><b>i. Please explain why the proposed exercise of powers of Compulsory Acquisition is necessary in this instance to achieve the objectives of the scheme?</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>ii. <b>Why does the scheme necessitate the prevention of slow-moving traffic joining the A303 before it reaches the newly constructed flyover?</b></li><li>iii. <b>Explain how the proposed closure of the junction of AMES1 with the A303, and the change in status of AMES1, to improve safety on the existing A303 and for the protection of the adjoining monument would comply with section 122 PA2008?</b></li><li>iv. <b>Explain why the alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition proposed by the landowner, including proposed arrangements for dedication and adoption of land as highway to provide the desired diversion, would not provide a reasonable alternative solution?</b></li><li>v. <b>Please explain why the Southern Gas Network main and the Wessex Water main within this stretch of byway could not be safeguarded by protective provisions or by the acquisition of any necessary rights by agreement?</b></li><li>vi. <b>The Applicant indicates that the hedgerow is proposed to be retained, managed and potentially enhanced under its possession and upon completion of the works the management would fall back to the landowner. Please clarify the rights sought in this respect and provide any necessary justification for the Compulsory Acquisition of permanent</b></li></ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>rights for the planting and future maintenance of a hedgerow on this objector's land.</b></p> <p><b>vii. Please explain why the desired objectives could not be achieved by the exercise of powers of Temporary Possession as opposed to permanent acquisition?</b></p> <p><b>viii. Please indicate whether a voluntary agreement with this landowner has yet been concluded?</b></p>
CA.2.40	Howard Smith on behalf of P J Rowland and Sons (farmers) Limited	<b>Please identify any outstanding concerns in relation to plot 11-09 and explain further why it is argued that this additional land is not necessary for the purposes of providing a link between Amesbury Road and Allington Track.</b>
CA.2.41	Applicant	<b>In relation to plot 11-09, please explain in detail why it is considered necessary to utilise this land to widen the highway verge in this location and why the present private track would be insufficient in width.</b>
CA.2.42	Howard Smith on behalf of Mrs P M Sandell and Philip Sawkill	<b>Please indicate the progress of discussions as regards the provision of combine harvester access over National Trust owned land, outside of the Order limits.</b>
CA.2.43	Applicant	<b>Please indicate the progress of discussions as regards the provision of combine harvester access over National Trust owned</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>land, outside of the Order limits for the benefit of Mrs P M Sandell's agricultural business.</b>
CA.2.44	Rachel Hosier on behalf of Max Hosier and Helen Hosier	<b>Please explain further why the proposed land take for the purposes of setting out land for ecological mitigation would be unjustified and represent an excessive use of the powers of Compulsory Ccquisition.</b>
CA.2.45	Applicant	<p>The response to ExQ1 CA.1.42 indicates that [REP2-029]:</p> <p>"Highways England is aware that Ms Hosier may seek to manage the land around the cutting from the western portal to Long Barrow roundabout post construction of the scheme. Highway's England is currently considering this opportunity to discuss proposals for the future maintenance of what would become Highway England's 'soft estate'".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please justify the extent of the land sought to be acquired in this location for the purposes of 'essential mitigation'.</b></li> <li><b>ii. Please indicate whether agreement in relation the future maintenance of such land by the Hosiers has been achieved and, if not, why it has not been possible to agree accommodation works around these areas?</b></li> <li><b>iii. Please provide an update as to the progress of any negotiations and the likelihood of agreement being reached before the close of the examination?</b></li> </ol>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CA.2.46	Countryside Solutions on behalf of Morrison and King Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please provide an update on the negotiations in relation to the proposed agreement under section 253 Highways Act 1980 in respect of plot 09-22.</b></li> <li><b>ii. The Applicant indicates that this plot is required for mitigation essential to the scheme. If agreement is not reached before the close of the examination would this provide a reasonable justification for the extent of the powers of Compulsory Acquisition sought?</b></li> </ul>
CA.2.47	Applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please provide an update on the negotiations in relation to the proposed agreement under section 253 Highways Act 1980 in respect of plot 09-22.</b></li> <li><b>ii. Explain further why this plot is required for mitigation essential to the scheme?</b></li> <li><b>iii. Please provide further justification for the extent of the proposed site compound on land in the ownership of Morrison and King Ltd.</b></li> </ul>
CA.2.48	Fowler Fortescue on behalf of the Turner family	<b>Please explain further how the boundaries could be realigned more efficiently to reduce the area of the proposed acquisition.</b>
CA.2.49	Applicant	The response to ExQ1 CA.1.43 indicates that discussions with the Turner family are ongoing and are taking place regarding how the proposed areas of land acquisition could be minimised [REP2-029].

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please indicate whether any reduction in proposed land take has been agreed as a result of those negotiations?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Notwithstanding the details submitted, please provide further justification for the degree of flexibility sought and the extent of the land in the ownership of the Turner family which is required for the purpose of providing a construction compound, and the settlement ponds.</b></li> <li><b>iii. Please confirm the precise extent of the proposed land take across the Turner family holding.</b></li> <li><b>iv. Please justify the necessity for the proposed land take for the section of the A360 north from the Longbarrow junction.</b></li> </ul>
CA.2.50	Carter Jonas on behalf of Travelodge Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please identify by means of a plan the part of the land over which permanent rights are proposed to be acquired to provide a means of access to the works compound.</b></li> <li><b>ii. Please explain further why Temporary Possession powers within the dDCO would be adequate for this requirement.</b></li> <li><b>iii. Explain further your alternative proposals for the utility diversions and why this would not require the acquisition of permanent rights.</b></li> </ul>



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CA.2.51	Gateley Hamer on behalf of Grove Property	<b>In relation to plot 09-14 currently let to Travelodge Hotels Ltd, please indicate the status of negotiations with the Applicant and whether a legal agreement has been completed?</b>
CA.2.52	Applicant	<b>Please confirm that negotiations have begun with Grove Property and indicate whether an agreement has been concluded.</b>
CA.2.53	English Heritage Trust	<b>Please provide an update on the discussions as regards the proposed restricted byway running alongside the A360 within the boundary of the Stonehenge Visitor Centre complex and the exploration of alternatives.</b>
CA.2.54	Applicant	<b>Please provide an update on the discussions as regards the proposed restricted byway running alongside the A360 within the boundary of the Stonehenge Visitor Centre complex and the exploration of alternatives.</b>
CA.2.55	Law and Fiennes on behalf of Lincoln College	<b>Please provide an update on negotiations with the Applicant and indicate whether your client's position has changed in the light of the Applicant's DL3 comments on Written Representations and the information set out therein [REP3-013].</b>
CA.2.56	Applicant	In relation to the objection raised on behalf of Lincoln College: <b>i. Please provide further details in relation to the proposal to take an electric cable across College land; details of the</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>alternative means of access following the change to AMES1 and the new access and fencing required in relation to the proposal to join Equinox Drive and Allington Track.</b></p> <p><b>ii. When is it anticipated that the scope of the required works will be confirmed by Scottish and Southern Electricity plc?</b></p>
CA.2.57	F W G Whiting	<p><b>i. Please outline any outstanding concerns in relation to plot 03-14 powers of Temporary Possession in the light of the Applicant's response to your Written Representation on this matter.</b></p> <p><b>ii. Has your alternative proposal for the Esso pipeline and/ or the land sought to be subject to Temporary Possession powers been discussed with the Applicant?</b></p>
CA.2.58	Applicant	<p><b>i. Please explain further why it is necessary to seek Temporary Possession of plot 03-14 and why the proposed powers are necessary to facilitate the diversion of the Esso pipeline.</b></p> <p><b>ii. Why is Temporary Possession required of the whole of plot 03-14 and not just the western most corner?</b></p> <p><b>iii. Please explain further the need and justification for the scope of the powers of Temporary Possession and the acquisition of rights sought over land parcels 03-13 and 03-14.</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>		
	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CA.2.59	Howard Smith on behalf of Mr Steven Moore	The Applicant in its response to your Written Representation indicates that having the land returned to your client in a chalk grassland condition post construction represents an option [REP3-013].  <b>Please indicate whether any discussions have taken place as regards that option including the consideration of any accommodation works that would be required.</b>
CA.2.60	Applicant	<b>Please provide an update in relation to the prospect of Mr Moore having the land returned to him post construction and the consideration of any accommodation works that would be required.</b>
CA.2.61	Applicant	<b>The Applicant is requested to provide an update as regards negotiations with other objectors not specifically mentioned above.</b>
<b>DCO.2</b>	<b>Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)</b>	
<b>Part 1 – Preliminary</b>		
DCO.2.1	Applicant	<b>Article 2 – “the authorised development”</b>  The response to ExQ1 DCO.1.2 (ii) [REP2-030] and the Applicant’s DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the dDCO hearing on 4 June 2019 [REP4-029] seek to justify the inclusion of the construction

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>compounds as 'ancillary works' rather than listing them as specific work numbers in the dDCO. Nonetheless, they have basically been assessed by the ES as being in a specific location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. For the avoidance of doubt, please specify precisely and justify the extent of the 'limited degree of flexibility' afforded for the location of the construction compounds that would currently be permitted by the DL4 OEMP [REP4-020] and the dDCO.</b></li> <li><b>ii. Please identify the other locations within the Order limits where the construction compounds could potentially be located.</b></li> </ul>
DCO.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 – “the authorised development”</b></p> <p>The response to ExQ1 DCO.1.4 [REP2-030] refers to the 'Government Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects', paragraph 10, which states:</p> <p><i>“As far as practicable, applicants should explain in their explanatory memorandum which parts (if any) of their proposal are associated development and why” and asserts that it would be impracticable to do so.”</i></p> <p>The DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on the 4 June 2019 also suggests that there would be practical difficulties in separately identifying associated development [REP4-029].</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. The relevant guidance is applicable to highway schemes and the practical difficulties highlighted would appear to be overstated. Explain further why it would be impracticable for all or any elements of associated development to be separately identified in the dDCO?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Would it not be helpful for the Secretary of State to have elements identified as associated development where practicable to do so to assist in the assessment of whether they are appropriately included in the application?</b></li> </ul>
DCO.2.3	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 relevant Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). 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. However, the response to ExQ1 DCO.1.8 (v) identifies that there are some activities excluded from the definition of “<i>commence</i>” that are not defined as comprising “<i>preliminary works</i>” in Schedule 2, Part 1 [REP2-030].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Should these activities not also be included within the definition of “<i>preliminary works</i>” and, if not, how would they be satisfactorily controlled by the DCO?</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>ii. Please provide evidence to support the assertion that they should be regarded as being de minimis and thus not subject to control.</b></p>
DCO.2.4	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. That is presently described as "The environmental statement, figures and appendices contained in document references 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3." The need for clarity in the scope of the certified ES is important given the reliance placed upon the detailed design and 'as built' parameters not leading to new or materially different effects than assessed in the ES.</p> <p><b>i. Given the various additional submissions, addenda, updated versions and the like please clarify and explain the contents of the ES that is to be certified.</b></p> <p><b>ii. Does the Schedule 12 reference currently include all that it should and/ or does it require updating?</b></p>
DCO.2.5	Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 - "maintain"</b></p> <p>The response to ExQ1 DCO.1.12 (iv) rejected the inclusion of additional words referring to the ES on the grounds that to do so would impose an unnecessary administrative burden upon the undertaker [REP2-030].</p> <p><b>Please explain why it would result in an unacceptable administrative burden for the Applicant to consider and record</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>for each maintenance operation whether it fell within the scope of the ES? Is it not important that such an exercise be carried out?</b>
DCO.2.6	Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 - “maintain”</b></p> <p>The response to ExQ1 DCO.1.12 (iii) confirmed that all works comprised in the definition of “maintain” had been fully assessed in the ES [REP2-030]. The ES references included within that response mention maintenance and repairs but do not specifically refer to all the activities within the scope of the definition.</p> <p><b>Please confirm that the ES has assessed the full scope of works of maintenance, including works of alteration, removal and reconstruction that would be permitted by Requirement 5 and identify where this is recorded.</b></p>
DCO.2.7	Applicant	<p><b>Other matters</b></p> <p><b>Please consider the suggestion made by Wiltshire Council in its DL4 Review of the dDCO (Rev 2) [REP4-039] that a definition of “Lead Local Flood Authority” should be included within Article 2 and that the definition of planning authority should be amended to reflect the fact that Wiltshire Council is a Unitary Authority.</b></p>
DCO.2.8	Applicant	<b>Article 3 – Disapplication of legislative provisions</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>		
<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>	
		<b>Please provide an update on the progress of discussions with Wiltshire Council as regards protective provisions for the protection of drainage authorities.</b>
DCO.2.9	Wiltshire Council	<b>Article 3 – Disapplication of legislative provisions</b> <b>Please indicate whether sufficient Protective Provisions have been agreed for the protection of drainage authorities?</b>
DCO.2.10	National Farmers’ Union	<b>Article 3 – Disapplication of legislative provisions</b> <b>In the light of the Applicant’s DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on 4 June 2019 [REP4-029], please comment on the Applicant’s post-hearing note in support of its disapplication of the Temporary Possession provisions of the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017.</b>
<b>Part 2 – Works provisions</b>		
<b>Principal powers</b>		
DCO.2.11	Applicant	<b>Article 7 – Limits of deviation</b> Article 7 would allow the exercise of limits of deviation (LoD) to be exercised to the extent (or so far as) the Undertaker considers necessary or convenient.



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>i. <b>Notwithstanding the details already provided please explain why, particularly within the WHS, the LoD should be permitted to be exercised where it would simply be “convenient” to do so?</b></p> <p>ii. <b>Does that reflect the justification for the LoD within the WHS provided at the DCO hearing?</b></p>
DCO.2.12	Applicant	<p><b>Article 7 – Limits of deviation</b></p> <p>The response to ExQ1 DCO.1.29 (iii) indicates that any changes sought pursuant to Article 7 would necessarily be minor and would not need to be subject to public consultation obligations [REP2-030]. However, whether public consultation is justified does not necessarily depend upon there being new or materially worse adverse environmental effects but upon the nature and extent on the proposed changes and their potential significance to those who might otherwise be consulted.</p> <p><b>Should the article therefore make further provision for consultation over and above that required with the planning authority?</b></p>
DCO.2.13	Applicant	<p><b>Article 7 – Limits of deviation</b></p> <p>The response to ExQ1 DCO.1.27 [REP2-030] indicates that the location of the Green Bridges on the Rights of Way and Access Plans are “illustrative” as those plans do not account for the 3m centreline LoD. The Applicant’s DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>hearing on the 4 June 2019 [REP4-029] indicates that the position of the crossing of the Green Bridges over the A303 is shown by reference to the chainages on the Engineering Section Drawings (Plans and Profiles).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. For the avoidance of doubt, please indicate whether the documentation as submitted would allow any scope for changes to the points at which the Green Bridges cross the A303. How far, if at all, could their position be potentially moved along the line of the parent work?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Explain any implications that the LoD would have for the ultimate locations of the Green Bridges.</b></li> </ul>
DCO.2.14	Wiltshire Council National Trust Historic England	<p><b>Article 7 – Limits of deviation</b></p> <p><b>Please indicate whether there are any outstanding concerns, for example, in relation to whether provision should be made for consultation with stakeholders before the proposed LoD for the tunnel could be invoked or whether any other drafting amendments are sought in relation to Article 7?</b></p>
DCO.2.15	Environment Agency	<p><b>Article 7 – Limits of deviation</b></p> <p><b>In the light of the Applicant’s DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on 4 June 2019 [REP4-029], are there any outstanding concerns as regards the interaction between the vertical LoD of the proposed tunnel and groundwater flows?</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>		<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>Streets</b>			
DCO.2.16	Applicant		<p><b>Article 11 – Temporary stopping up of streets</b></p> <p><b>Please respond to the point made by Wiltshire Council in its Review of dDCO (Rev 2) submitted at DL4 [REP4-039] that highways cannot be temporarily stopped up and whether this has any implications for the drafting of the dDCO?</b></p>
DCO.2.17	Applicant		<p><b>Article 12 – Access to works</b></p> <p>The response to ExA1 DCO.1.32 (ii) indicates that the exercise of this power would be subject to Requirement 4 which secures compliance with the OEMP and refers to MW-G28 as dealing with construction compounds generally (including access) [REP2-030].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. The OEMP MW-G28 deals with construction compounds generally [REP4-020]. Explain how it would satisfactorily cover or control the access to construction compounds?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Should further thought be given as to how access to construction compounds is considered by the OEMP?</b></li> </ul>
DCO.2.18	National Trust		<p><b>Article 12 – Access to works</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please provide any additional comments you may have in the light of the Applicant’s DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on 4 June 2019 [REP4-</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>		
<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>	
		<p><b>029] which indicates that provision for haul roads to be constrained to the footprint for the construction of the scheme would be in the updated OEMP submitted at DL4 – item D-CH31 [REP4-020].</b></p> <p><b>ii. Does this overcome the concerns in relation to the haul roads or are any other changes to the OEMP sought in this respect?</b></p>
<b>Supplemental powers</b>		
DCO.2.19	Applicant	<p><b>Article 13 – Discharge of water</b></p> <p><b>Please indicate whether the Environment Agency’s proposed amendments to Article 13 in relation to groundwater have been received and considered? If so, please provide comments in relation thereto.</b></p>
DCO.2.20	Environment Agency	<p><b>Article 13 – Discharge of water</b></p> <p><b>Please set out any proposed amendments to Article 13 in relation to groundwater together with the reasons for seeking these changes.</b></p>
DCO.2.21	National Farmers’ Union	<p><b>Article 13 – Discharge of water</b></p> <p><b>Please provide any additional comments you may have in the light of the Applicant’s DL4 written summary of oral submissions</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>put at the DCO hearing on 4 June 2019 [REP4-029] which confirms that Article 13 would apply to any watercourse as defined in the Water Resources Act 1991.</b>
DCO.2.22	Applicant	<p><b>Article 15 – Authority to survey and investigate the land</b></p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, please specify the relevant provisions in the OEMP [REP4-020] and DAMS [REP4-024] that would regulate any intrusive surveys that would be carried out.</p> <p><b>Please confirm that such controls and the relevant dDCO Requirement securing those provisions would also apply to the carrying out of surveys on land outside the Order limits?</b></p>
DCO.2.23	National Trust Historic England	<p><b>Article 15 – Authority to survey and investigate the land</b></p> <p><b>Please indicate whether there are any outstanding concerns as regards the regulation of any intrusive surveys that would be allowed by this article under the relevant measures in the OEMP [REP4-020] and DAMS [REP4-024].</b></p>
DCO.2.24	National Farmers’ Union	<p><b>Article 15 – Authority to survey and investigate the land</b></p> <p><b>Please indicate whether the revised drafting of this Article at DL4 [RE4-018] to include reference to the nature of the survey intended to be undertaken satisfies your concerns in this respect?</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>		
<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>	
<b>Part 3 – Powers of acquisition and possession of land</b>		
DCO.2.25	National Trust	<p><b>Article 22 – Compulsory acquisition of rights</b></p> <p>i. Please indicate whether any issue is taken with the drafting of this article in the light of the Applicant’s post hearing note included within its DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on 4 June 2019 [REP4-029] concerning whether the powers exercised by Statutory Undertakers under Article 2 would be subject to the Requirements of the Order.</p> <p>ii. Is it agreed that any intrusions into the land within the WHS by Statutory Undertakers would be appropriately regulated by the OEMP [REP4-020] and the dDCO Requirements or are any further drating changes sought?</p>
DCO.2.26	Wiltshire Council National Trust Historic England	<p><b>Article 22 – Compulsory acquisition of rights</b></p> <p>Please indicate whether there are any outstanding concerns 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.2.27	Applicant	<b>Article 24 – Power to override easements and other rights</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>The response to ExQ1 DCO.1.45 expresses the view that sections 203 to 205 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 would not supersede the effect of this Article [REP2-030].</p> <p><b>i. Is that correct or does section 203(4) not also have effect in respect of the use of land? If so, why would this not be sufficient for your purposes as it would allow for rights to be interfered with or overridden either when building or maintenance work is carried out or when the land is used for development authorised by the DCO.</b></p> <p>Article 24(2)(b) extends this even further allowing the undertaker to interfere with or override rights when exercising any power authorised by the DCO.</p> <p><b>ii. What does the Applicant have in mind here that would justify this power?</b></p> <p><b>iii. What other powers in the dDCO would be used other than building, maintaining or using the land which would involve interference with or overriding other rights?</b></p>
DCO.2.28	Applicant	<p><b>Article 29 – Temporary use of land for constructing the development</b></p> <p>The duration of the Temporary Possession is limited by reference to the completion of the works for which Temporary Possession is taken, plus one year to allow for restoration of the land. However, unless and until</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>the works are completed the one-year restoration period does not begin meaning that the temporary use could potentially continue indefinitely.</p> <p><b>Whilst it is stated that the compensation that would be due would provide an incentive to keep Temporary Possession to a minimum, is it reasonable for reliance to be placed upon the payment of compensation in this way or should an overall time limit for the exercise of powers of Temporary Possession be included within this Article?</b></p>
DCO.2.29	Applicant	<p><b>Article 31 – Statutory undertakers</b></p> <p><b>Please identify the relevant Statutory Undertakers where Protective Provisions have not yet been agreed and provide an update on the progress of such negotiations?</b></p>
DCO.2.30	Applicant	<p><b>Article 38 – Crown land</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></p>
DCO.2.31	Applicant	<p><b>Article 53 – Operational land for the purposes of the 1990 Act</b></p> <p><b>i. Please explain further why it is necessary to ensure that the Applicant enjoys the full range of permitted development afforded to it under the Town and Country</b></p>



<b>ExQ1</b>		
<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>	
		<p><b>Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 and outline how it is envisaged that the exercise of permitted development rights would operate in practice?</b></p> <p><b>ii. Given the particular circumstances of this project and site location is there justification for the restriction of permitted development rights in this case?</b></p>
<b>Schedule 2 – Part 1 – Requirements</b>		
DCO.2.32	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 1 – Interpretation</b></p> <p><b>i. Please confirm that the following activities are both excluded from the definition of “commence” and do not fall within the definition of “preliminary works”, namely, ecological surveys, investigations for the purposes of assessing ground levels, investigations for the purposes of monitoring ground conditions and levels, receipt and erection of construction plant and equipment, and temporary display of site notices or advertisements.</b></p> <p><b>ii. Please explain the means whereby these activities would be controlled and regulated and how this would be secured by the DCO?</b></p> <p><b>iii. In relation to site clearance, which is part of the preliminary works, please respond to Wiltshire Council’s request that REAC table 3.2a of the OEMP [REP4-020] should include an</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>action/ commitment for site drainage, similar to that which has been included in REAC table 3.2b for the main works. If that is not agreed, please explain why?</b></p>
DCO.2.33	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Requirement 1 – Interpretation</b></p> <p><b>Please provide full reasons to support the request that REAC table 3.2a of the OEMP [REP4-020] should include an action/ commitment for site drainage, similar to that which has been included in REAC table 3.2b for the main works.</b></p>
DCO.2.34	Environment Agency	<p><b>Requirement 3 (1) and (2) – Preparation of detailed design etc</b></p> <p>The Applicant’s DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on the 4 June 2019 [REP4-029] and the post hearing note in relation to Requirement 3 indicates that it does not consider it appropriate for the Environment Agency to be consulted by the Secretary of State when he or she is considering whether to approve a departure from the plans specified in the Requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please indicate whether there are any particular circumstances in relation to this scheme that would support the need for consultation.</b></li> <li><b>ii. Please comment on whether the fact that the scheme would still be subject to Requirement 4 which secures compliance with the OEMP [REP4-020] would provide sufficient safeguards and obviate the need for consultation</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>with the Environment Agency to be included within Requirement 3?</b>
DCO.2.35	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 3 (1) and (2) – Preparation of detailed design etc</b></p> <p><b>Please explain further why it would not be appropriate for any other relevant stakeholders in addition to the planning authority to be consulted by the Secretary of State when he or she is considering whether to approve a departure from the plans specified in Requirement 3.</b></p>
DCO.2.36	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 3 (1) and (2) – Preparation of detailed design etc</b></p> <p>The DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on 4 June 2019 [REP4-029] indicates that the updated OEMP includes further design commitments, design principles and a stakeholder consultation mechanism that has emerged from ongoing consultation with heritage stakeholders [REP4-020].</p> <p><b>Please provide an update on those ongoing discussions with stakeholders in relation to such matters and indicate whether it is agreed that the dispute mechanism proposed in section 4 of the updated OEMP would be adequate.</b></p>
DCO.2.37	Wiltshire Council National Trust	<p><b>Requirement 3 (1) and (2) – Preparation of detailed design etc</b></p> <p>The Applicant’s DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on 4 June 2019 [REP4-029] indicates that the updated</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Historic England English Heritage	<p>OEMP includes further design commitments, design principles and a stakeholder consultation mechanism that has emerged from ongoing consultation with heritage stakeholders [REP4-020].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please provide an update on those ongoing discussions with the Applicant in relation to such matters and indicate whether it is agreed that the dispute mechanism proposed in section 4 of the updated OEMP would be adequate?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Should matters such as design principles, stakeholder consultation and dispute mechanisms be the subject of specific DCO Requirements or does their inclusion within the OEMP provide adequate safeguards?</b></li> <li><b>iii. Are those design-related matters as set out in the OEMP sufficiently precise and detailed to be readily enforceable or are any further drafting changes sought?</b></li> </ul>
DCO.2.38	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 3 (1) and (2) – Preparation of detailed design etc</b></p> <p>The DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on 4 June 2019 [REP4-029] confirms the Applicant’s view that Requirement 3 should not include reference to the Environmental Masterplan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. For the avoidance of doubt, please confirm the status of the Environmental Masterplan and its relationship with the Environmental Statement.</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>ii. <b>There seems to be an inconsistency in the Applicant’s approach to the use of the terms “<i>indicative</i>” and “<i>compatible</i>” in its rejection of any specific reference to the Environmental Masterplan in this Requirement. Explain further why the inclusion of such a reference would unduly constrain the flexibility of the detailed design and of mitigation?</b></p> <p>iii. <b>Given the particular circumstances and value of the WHS, is there not a need for the clarity and certainty in design terms that a specific design parameters document could provide and to which specific reference could made in this Requirement?</b></p>
DCO.2.39	Historic England	<p><b>Requirement 3 (1) and (2) – Preparation of detailed design etc</b>  <b>Please provide further details of your proposal for a design parameters document.</b></p>
DCO.2.40	Wiltshire Council National Trust Historic England English Heritage	<p><b>Requirement 3 (1) and (2) – Preparation of detailed design etc</b>          The Applicant’s response to ExQ1 DCO.1.81 (ii) recognises the need to give key stakeholders confidence that the detailed design of the scheme would be carried out appropriately [REP2-030].</p> <p><b>i. Please provide an update as regards the discussion of an appropriate mechanism to achieve the matters 1, 2 and 3 set out in that response and indicate whether any further</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>changes to the updated OEMP [REP4-020] are envisaged in that respect.</p> <p>ii. <b>Please comment as to the merits of a specific design parameters document over and above the various design commitments and principles specified within the updated OEMP that would be secured by a specific DCO Requirement?</b></p>
DCO.2.41	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 3 (1) and (2) – Preparation of detailed design etc</b></p> <p>The response to ExQ1 DCO.1.81 (ii) recognises the need to give key stakeholders confidence that the detailed design of the scheme would be carried out appropriately [REP2-030].</p> <p><b>Please provide an update as regards the discussion of an appropriate mechanism for achieving that with heritage stakeholders and whether any further changes to the OEMP are envisaged in that respect.</b></p>
DCO.2.42	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 3 (1) and (2) – Preparation of detailed design etc</b></p> <p>The DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on 4 June 2019 [REP4-029] confirms the Applicant’s view that Requirement 3 should require the detailed design to be carried out so that it is “<i>compatible</i>” with the listed plans rather than in “<i>accordance</i>” with them and suggests that to do otherwise would contradict the LoD.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>i. <b>However, could this not be overcome by drafting the Requirement to include reference to the LoD?</b></p> <p>ii. <b>If “compatible” is to be read as the Applicant suggests what is the objection to the use of the term “accordance” in this Requirement?</b></p>
DCO.2.43	Wiltshire Council National Trust Historic England English Heritage Environment Agency	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The Applicant’s DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on the 4 June 2019 [REP4-029], refers to the amended OEMP submitted at DL3 and the provision for consultation contained therein [REP3-006].</p> <p><b>Do the parties have any outstanding concerns in this respect and would the provision for consultation be satisfactorily secured by the dDCO Requirement 4?</b></p>
DCO.2.44	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on 4 June 2019 [REP4-029], in relation to the CEMPs, points to the fact that each CEMP would require the approval of the Authority, in consultation with relevant stakeholders and that measure MW-G6 of the OEMP requires consultation if a CEMP is being materially revised.</p> <p><b>How would that provide sufficient safeguards given that the Authority is still ultimately the approving body?</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.2.45	National Trust	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on 4 June 2019 [REP4-029], in relation to the CEMPs, points to the fact that each CEMP would require the approval of the Authority, in consultation with relevant stakeholders and that measure MW-G6 of the OEMP requires consultation if a CEMP is being materially revised.</p> <p><b>Does the National Trust have any outstanding concerns with this arrangement and would it provide sufficient safeguards given that the Authority is still the approving body?</b></p>
DCO.2.46	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>For the CEMPs and certain other management plans 'the Authority' remains the approving body.</p> <p><b>Notwithstanding the provision for consultation with relevant stakeholders, please identify any outstanding concerns with this arrangement and, for the avoidance of doubt, list the plans that the Council considers it needs to approve itself before commencement of work giving reasons for that approach.</b></p>
DCO.2.47	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The response to ExQ1 DCO.1.86 indicates that the relevant contractor would be the author of the CEMP and appropriate assurance of scrutiny would be provided by the Requirement in the OEMP for the contractor to</p>



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>consult with Wiltshire Council and the Environment Agency in its development of the CEMP before approval by the Applicant [REP2-030]. Further details are provided in the DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on 4 June 2019 [REP4-029]. Nonetheless, the CEMP would still be drafted by a contractor in a contractual relationship with the ultimate approver of that document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. How would that provide an appropriate level of independent scrutiny of the CEMP?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Please provide other examples in addition to the A14 DCO to support the view that it is well-established for applicants that carry out public functions to have an approval role on CEMPs or Codes of Construction Practice on such schemes.</b></li> <li><b>iii. Please provide evidence to support the view that the discharge of pre-commencement Requirements by Wiltshire Council, as opposed to the Authority, would cause undue delay?</b></li> <li><b>iv. Does the Wiltshire Council not also have the expertise, experience and resources to carry out the approval function?</b></li> <li><b>v. Please explain further with reference to statute and case law, as appropriate, the Applicant's duty to act reasonably in this respect and the scope for supervision by the court.</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.2.48	Historic England	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The Applicant’s DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on the 4 June 2019 [REP4-029] refers to section 4 of the updated OEMP and the mechanism set out therein for consultation on aspects of the detailed design within the WHS.</p> <p><b>Does this provide a sufficiently clear mechanism or is there an alternative mechanism that would be preferable?</b></p>
DCO.2.49	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The response to ExQ1 DCO.1.93 rejects the suggestion that any of the commitments in the OEMP, Table 3.2b DCH1-DCH13 such as the provision of visual screening earth bunds (D-CH1) and those actions relating to lighting (DCH8-12) should include provision for consultation and/ or be the subject of specific Requirements in the dDCO [REP2-030].</p> <p><b>Given that these represent key aspects of detailed design please indicate whether the Applicant’s position in relation to consultation on these matters has changed during the course of the examination and, if not, why not?</b></p>
DCO.2.50	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>There has been concern expressed by various parties as regards the lack of control over the design of lighting at the tunnel portals.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>Does the updated OEMP provide sufficient controls in that respect and/ or should the approval of the design of the lighting scheme specifically be the subject of a dDCO Requirement?</b></p>
DCO.2.51	Wiltshire Council National Trust Historic England	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>There has been concern expressed by various parties as regards the lack of control over the design of lighting at the tunnel portals.</p> <p><b>Does the updated OEMP provide sufficient controls in that respect and/ or should the approval of the design of the lighting scheme specifically be the subject of a dDCO Requirement?</b></p>
DCO.2.52	Wiltshire Council National Trust Historic England	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The Applicant’s DL4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on the 4 June 2019 [REP4-029] refers to the consultation which has taken place on the detailed design of the public rights of way within the WHS and the further details and commitments in that respect set out in the updated OEMP submitted at DL3 [REP3-006].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please indicate whether these design commitments and principles are agreed and considered to be sufficiently precise and comprehensive or do they require further amendment?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Does the OEMP, as secured by Requirement 4, provide a satisfactory means of achieving these aims or is it</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>considered that a further specific Requirement in relation to this matter is necessary?</b>
DCO.2.53	National Farmers' Union	<p><b>Requirement 4 – Outline Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The Applicant's DL 4 written summary of oral submissions put at the DCO hearing on the 4 June 2019 [REP4-029] refers to the addition of further measures in relation to agricultural land drainage and the record of condition surveys in the updated OEMP.</p> <p><b>Are there any outstanding concerns as regards the provision made in the OEMP regarding agricultural field drainage and/ or the reinstatement and aftercare of soils?</b></p>
DCO.2.54	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 5</b></p> <p><b>Please consider whether this Requirement should be amended as sought by Wiltshire Council in its DL4 Review of the dDCO (Rev 2) [REP4-039]?</b></p>
DCO.2.55	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Requirement 5</b></p> <p><b>Please provide further reasoning to support the necessity for and reasonableness of the suggested amendments to this Requirement put forward in your Council's DL4 Review of the dDCO (Rev 2) [REP4-039].</b></p>
DCO.2.56	Applicant	<b>Requirement 7 – Contaminated land</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>i. <b>The Applicant notes that any timeline for the carrying out of remediation would be set out in the “programme” that is required to be submitted for approval. For the avoidance of doubt, should the Requirement be drafted to ensure that this is made explicit on its face?</b></p> <p>ii. <b>Although Requirement 7(3) makes provision for the submission of a written scheme and programme for remedial measures there is no timeline within which the actual submission to the Secretary of State must take place. Part 2 Schedule 2 only sets a timeline post-submission of any application for approval. Please consider whether the Requirement needs amendment in this respect?</b></p> <p>iii. <b>Requirement 7(3) leaves it to the undertaker to determine whether remediation of contaminated land is necessary. Should this decision be made in association with the Environment Agency and the planning authority?</b></p>
DCO.2.57	Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Requirement 7 – Contaminated land</b></p> <p><b>Please comment on whether any further drafting changes are necessary for this Requirement and/ or any additional Requirements are necessary in relation to contaminated land?</b></p>
DCO.2.58	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 8 – Landscaping</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>Please consider whether this Requirement should be amended as sought by Wiltshire Council in its DL4 Review of the dDCO (Rev 2) [REP4-039], including reference to an implementation programme or programmes for all landscaping works and a programme for maintenance of the scheme. If this revised wording is not agreed, please provide reasons for the rejection of this proposed amendment.</b></p>
DCO.2.59	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 8 – Landscaping</b></p> <p>As previously noted, Requirement 8(2)(b) only specifies “<i>noise fences and walls</i>” as opposed to fences or walls designed for other purposes. The Applicant acknowledges that within the WHS, the location and appearance of fences could be important.</p> <p><b>Given the importance of safeguarding the WHS, should the landscaping works associated with all fences and walls within it not be subject to this Requirement in addition to the OEMP (D-CH14) in order to provide adequate protection for this area?</b></p>
DCO.2.60	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 8 – Landscaping</b></p> <p><b>Please reconsider whether Historic England should be consulted on any submission for approval under Requirement 8 insofar as it relates to landscaping within the WHS?</b></p> <p>Although the planning authority is specified as consultee, as is normally the case, most applications would not affect such historic areas.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.2.61	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 9 – Traffic management</b></p> <p>Please consider whether this Requirement should be amended as sought by Wiltshire Council in its DL4 Review of the dDCO (Rev 2) [REP4-039], namely, that the words "<i>which makes clear provision for traffic management proposals required to facilitate the construction of that phase of the development</i>" should be inserted in Requirement 9(1)? If not, please provide reasons for the rejection of this clarification.</p>
DCO.2.62	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 10 – Drainage</b></p> <p>Please consider and respond to the amendment to this Requirement proposed by Wiltshire Council at DL4, namely, that it would prefer the wording "<i>on matter related to drainage functions</i>" to be removed, or if not agreeable, for the wording to be replaced with the following: "<i>on matters related to its drainage and flood risk functions</i>" [REP4-039].</p> <p>If not, please provide reasons for the rejection of this clarification.</p>
DCO.2.63	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 11 - Details of consultation</b></p> <p>Please consider and respond to the alternative wording for this Requirement proposed by Wiltshire Council at DL4 [REP4-039].</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>If this revised wording is not agreed, please provide reasons for the rejection of this amendment.</b>
DCO.2.64	Wiltshire Council National Trust Historic England English Heritage Environment Agency	<b>Requirement 11 - Details of consultation</b> <b>Are there any outstanding concerns as regards the provision for consultation with relevant stakeholders and the means whereby this would be secured by the dDCO?</b>
DCO.2.65	Applicant	<b>Additional Requirements</b> <b>i. Please consider whether the additional Requirements sought by Wiltshire Council in its DL4 Review of the dDCO (Rev 2) [REP4-039] should be imposed, namely, those relating to the CEMP, traffic monitoring and mitigation, highway lighting scheme, traffic management during tunnel closures, flood risk assessment and approval and amendment of approved details. If not, please provide reasons for the rejection of this additional Requirements.</b> <b>ii. Please also explain why it is regarded as being appropriate for Highways England to approve the CEMP, rather than the Secretary of State or the Wiltshire Council in consultation with other key stakeholders.</b>



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>iii. Whilst MW-G5 of the OEMP requires the main works contractor to prepare a CEMP in accordance with the OEMP, given the critical nature of the obligation should this not be a matter that is specifically secured within the DCO?</b></p> <p><b>iv. Likewise, should specific reference of the conversion of the CEMP to the HEMP not also be included within a DCO Requirement as proposed by Wiltshire Council?</b></p>
DCO.2.66	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Additional Requirements</b></p> <p><b>i. Please provide further detailed reasons to support the inclusion of the suggested additional Requirements in the dDCO and explain why, for example, the revised OEMP does not provide adequate safeguards for such matters?</b></p> <p><b>ii. Please explain further why the CEMP should not be left for the approval of Highways England rather than the Secretary of State or the Wiltshire Council in consultation with other key stakeholders?</b></p>
DCO.2.67	Applicant	<p><b>Additional Requirements</b></p> <p>The Applicant, in rejecting any provision within the dDCO to secure improvements and/ or enhancement to waterbodies, points to the net biodiversity gain secured by the scheme, principally through the creation of new connected chalk habitats.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>Please explain further and with reference to relevant local and national policies on this topic why it is considered to be unnecessary and unreasonable to impose a Requirement securing further biodiversity gain which could potentially be achieved as a result of the scheme?</b>
DCO.2.68	Environment Agency	<b>Additional Requirements</b> <b>Please indicate and explain further, with reference to relevant local and national policies on this topic, the contributions to improvements to waterbodies that could potentially be achieved as a result of the scheme and why it would be reasonable and necessary to secure this within the dDCO.</b>
<b>Schedule 11 – Protective Provisions</b>		
DCO.2.69	Applicant	<b>Please provide an update as to the present state of negotiations with the Statutory Undertakers and revised Protective Provisions where appropriate?</b>
DCO.2.70	Applicant	<b>Please indicate whether the terms of the Protective Provisions set out in Schedule 11 of the dDCO are agreed and, if not, what are the areas of disagreement?</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.2.71	Esso Petroleum Company Ltd South Electric Power Distribution plc Wessex Water Services Ltd Southern Gas Networks plc BT Group plc CenturyLink Ltd, Sky UK Ltd Virgin Media Ltd	<b>Please indicate whether the terms of the Protective Provisions set out in Schedule 11 of the dDCO are agreed and, if not, what are the areas of disagreement?</b>
<b>Schedule 12 – Documents to be certified</b>		
DCO.2.72	Applicant	<b>Please confirm that the references in this schedule to the documents to be certified are accurate and complete or do any of these references require updating?</b>
DCO.2.73	Applicant	<p>The [AS-009] Pre-examination clarification document plays an important role in the interpretation of detailed design issues and/ or Requirements and the relationship between them.</p> <b>Please consider whether specific reference to this document on the face of the dDCO would provide clarity and aid interpretation?</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>		
<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>	
<b>Fg.2</b>	<b>Flood risk, groundwater protection, geology and land contamination</b>	
Fg.2.1	Applicant	<b>Flood risk and drainage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. How has the potential for permanent compaction of underlying chalk from construction activities been assessed?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Should the means to mitigate this risk be clearly stated in the OEMP?</b></li> </ul>
Fg.2.2	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council National Farmers' Union	<b>Flood risk and drainage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. How would the discharge of any water from the construction phase, including any dewatering of the tunnel arisings slurry be controlled to prevent flood risk and contamination?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Should this be explicitly addressed in the OEMP?</b></li> </ul>
Fg.2.3	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<b>Flood risk and drainage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Given the Council's statutory role should MW-WAT3 be expanded to also require consultation and/ or agreement with the Council as well as the Environment Agency?</b></li> <li><b>ii. If so, should this just be in respect of part c or more generally?</b></li> </ul>
Fg.2.4	Applicant	<b>Flood risk and drainage</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Wiltshire Council	<b>Please provide an update on the discussions following the Council's peer review of the latest FRA. Please set out any areas of disagreement. Within this response please set out the position in respect of the revised culvert design, the updated modelling outputs and the peak surface water flow onto the River Till flood plain and any associated mitigation.</b>
Fg.2.5	Applicant Environment Agency	<b>Flood risk and drainage</b> <b>Please provide an update on the discussions in respect of the FRA. In particular please outline any areas of disagreement, where additional information is required, and any consequential implications for other documents such as updates to the OEMP?</b>
Fg.2.6	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<b>Flood risk and drainage</b> <b>i. Should the Flood Risk Management Plan be listed in MW-G7 of the OEMP and should the plan be developed in consultation with Wiltshire Council as well as the Environment Agency?</b> <b>ii. If not, why?</b>
Fg.2.7	Applicant Wiltshire Council	<b>Flood risk and drainage</b> <b>Please provide an update on the discussions about the need for the employment of a full-time drainage engineer during construction:</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>What is the current status of the discussions?</b></li> <li>• <b>Set-out why this post is considered to be necessary (or not); and</b></li> <li>• <b>how this would be secured.</b></li> </ul>
Fg.2.8	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Flood risk and drainage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please provide an update on the discussions about the climate change allowance for road drainage.</b></li> <li><b>ii. If the Applicant considers that a 30% allowance (with a 40% sensitivity check) is sufficient please respond to the Council concerns in respect of reliance on the freeboard, lack of allowance for any uncertainty and that climate change allowances may increase in the near future?</b></li> <li><b>iii. Could the Environment Agency set out its position on this matter?</b></li> <li><b>iv. Should MW-WAT12 be updated to include reference to climate change allowances in line with the comments made by the Environment Agency at DL4 [REP4-049]?</b></li> </ul>
Fg.2.9	Applicant Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Flood risk and drainage</b></p> <p>In the Relevant Representation from Wiltshire Council [RR-2365] a detailed concern was raised in respect of the Triangular Irregular</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>Networks and the Light Detection and Ranging (paragraph 69 (a)). A specific response to this concern does not appear to have been provided.</p> <p><b>Can the Applicant respond to this matter and can the Council set out its current position in respect of this?</b></p>
Fg.2.10	Applicant Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Flood risk and drainage</b></p> <p>In the Relevant Representation from Wiltshire Council [RR-2365] a detailed concern was raised that the model should be run for a longer simulation time (paragraph 69 (c)). A specific response to this concern does not appear to have been provided.</p> <p><b>Can the Applicant respond to this matter and can the Council set out its current position in respect of this?</b></p>
Fg.2.11	Applicant Wiltshire Council	<p>Flood risk and drainage</p> <p>In the Relevant Representation from Wiltshire Council [RR-2365] a query was raised as to the ownership and maintenance responsibilities and regime for the proposed culvert. The long culvert has now been removed from the scheme, however, it is understood that shorter culverts would still be utilised.</p> <p><b>What would the ownership, maintenance regime and responsibilities be for any culverts and how would this be secured?</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Fg.2.12	Applicant Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Flood risk and drainage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Having regard to the DL4 submission from Wiltshire Council [REP4-039] please could the Applicant address matters of potential flood risk to the B3083?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Could the Council set out its current position on these matters?</b></li> </ul>
Fg.2.13	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Flood risk and drainage</b></p> <p><b>Having regard to the provision of the additional evidence submitted to the examination, please set out an updated assessment of the proposed development in respect of the flood risk policy, including the application of the Sequential and Exception Tests, in the NPSNN?</b></p>
Fg.2.14	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Drainage</b></p> <p>The road drainage strategy would involve water from a sump within the tunnel being pumped beyond the eastern portal. The water would then either enter the highway drainage system or, if contaminated, be retained in an impounding sump for disposal by tanker. It appears that the switch between discharge or retention could either be automated or manual. The method is not secured (ie within the OEMP).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. What are the risks and benefits of each approach?</b></li> </ul>



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. <b>If a manual approach were chosen, would any time delay from a contamination incident to the manual override being initiated result in polluted water entering the wider road drainage system?</b></li> <li>iii. <b>If an automated approach were chosen, what measures would be in place in the event that the automated system failed?</b></li> <li>iv. <b>In view of the importance of this part of the drainage strategy, is it necessary to provide certainty on this within the OEMP?</b></li> </ul>
Fg.2.15	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<b>Drainage</b> <b>Given its significance should the impounding sump (and related infrastructure) be identified on the work plans and specified in the Works in Schedule 1 of the dDCO?</b>
Fg.2.16	Applicant	<b>Drainage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <b>How would any contaminants entering the road drainage ditches be treated/ attenuated to prevent pollution?</b></li> <li>ii. <b>How would this be secured?</b></li> </ul>
Fg.2.17	Applicant Environment Agency	<b>Flood risk and drainage</b> At DL4 the Council suggested additions to MW-WAT14 [REP4-039].

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>i. Given Requirement 10 would secure the details of the drainage system, why does the Council consider it necessary that this detail is set out in MW-WAT14? In responding, please provide a justification for each separate addition proposed.</b></p> <p><b>ii. Can the Applicant and the Environment Agency provide their views on whether the suggested additions are necessary?</b></p>
Fg.2.18	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Flood risk and drainage</b></p> <p>Requirement 10 of the dDCO requires that the drainage system is approved by the Secretary of State following consultation with the Council and the Environment Agency.</p> <p><b>Notwithstanding the recent addition of Requirement 11, should this be amended to secure the specific approval/ agreement of either or both the Environment Agency and the Council? Please provide detailed reasoning and, if you consider that this is necessary, why the current drafting of Requirements 10 and 11, along with the OEMP, are not adequate.</b></p>
Fg.2.19	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Flood risk and drainage</b></p> <p><b>i. Could the Environment Agency and the Council set out what, if any concerns remain in respect of the updated Road Drainage Strategy [REP2-009 and REP2-010] and are requirements beyond those set out in DMRB necessary?</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>ii. Could the Applicant set out its position on this matter and confirm whether a revised version is intended to be submitted?</b></p>
Fg.2.20	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Flood risk and drainage</b>  <b>Please provide an update on the discussions in respect of the maintenance responsibilities for the drainage infrastructure?</b></p>
Fg.2.21	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Drainage, groundwater and contamination</b>                      Reliance would be placed on natural attenuation of any contaminants that pass through the filtration material in the drainage treatment areas. Groundwater levels are relatively high in the area.</p> <p><b>i. What degree of confidence is there that this method is sufficient and how conservative is the design?</b></p> <p><b>ii. What water quality standards would be applied and how would meeting these be monitored?</b></p>
Fg.2.22	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Groundwater monitoring</b>                      Groundwater monitoring (for water levels and quality) is intended to take place during construction and for 5 years post construction.</p> <p><b>i. For the construction phase this is dealt with in MW-WAT10 of the OEMP. Is it intended that the post construction monitoring is secured via the HEMP? Is this sufficiently clear</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>to ensure that adequate post construction monitoring is secured, or should the 5-year period be explicitly stated?</b></p> <p><b>ii. In addition to the Environment Agency, should Wiltshire Council also be consulted on the Groundwater Management Plan?</b></p> <p>It appears that the principle of on-going monitoring has been agreed between the Applicant, the Environment Agency and Wiltshire Council, but that specific proposals have not yet been agreed.</p> <p><b>iii. To what extent would it be necessary to agree specific details at the pre-consent stage? If this is required, how would this be secured? Are the existing measures in the dDCO, the OEMP and the requirement for the production of a HEMP sufficient to ensure that the detailed proposals would be secured/ agreed appropriately?</b></p> <p><b>iv. What processes would be put in place in respect of landowner consent for the on-going monitoring?</b></p>
Fg.2.23	Environment Agency	<p>Groundwater</p> <p><b>i. Can you confirm whether you are satisfied with the provision in the OEMP for the Groundwater Management Plan?</b></p> <p><b>ii. If this is inadequate, please specify why and what amendments do you consider to be necessary?</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Fg.2.24	Applicant Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Groundwater monitoring and contamination</b></p> <p>A number of private water supplies are used for drinking water.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. In view of this is it necessary that monitoring is put in place to ensure compliance with drinking water standards (for example by expanding MW-WAT15 in the OEMP)?</b></li> <li><b>ii. If it is the Applicant's view that this is not necessary, please clearly set out the reasons and any risk assessment which has been carried out.</b></li> <li><b>iii. If this is considered to be necessary how should this be secured, for example is the wording suggested by the Council at DL4 to insert into the OEMP appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>iv. If monitoring is necessary, what frequency would be required to mitigate any risks appropriately?</b></li> <li><b>v. In the event that any samples failed to meet drinking water standards what reporting measures would be put in place and how would any remediating action be secured?</b></li> </ol>
Fg.2.25	Applicant	<p><b>Groundwater</b></p> <p>Please provide a response to the matter raised by the National Farmers' Union (paragraph 2.2) [REP4-052] and Howard Smith on behalf of West Amesbury Farm [REP4-059] in respect of pump tests.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>In particular is further testing proposed and to what extent is this necessary to inform the baseline evidence?</b>
Fg.2.26	Applicant Environment Agency	<p><b>Groundwater, Geology and detailed design</b></p> <p>In its DL4 submission the Environment Agency has requested that it be consulted on any updated design to the proposed tunnel to consider any impact on groundwater flows [REP4-049]. Requirement 3 in the dDCO requires consultation with the planning authority on matters relating to its functions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Should there be a Requirement to consult the Environment Agency where any changes are proposed to the tunnel? Please provide reasons.</b></li> <li><b>ii. If consultation is required, how should this be secured (for example by amending Requirement 3)?</b></li> </ul>
Fg.2.27	Applicant Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Contamination</b></p> <p>At DL4 the Environment Agency has suggested that Article 13 in the dDCO be amended to include reference to ground water and dissolved pollutants [REP4-049].</p> <p><b>Please set out your position on this matter with reasons?</b></p>
Fg.2.28	Applicant Environment Agency	<p><b>Contamination</b></p> <p>Requirement 7 deals with contamination found during construction.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Wiltshire Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Is it necessary to also secure pre-commencement investigation and risk assessment of potentially contaminated land to minimise the risk of contamination being discovered during construction? Please provide reasons for your answer.</b></li> <li><b>ii. If this is necessary how should this be secured (ie an additional Requirement)?</b></li> <li><b>iii. It appears that some investigation is ongoing, can the Applicant provide an update on this and whether it is likely to be completed and be able to be reviewed adequately during the examination?</b></li> </ul>
Fg.2.29	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Contamination</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Should Requirement 7 be updated to clarify that, if contaminated land and/ or groundwater is found works in that area should cease until the risk assessment is completed and (if necessary) the remediation is approved?</b></li> <li><b>ii. If not, why?</b></li> </ul>
Fg.2.30	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Contamination</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Should MW-WAT2 and MW-WAT7 in the OEMP also require consultation with Wiltshire Council in respect of the Water Management Plan?</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>ii. If not, why?</b>
Fg.2.31	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<b>Contamination</b> <b>Should MW-GEO1 in the OEMP be amended to also consider human health and environmental impacts of the scheme and contamination [REP4-020]?</b>
Fg.2.32	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council The Stonehenge Alliance	<b>Contamination and groundwater flow</b> In respect of the tunnel boring methodology and the potential for there to be a risk of pollution or impediment to groundwater flow the Environment Agency notes that OEMP: PW-G1, MW-G5, MW-G7, MW-WAT8, MW-WAT9, MW-WAT 10, MW WAT11, and MW-WAT14 provide <b>some</b> control of these activities (emphasis added) [REP4-020]. <b>Are the controls adequate and, if not, what additional controls are required to mitigate any risks appropriately?</b>
Fg.2.33	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<b>Dewatering</b> The OEMP now commits to the use of closed face tunnelling techniques. This should prevent the risk of large-scale dewatering being required [REP4-020]. <b>i. To what extent was small-scale dewatering assessed in the Environmental Statement and does it reflect the worst-case scenario in terms of dewatering?</b>



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. <b>Should a limit on the level of smaller-scale dewatering be secured as part of the DCO to ensure that dewatering, beyond that assessed, does not take place?</b></li> <li>iii. <b>Is the approval/ permitting procedure sufficient to ensure any required dewatering is adequately controlled?</b></li> </ul>
Fg.2.34	Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Dewatering</b></p> <p><b>Are there any residual concerns in respect of potential dewatering and to what extent would the permitting regime deal with these?</b></p>
Fg.2.35	Applicant Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Disapplication of legislation and protective provisions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <b>Please provide an update on discussions in respect of the disapplication of the Land Drainage Act and the related Protective Provisions.</b></li> <li>ii. <b>Please outline any areas of disagreement clarifying why any residual concerns remain.</b></li> </ul>
Fg.2.36	Applicant Environment Agency	<p><b>Disapplication of legislation and protective provisions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <b>Please provide an update on discussions in respect of the disapplication of legislation and the related Protective Provisions?</b></li> <li>ii. <b>Please clarify whether the current proposed wording now satisfies all the relevant comments raised in [RR-2060]?</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Fg.2.37	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Soils management strategy</b></p> <p>In MW-G7 the OEMP states that the main works contractor will consult with Wiltshire Council, the Environment Agency (and others) on those aspects of the various specified plans relevant to their functions [REP4-020].</p> <p>In respect of the Soils Management Strategy it appears to be unclear who would be consulted.</p> <p><b>Please provide clarity on this, for example would this include Wiltshire Council. Should this be more clearly stated in the OEMP?</b></p>
Fg.2.38	Applicant	<p><b>Geology and soils</b></p> <p><b>Please provide a response to the comments raised by Dr Reeves on behalf of the Stonehenge Alliance in [REP4-087] and, as necessary, please cross refer to [REP2-131] to ensure all areas of concern have been responded to.</b></p>
Fg.2.39	The Stonehenge Alliance	<p><b>Geology and soils</b></p> <p>At ISH4, and within the DL4 submission documents, the Applicant set out the methodologies for tunnelling including grout application and surface and vibration monitoring. Measures are provided in the OEMP to secure the monitoring and mitigation strategies.</p> <p><b>Please indicate whether you consider that this provides adequate mitigation and if not detail why you consider this to be deficient</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>and what changes/ additions to the monitoring and mitigation you consider to be necessary?</b>
Fg.2.40	Applicant The Stonehenge Alliance	<b>Geology and soils</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <b>Are you aware of any examples where an integrated 3D model (as suggested by Dr Reeves at ISH4 on behalf of the Stonehenge Alliance) has been considered to be necessary at the pre-consent stage?</b></li> <li>ii. <b>If so, please provide details of any examples and set out whether these can be considered reasonably comparable with the Proposed Development?</b></li> </ol>
Fg.2.41	Wiltshire Council	<b>Blick Mead hydrogeology</b> <b>How would general post construction monitoring of water levels alleviate concerns of the potential impact on the Blick Mead site if there is no express requirement to monitor this site explicitly in relation to the impact on archaeological remains?</b>
Fg.2.42	Applicant Environment Agency Historic England	<b>Blick Mead hydrogeology</b> Notwithstanding the Applicant’s position that future monitoring of groundwater at the Blick Mead site is not required, it is suggested that the site could/ would be monitored more generally and more widely (with reference to MW-WAT10). The Groundwater Management Plan is proposed to be prepared in consultation with the Environment Agency only who

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>have no heritage responsibility. In the event that groundwater levels are affected at the Blick Mead site it is unclear how any reporting and subsequent remediation would be adequately secured without any requirement to take account of the heritage assets at the site.</p> <p><b>In this context, how would any general monitoring adequately take account of the effect on archaeological remains?</b></p>
Fg.2.43	<p>Mark Bush on behalf of the Blick Mead Project Team</p> <p>The Council for British Archaeology</p>	<p><b>Blick Mead hydrogeology</b></p> <p>The period of monitoring did not cover a full 12 months; however, it did collect data from the highs and lows of one calendar year.</p> <p><b>With this in mind, what practical implications could the shorter monitoring period have?</b></p>
Fg.2.44	<p>Applicant</p> <p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Historic England</p> <p>Wiltshire Council</p> <p>Mark Bush on behalf of the Blick Mead Project Team</p> <p>The Council for British Archaeology</p>	<p><b>Blick Mead hydrogeology</b></p> <p>The extent of the archaeological remains at the Blick Mead site is unknown.</p> <p><b>To what extent should this influence any monitoring at the site both in terms of establishing the baseline and then ongoing monitoring?</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Fg.2.45	Applicant	<p><b>Blick Mead hydrogeology</b></p> <p><b>Please provide the predicted reduction in groundwater levels down gradient of the tunnel during high ground water level conditions and indicate whether any fall is likely to extend as far as the Blick Mead site and set out whether this would be significant in comparison to the seasonal rise?</b></p>
Fg.2.46	Applicant Environment Agency Historic England Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Blick Mead hydrogeology</b></p> <p>In the Environment Agency’s response to DL4 it was advised that any dewatering in the vicinity of the Blick Mead site has the potential to impact on groundwater levels but that this would be subject to regulation by the Environment Agency [REP4-049]. It appears that an assessment of risk to all receptors would be required prior to the issue of any licence.</p> <p><b>Would any assessment of risk extend to the effect on archaeological remains and is there sufficient expertise in the process to scrutinise any heritage impacts prior to issuing any licence?</b></p>
Fg.2.47	Applicant Environment Agency Historic England Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Blick Mead hydrogeology</b></p> <p>In the Environment Agency’s response to DL4 it was noted that there is potential for the final design to deviate from that assessed to date and, if this were to occur, then further assessment of risk in respect of the</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>magnitude and extend of impacts on groundwater would be required [REP4-049].</p> <p><b>If this were to occur what measures would there be to ensure that any further risk assessment would take account of the potential to impact on the archaeology at the Blick Mead site?</b></p>
Fg.2.48	Applicant Environment Agency Historic England Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Blick Mead hydrogeology</b></p> <p>Please provide a detailed response to the submissions made by Mark Bush on behalf of the the Blick Mead Project Team [REP4-047].</p> <p><b>Please have particular regard to the tiered assessment and whether it would be necessary for this to be advanced ie to tier 4?</b></p>
Fg.2.49	Applicant	<p><b>Blick Mead hydrogeology</b></p> <p>Please provide an assessment/ evidence as to what degree the site is wetted from perched water and what are the implications of this for the effect of the development on the archaeological remains?</p>
Fg.2.50	Applicant	<p><b>Blick Mead hydrogeology</b></p> <p>Figure 5.2 in the Road Drainage Strategy [REP2-009] sets out a catchment comparison for Blick Mead. It shows an existing and preliminary proposed peak flow rate.</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>i. Can you please explain the numbers in this figure and in particular what the second Q number represents and why this rises in the proposed preliminary design?</b></p> <p><b>ii. In addition, please provide a clearer copy of this figure as the text is difficult to read.</b></p>
Fg.2.51	Applicant	<p><b>Hydrology/ ground conditions/ vibration</b></p> <p>At Deadline 4 (DL4) you respond to comments on the issues raised by the Stonehenge Alliance however no response is given regarding concern raised by the Stonehenge Alliance ref 11.3.5 page 11-99 [REP4-036].</p> <p><b>i. Has a response been provided elsewhere to this concern?</b></p> <p><b>If not, what are your views in this respect?</b></p>
<b>HW.2</b>	<b>Health and wellbeing</b>	
HW.2.1	Applicant Historic England ICOMOS Wiltshire Council	<p>Loss of the casual encounter with the Stones as you pass on the A303 is referenced by numerous RRs as an important part of the cultural experience of the area. The WHS Management Plan recognises there has been routes through the landscape for significant periods of time and the location of the road has opened this up to artists, poets, musicians etc which has further developed the cultural significance of the site.</p> <p><b>i. Whilst there will remain views from rights of way would you agree the casual encounter by the commuter will be lost?</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<b>ii. What significance do you consider this has on the OUV for the WHS?</b>
HW.2.2	Applicant Wiltshire Council Historic England	<b>How have the competing desires of the Druids who wish to have any human remains found on the site reinterred and archaeologists desire to study, understand and display those remains been considered and addressed? [REP3-012, REP2-003 (Article 16), APP-296, REP2-032 (HW.1.17)]</b>
<b>LV.2</b>	<b>Landscape and visual</b>	
LV.2.1	Applicant All Interested Parties	<p><b>Integrity of landscape and cultural heritage</b></p> <p>The integral nature of the landscape, astronomy, the skies, and the monuments of Stonehenge is of enormous importance. The Stonehenge landscape has changed and developed spatially, visually, and emotionally into an enormously significant setting of ceremonial and cultural importance over many thousands of years.</p> <p>In the Examination, some have argued that this aspect, of paramount importance, has been underappreciated in the ES and the HIA. Criticisms have been made of the failure to consider emerging evidence which might give rise to new theories on the significance and history of the Stonehenge landscape. Also, criticism has been made of the absence of a precautionary approach, which might prevent the Scheme destroying</p>



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>evidence or disrupting ancient topography and important spatial interrelationships within and beyond the WHS.</p> <p>Please comment, particularly in the light of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>i. HIA, page 23, penultimate paragraph, re: second Attribute (the physical remains in relation to the landscape), 'The Scheme has been developed to avoid known concentrations of archaeological remains...' [APP-195].</b></li><li><b>ii. Josh Pollard and colleagues' 2017 publication, which identified not only the area adjacent to the western approach, but also a substantial area to the north, several kilometres long, with a remarkable density of Beaker associated material. A risk exists of sterilising this evidence with the construction of the western approach and the Longbarrow junction. (Noted in Part 1, paragraph 9 of the 5/6 June ISH written summary of the Consortium of Archaeologists and Blick Mead Project Team [REP4-047]).</b></li><li><b>iii. The discovery of two longbarrows to the south in 2017 adding to the remarkable concentration of Neolithic monuments dating from before the construction of Stonehenge. These appear to form a circular array focussed on the top of a dry valley (Wilsford Coombe?), which the western approach cutting would disturb. (Noted in Part 2, paras 11 and 12 of the same written summary [REP4-047],</b></li></ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>and elsewhere including Dr David Field’s Written Representation [REP2-163]).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iv. <b>A much later array dating from the Early Bronze Age is suggested in Section 4 of Paul Garwood’s paper, Winterbourne Stoke Crossroads, Early Bronze Age funerary complex. He notes the clustering of monuments in large complexes with linear arrangements, within sight of Stonehenge and its wider environs. Whilst their central focus is Stonehenge they relate in a complex spatial and visual relationship to each other.</b></li> <li>v. <b>The failure to make use of viewsheds from particular monuments to gauge the visual connectedness of features within the overall landscape.</b></li> <li>vi. <b>Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (WHC.17/01) notes at paragraph 100 that, for properties nominated under criteria (i) – (vi), boundaries should be drawn to include all those areas and attributes which are a direct tangible expression of the OUV of the property, as well as those areas which in the light of future research possibilities offer potential to contribute to and enhance such understanding.</b></li> <li>vii. <b>HIA paragraph 5.10.4 [APP-195] and Highways England’s response to ExQ1 CH.1.58 [REP2-025] note that, in the forthcoming WHS boundary review, mooted changes include</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>extension of the existing boundary to the north and west. This suggests extreme caution should be exercised with regard to the Longbarrow junction works. The junction, with its motorway scale partially sunk into the landscape, has the potential to fundamentally alter the ancient topography integral to the above points, interfere with the connected monument arrays, and disturb archaeological remains.</b></p>
LV.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>The effect on landscape character of the proposed Longbarrow junction</b></p> <p>ES Appendix 7.7: Schedule of Landscape Effects [APP-227], LLCA 11 Oatlands Hill (page 15) notes the Year 1 Effect of the Scheme as moderate adverse and the Year 15 Effect as slight adverse. The analysis seems to confine itself to the impact on the character of surface cultivation. This appears to ignore the vast changes to the ancient topography and landscape character made by the insertion of a motorway junction and approach cutting. These elements would be of a scale beyond that of the Stones or any of the surrounding monuments, and of a geometric pattern alien to the character of the overall landscape of the WHS and its environs.</p> <p><b>Please comment.</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
LV.2.3	Applicant All Interested Parties	<p><b>Visual receptors associated with the route of the existing A303 and Green Bridge 4</b></p> <p><b>i. Have analyses been made of the visual effects of the cutting from points on the ex A303, especially those close to the western portal where the cutting is at its widest and deepest and the ex A303 closest?</b></p> <p>By my rough calculation, at Chainage 7200, the cutting is 35m wide and 11m deep, with a width of 60m across the embankment tops. At that point, the ex A303 is only 20m from the permanent fence line and the edge of the embankment, and only 35m from the edge of the cutting.</p> <p><b>ii. Have analyses been made of the visual effects of the embankments and cutting from Green Bridge 4?</b></p>
LV.2.4	Applicant All Interested Parties	<p><b>Tranquillity</b></p> <p>The OED defines tranquillity as serenity, calmness; Chambers Dictionary as calmness, peacefulness; the GLVIA glossary as a state of calm and quietude associated with peace.</p> <p>Tranquillity is considered within ES Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual [APP-045], where the IAN 135/10 definition of tranquillity is adopted, as remoteness and sense of isolation [...] often determined by the presence or absence of built development and traffic. The analysis then relates largely to the perception of noise, although it touches on the perception of vehicles and settlements, and the panoramic extent of views. Figure</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>7.5 illustrates existing tranquillity across the study area as mapped by the CPRE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. How is the CPRE analysis derived? Is it based on noise measurement or on other factors?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Have attempts been made to map projected tranquillity with the Scheme in place?</b></li> <li><b>iii. Have attempts been made to analyse tranquillity in terms of serenity, calmness, and peace rather than the impact of noise, qualities which might be affected by the proximity to major road cuttings or junctions, whether or not accompanied by noise?</b></li> <li><b>iv. Has the connection between tranquillity and the feeling of completeness of the landscape and the interconnectedness of its features been considered?</b></li> <li><b>v. Has the connection between tranquillity and the presence of astronomical features and light pollution in night skies, particularly important on this site, been considered?</b></li> </ul> <p>These points apply in relation to both the construction and operational phases of the Scheme.</p>
LV.2.5	Applicant	<b>The night sky</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>Please set out the assumptions, the modelling, and the calculations made to support the conclusions in ES Chapter 7, paras 7.9.124 to 7.9.132 [APP-045].</b></p> <p>Pay particular attention to the effects of night sky glow over the Longbarrow junction and western approach cutting; over the Countess flyover; spillage from the western and eastern portals; and the effects of car headlights directed into the night sky from vehicles climbing out the portals and over the flyover.</p>
LV.2.6	Applicant Wiltshire Council Historic England	<p><b>Landscaping scheme</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Why, in Requirement 8 of the DL4 dDCO, is the submission and approval of the overall landscape scheme limited to Work No 4 and the WHS [REP4-018]?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Are WILTSHIRE COUNCIL and Historic England content that only consultation, rather than agreement, should be in place prior to submission to the SoS for approval?</b></li> </ul>
<b>Ns.2</b>	<b>Noise and vibration</b>	
Ns.2.1	Applicant The Stonehenge Alliance Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Tranquillity</b></p> <p>The issue of tranquillity appears to remain in dispute in that the visitors to the WHS and particularly the Stones would appear to influence the degree of tranquillity at the Stones and in the vicinity of the Stones. As a consequence, the degree of effect from the current road is arguably</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>reduced and the degree of benefit from its removal in respect of tranquillity in the area of the Stones may be regarded as less significant.</p> <p><b>Do you consider that tranquillity will be achieved at the Stones as a consequence of the scheme?</b></p>
Ns.2.2	Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Tranquillity</b></p> <p>The NPPF at paragraph 180 states:</p> <p>“Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:</p> <p>a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum, potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life;</p> <p>b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason....”</p> <p><b>i. In light of the above does Wiltshire Council consider any areas within the confines of the DCO application as tranquil such that they would be classed as such in any Local Plan document?</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. <b>What is the Wiltshire Council’s view of tranquillity in respect of the current WHS?</b></li> <li>iii. <b>What is Wiltshire Council’s view of tranquillity in respect of the current River Till Valley?</b></li> <li>iv. <b>What is Wiltshire Council’s view of any impact on tranquillity in respect of the Proposed Development?</b></li> </ul>
Ns.2.3	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>REAC Table - PW NOI 1 b) – “<i>the preliminary works contractor may</i>” offer [REP4-020].</p> <p><b>What happens in the event the contractor chooses not to offer?</b></p> <p>This wording needs to be re-examined to ensure safeguards offered are provided if required.</p>
Ns.2.4	Applicant Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Piling</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <b>Has the terminology for non-impact piling now been agreed?</b></li> <li>ii. <b>Has this been consistently set out through the documentation to ensure consistency at the River Till, Countess roundabout or other areas within the site where piling may occur?</b></li> </ul>
Ns.2.5	Applicant	<p><b>Noise</b></p>



<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Wiltshire Council	<p>Paragraph 5.195 of the NPSNN sets out three tests for assessing National Infrastructure Projects. The third bullet states:</p> <p>“contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effective management and control of noise, where possible.”</p> <p>To date no barrier is proposed on the northern side of the viaduct crossing the River Till and the specification for the southern barrier is not currently set out.</p> <p><b>Please advise how you consider this meets this requirement of the NPSNN and achieve where possible effective management and control of noise.</b></p>
Ns.2.6	Applicant	<p><b>Vibration effects on archaeology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Is it reasonable to say that the vibration analysis has been carried out to assess impacts upon human health and buildings, but not been specifically designed to assess impacts on archaeology bar the analysis of potential impacts on the Stonehenge monument itself?</b></li> <li><b>ii. Can you point out where the specific archaeological analysis in respect of vibration is within the ES?</b></li> </ul>
Ns.2.7	Historic England Applicant	<p><b>Vibration effects on archaeology</b></p> <p>In light of the comments made by the different parties to date can you advise on the latest position in respect of:</p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Wiltshire Council The Council for British Archaeology ICOMOS Blick Mead Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. An agreed methodology for measuring vibration and what standards could be used to safeguard archaeological remains.</b></li> <li><b>ii. The level at which significant effects might occur.</b></li> <li><b>iii. How any vibration will be monitored to protect archaeology.</b></li> <li><b>iv. Mechanism/ mitigation to avoid potential adverse effects including any agreed positions of monitoring locations.</b></li> </ul>
Ns.2.8	Historic England Applicant Wiltshire Council The Council for British Archaeology ICOMOS Blick Mead Project Team	<p><b>Settlement effects on archaeology</b></p> <p>In light of the comments made by the different parties to date can you advise on the latest position in respect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. An agreed methodology for measuring settlement, and what standards could be used to safeguard archaeological remains.</b></li> <li><b>ii. The level at which significant effects might occur.</b></li> <li><b>iii. How the settlement will be monitored to protect archaeology.</b></li> <li><b>iv. Mechanism/ mitigation to avoid potential adverse effects including any agreed positions of monitoring locations.</b></li> </ul>
Ns.2.9	Druid Orders	<b>Noise</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Rollo Maughfling Arthur Pendragon Lois Lloyd The Stonehenge Alliance	<p>During the hearings concern was expressed that the noise effects from A360 and new Longbarrow junction would result in additional noise impacts on nearby archaeology/ monuments/ places of cultural/spiritual significance. The sound profiles that have been provided (Fig 9.4 and 2026 Do Something Noise Levels) show a limited field of increased noise extending from the western portals and in the area of the new Longbarrow junction.</p> <p><b>Do you consider this shows an improvement over the current situation and will improve the tranquillity of the WHS, thus improving the opportunity for quiet contemplation/ enjoyment of the landscape?</b></p>
<b>Tr.2</b>	<b>Traffic and transport</b>	
Tr.2.1	Applicant	<p>The Stonehenge Alliance is concerned that the 'most likely scenario' may overestimate future traffic flows, with implications for the calculation of costs and benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please explain why the modelling has not considered a wider range of growth scenarios, including low growth.</b></li> <li><b>ii. How sensitive are the assessment's conclusions to the Stonehenge Alliance's concerns about future traffic growth and congestion on the M3, outside the study area?</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Tr.2.2	Applicant	<p>i. <b>Does the use of the “fastest day” as the basis for assessing congestion on all other days over-emphasise the alleged benefits of the scheme in terms of time saving, as suggested by the Stonehenge Alliance?</b></p> <p>ii. <b>Would it be more realistic to base the busy day assessment on a more typical non-peak day, rather than assuming free flow conditions (represented by speeds of 95 kph)?</b></p>
Tr.2.3	Applicant	<p>The Stonehenge Alliance’s position is that without the inclusion of the ‘contingent valuation’ of removing the A303 from WHS (which they say is inherently flawed) the BCR for the scheme is “<i>an appallingly low 0.31</i>”. The Applicant’s position is that the economic case for the scheme is a matter for the Government and the Road Investment Strategy and the ExA should focus on evaluation of the planning merits.</p> <p><b>How is this compatible with the advice in paragraph 4.5 of the NPSNN which states that “The [economic case prepared for a transport business case] will be important for the examining authority and the Secretary of State’s consideration of the adverse impacts and benefits of the Proposed Development”?</b></p>
WM.2	<b>Waste and materials management</b>	
WM.2.1	Applicant	<b>Site Waste Management Plan and Materials Management Plan</b>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	Environment Agency Wiltshire Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <b>Should the Site Waste Management Plan and the Materials Management Plan be prepared in consultation with either Wiltshire Council and/ or the Environment Agency? Please provide reasons for your answer.</b></li> <li>ii. <b>Both these plans are listed in MW-G7 where there is a general requirement to consult with the relevant bodies in respect of the areas relevant to their functions. However, if required, should this consultation be explicitly set out (for example in MW_MAT1 and MW_MAT2 of the OEMP [REP4-020]) to provide clarity?</b></li> </ul>
WM.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Tunnel arisings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <b>To what extent would the deposition of tunnel arisings form part of Work No.1A being an integral part of the construction of the new A303.</b></li> <li>ii. <b>Should this be specified in Work No.1A rather than solely being specified in Work No. 8?</b></li> </ul>
WM.2.3	Applicant	<p><b>Tunnel arisings</b></p> <p><b>Please provide an additional sheet for the Work Plans combining sheet 3 and sheet 12.</b></p>
WM.2.4	Applicant	<p><b>Tunnel arisings</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>400,000 square metres of the tunnel arisings will be utilised to allow blending into the surrounding landscape, providing essential landscape mitigation for the embankments at the Winterbourne Stoke bypass. Table 10.12 states that no import of soil is required.</p> <p><b>What would be the origin of any topsoil required to provide the landscaped areas around the embankments?</b></p>
WM.2.5	Applicant	<p><b>Tunnel arisings and structural embankments</b></p> <p>It is intended that the structural embankments would not be constructed from the tunnel arisings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please clarify how the structural embankments will be constructed.</b></li> <li><b>ii. Should this be specified in the dDCO?</b></li> </ul>
WM.2.6	Applicant	<p><b>Tunnel arisings</b></p> <p>It is intended that off-site disposal of tunnel arisings would only occur in exceptional circumstances. At ISH4 it was stated that such disposal was only likely to relate to modest quantities of materials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Please clarify what exceptional circumstances would be likely to lead to off-site disposal.</b></li> </ul>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>ii. What measures would ensure that such off-site disposal is minimal, and should a maximum volume of material be specified?</b></p>
WM.2.7	Applicant	<p><b>Tunnel arisings</b></p> <p>The tunnel arisings are required for essential landscaping and biodiversity improvements and large-scale off-site removal could result in significant effects.</p> <p><b>Please provide clarity that there are no circumstances in which large scale off-site removal would be required, and explain what measures are contained within the dDCO and/ or OEMP to ensure large scale off-site removal of the tunnel arisings could not take place?</b></p>
WM.2.8	Applicant Wiltshire Council	<p><b>Tunnel arisings</b></p> <p>Given the quantity of materials and vehicle movements, please could the Applicant provide an outline methodology for the placement of the excavated materials at land east of Parsonage Down NNR (including that to be used for landscaping around the structural embankments).</p> <p><b>Should a detailed methodology be secured, and should this require consultation with/ the agreement of the Council?</b></p>
WM.2.9	Applicant	<p><b>Tunnel arisings (off-site disposal)</b></p>

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>Only a high-level analysis of noise receptors along the routes which would be utilised for the off-site disposal of tunnel arisings has been undertaken.</p> <p><b>Please provide further information on how the assessments were undertaken.</b></p>
WM.2.10	Applicant	<p><b>Deposition of excavated materials</b></p> <p>The deposition of excavated materials, other than on land east of Parsonage Down NNR, forms part of the ancillary works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. Would/ could this include tunnel arisings and what is the likely extent of this deposition.</b></li> <li><b>ii. How has the impact of this been assessed and what measures would be in place to control the associated impacts?</b></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 Archaeology 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