

Planning Act 2008 – section 91

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

Agenda for Issue Specific Hearing 8 dealing with matters relating to cultural heritage, landscape and visual effects and design

The Examining Authority (ExA) notified Interested Parties (IPs) in its letter dated 26 July 2019 of the decision to hold an Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) into the above matters on the following date:

Hearing	Date and time	Location
Issue Specific Hearing 8 Cultural heritage, landscape and visual effects and design	21 August 2019 10.00am (seating available from 9.30am)	City Hall, Malthouse Lane, Salisbury, SP2 7TU

Participation, conduct and management of hearing

Oral submissions on other subject matters or from persons who are not IPs may only be heard at the discretion of the ExA.

The following IPs are invited, in particular, to attend and participate in this hearing:

- The Applicant;
- Historic England;
- English Heritage;
- The National Trust;
- Wiltshire Council;
- The Environment Agency;
- The Stonehenge and Avebury WHS Coordination Unit;
- ICOMOS-UK;
- The Stonehenge Alliance;
- Blick Mead Project Team;
- The Council for British Archaeology;
- Amesbury Abbey Group;
- Christopher Chippindale; and
- The Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport.

The named persons have been invited for the following reasons:

- As public bodies with policy and regulatory responsibilities associated with the subject matter;
- as national and local authorities for the affected area; or
- as parties with another special interest.

Participation in the hearing is subject to the ExA's power to control the hearing. IPs may be invited to make oral representations at the hearing (subject to the ExA's power to control the hearing). Oral representations should be based on the Relevant Representations or Written Representations made by the person by whom (or on whose behalf) the oral representations are made.

However, representations made at the hearing should not simply repeat matters previously covered in a written submission. Rather, they should draw attention to those submissions in summary form and provide further detail, explanation and evidential corroboration to help inform the ExA.

The ExA may ask questions about representations or ask the Applicant or other party to comment or respond. The ExA will probe, test and assess the evidence through direct questioning of persons making oral representations. Questioning at the hearing will therefore be led by a member of the Panel, supported by other Panel members.

This agenda is for guidance only. It is not designed to be exclusive or exhaustive. The ExA may add other issues for consideration, may alter the order in which issues are considered and will seek to allocate sufficient time to each issue to allow proper consideration of them.

Any lack of discussion of a particular issue at a hearing does not preclude further examination of that issue.

Should the consideration of the issues take less time than anticipated, the ExA may conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions asked and responded to. Some of the issues identified in the agenda are by their nature overlapping. It may be the case therefore that certain questions later on in the agenda are answered by earlier questions. If this is the case the ExA will acknowledge this at the time.

If there are additional matters to be dealt with or there are submissions that take a considerable amount of time, there may be a need to continue the session for longer on the day or continue the hearing at a subsequent sitting. Breaks will be taken during the hearing as directed by the ExA.

All parties should note that the agenda given below is to provide a framework for this hearing and offer discussion points; it does not constrain the ExA to specific topics. The ExA may wish to raise other matters arising from submissions and pursue lines of inquiry in the course of the discussions which are not included in this agenda.

References in square brackets [] are to the unique document identification number in the Examination Library. This document is found on the National Infrastructure Planning website at:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR010025/TR010025-000484-Stonehenge%20-%20Examination%20Library%20Template.pdf>



AGENDA

1. OPENING REMARKS BY THE EXAMINING AUTHORITY

2. INTRODUCTIONS

3. THE WORLD HERITAGE SITE

3.1 Harm to the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV)

- i. Harm to the OUV and its place in the overall acceptability of the Proposed Development. Discussion.

3.2 World Heritage Committee adopted decision and report, July 2019

- i. The report's criticism of the focus of the Proposed Development's analysis on measuring and aggregating its impact on individual components, and of its justification based on assessing whether the proposal is an improvement, rather than the best available outcome for the property.
- ii. The report notes that a longer tunnel is technically feasible but is not proceeding because of cost, etc. However, a detailed analysis of the benefits compared with the costs of a longer tunnel is absent from the application.

3.3 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA)

- i. The HIA's approach to the effects of the Proposed Development on the OUV given that four of the seven attributes which together express the OUV of the site concern spatial relationships.
- ii. Integrity and authenticity.
- iii. Harm to the OUV from effects outside the boundaries of the World Heritage Site.

4. Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) (DL6 version [[REP6-011](#) and [REP6-012](#)])

4.1 Approvals/ agreements/ consultation

- i. MW-G7 and MW-CH1 note the Heritage Management Plan is to be approved by Wiltshire Council, as are the Heritage Method Statements (amend MW-G8) and Site Specific Written Schemes of Investigation (SSWSI). However, approval of the type of fencing (MW-CH3); surfacing (MW-CH14); monitoring of heritage assets arrangements (MW-CH7); the Ground Movement Monitoring Strategy (MW-CH8); the vibration control measures (PW-NO14 and MW-NO13); the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) (MW-LAN1) and the Arboricultural Mitigation Strategy (MW-LAN3) remains the responsibility of Highways England. Discussion.



The Planning Inspectorate

- ii. Discussion on approval of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (MW-G5) and Handover Environmental Management Plan (HEMP) (MW-G11), including the Cultural Heritage Asset Management Plans (Cultural Heritage Asset Management Plans (CHAMPS) – Draft Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (DAMS), para 5.1.21).

4.2 Roles and Responsibilities

- i. The Ecological Clerk of Works (CoW) is in the Contractor's team. However, the Archaeological CoW is in Highways England's team. Why the difference?

4.3 Miscellaneous

- i. *Construction compounds* (MW-G28): Location and design. Function, size and appearance of the concrete batching plants, and their relationship to the Site Travel Plan.
- ii. Approval of colours of buildings and hoarding.
- iii. *Site lighting* (MW-G30): Why no management plan under MW-G7? Approval? Environmental Statement Chapter 7, section 7.8, Table 7.4 is silent on site lighting.
- iv. *Ground Movement Monitoring Strategy* (MW-CH8, cf: DAMS, para 5.2.7). Has an agreed specification been established for acceptable levels of vibration and settlement? How should monitoring and remediation, during and post construction, be secured?
 - a) *Through the OEMP?*
 - i. Through the Noise and Vibration Management Plan, Ground Movement Monitoring Strategy, or Heritage Management Plan (HMP)? How would the documents correlate and who would be responsible for particular aspects?
 - ii. Wording regarding vibration/ settlement level and quality monitoring, reporting programme, trigger levels, action plans for mitigation/ remediation.
 - iii. Appropriate reporting criteria: Should Wiltshire Council or Historic England's role be expanded beyond approval of SSWSIs, Method Statements and the HMP, and consultation on Noise and Vibration/ Ground Movement Monitoring?
 - b) *Through an additional Requirement?*
 - i. Appropriate wording, including consultation and approval bodies.
 - ii. Approval of the details before tunnelling works commence.

4.4 Design

- i. *Cutting profile* (D-CH5): Notes that the grassed slopes either side of the cutting are to be approx. 2.5m wide, and approx. 1 in 2



The Planning Inspectorate

gradient. They will therefore be approx. 1.25m high. They appear of much greater width, some 6 to 10m, in the Environmental Masterplan Figs 2.5P-S (drawings scale?), and the Structures Drawings (Sheet 7/13).

- ii. *Highway boundary fencing* (D-CH25): Is to be no higher than ground level at the top of the cutting. Is this to be taken as 1.25m?
- iii. *Design vision* (Section 4.2): Discussion.
- iv. *Design principles* (Section 4.3): Discussion.
- v. Para 4.3.2 – *Illustrated Examples of Key Design Elements*, Annex A4: Discussion.
- vi. *Design consultation* (Section 4.5): Discussion.
- vii. Para 4.5.14 – *Final Decision on Detailed Design*: Why not the traditional arrangement, whereby highways and planning requirements each have to be separately met and then approved by the competent statutory authority?
- viii. *Selection of MW Contractor*: How do design capabilities feature in the selection criteria? Past track record? Proposed engagement of design consultants? Candidates' submissions might include an illustrated account of how they intend to meet the design principles?

5. DAMS (DL7 version [[REP7-019](#) and [REP7-020](#)])

5.1 Part 1 – DAMS

- i. Para 1.1.4 – *Status of document*. Discussion regarding agreement on, or approval of, the final version of the DAMS.
- ii. Section 4 – *Archaeological Research Agenda*. Discussion.
- iii. Para 5.1.18 – *Unexpected discoveries during the construction process*. Do these procedures also apply to the Preliminary Works?
- iv. Para 5.2.10 – *Tunnel Protection Zones*. Discussion
- v. Para 5.2.18 – *Soils handling strategy*. Discussion
- vi. Para 5.2.35 – *Earthworks haul roads*. In addition to the all-weather haul roads indicated in Fig 2.7. How is archaeology to be protected?

5.2 Part 2 – Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI)

- i. Para 6.1.13- *Archaeological Project Team*. Are the posts occupied by separate individuals, or may one person cover several posts?
- ii. Para 6.1.21 – *Interruptions and Delays*. Agreement should take place between the parties on cessation or resumption.

5.3 Preservation in situ - Section 6.2



The Planning Inspectorate

- i. Paras 6.2.4 to 6.2.6 - *Preservation Beneath Fill*. The method statement should take account of the different kinds of possible overload - heavy, dynamic load as well as static load (cf paras 5.3.16 to 5.3.19 – *Protection beneath fill material and construction working areas*).

5.4 Preservation by record – sections 6.3 to 6.5

(Including a 10-minute presentation by Professor Parker Pearson)

- i. **Archaeological excavation and recording**
 - Agreement required on a baseline percentage for plough zone and other sampling.
 - Para 6.3.15 – How would the mechanism of a reflexive approach operate? How are trigger points and proportions determined?
 - Para 6.3.22 – Should decisions regarding cleaning by hand be made by the Contractor or by others?
 - Para 6.3.44 to 6.3.48 – Changes to the sampling strategy would mean a revised SSWSI, subject to Wiltshire Council's approval.
 - Para 6.3.50 – Agreement required on the proportion of tree hollows excavated.
 - Para 6.3.77 – Treatment of human remains. Discussion.
- ii. **Strip, Map and Record**
 - Para 6.4.4 – Agreement required on a baseline percentage for the proportion of features excavated.
- iii. **Archaeological Monitoring and Recording**
 - Para 6.5.10 - Agreement required on a baseline for the quantum of excavation.

5.5 Communications, etc

- i. Para 8.5.1 – *Consultation on SSWSIs, etc* and para 8.6.1 – *Approval of Documents by Wiltshire Council*. Are these arrangements acceptable, including the time periods allowed?
- ii. Para 8.6.5 – *Appeals*. Should such procedures also apply to disagreement with a decision of Highways England?

5.6 Reporting, etc

- i. Comments on the content of sections 9 and 10.

5.7 Part 3 – Tables, figures and references

- ii. Table 11-3: *Summary of proposed mitigation areas and actions*. Are the parties satisfied with these proposals, including treatment of stockpile areas? Should other areas be covered?



The Planning Inspectorate

- iii. Table 11-4: *Areas excluded from archaeological mitigation*. Are the parties satisfied with the list, including the exclusion of proposed working areas?

5.8 Part 4 – Appendices

i. Appendix A: Flowcharts

- A1 – Should the HEMP be the product of three bottom section elements, rather than just the Main Works, HMP and Method Statement?
- A4, A7, and A9 – Should the headings indicate approvals by statutory bodies as in A3, A5, A6, and A8?

ii. Appendix D: Action Areas

Comments and discussion.

iii. Appendix E: Public Archaeology and Community Engagement

Comments and discussion.

6. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL

6.1 Landscape character

- i. The introduction of significant engineering elements into the landscape.
- ii. The lighting scheme – Has technical modelling taken place? Requirement for a lighting strategy and responsibility for approval of a final highway lighting scheme.
- iii. The night sky – technical modelling and testing?

6.2 Visual

- i. Reprise on visualisations produced and outstanding requests including digital modelling of the site.
- ii. Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Fig 7.107, *View North from Blick Mead*. At what point relative to Blick Mead would the flyover start its ascent?
- iii. Visualisations from the ex-A303 as a by-way under the Proposed Development.
- iv. Reprise on the visual effects of adjustments within Limits of Deviation (LoD).

7. DESIGN

Any matters not covered under 4.4 above

8. BLICK MEAD HYDROLOGY

If monitoring (and any associated remediation) is required for groundwater levels at Blick Mead during construction, and post construction, how should this be secured?



The Planning Inspectorate

a) *Through the OEMP?*

- i. Would an additional sub-category to the Groundwater Management Plan, secured through MW-WAT10, adequately deal with this?
- ii. What wording should be used? eg Groundwater level and quality monitoring, reporting programme, trigger levels and action levels/ mitigation/ action plans for exceedances for Blick Mead.
- iii. What reporting criteria would be appropriate given the non-designated status of the asset? ie should Wiltshire Council's role be expanded beyond their function as lead local flood authority to include heritage considerations?

b) *Through an additional Requirement?*

- i. What wording would be appropriate, including the consultation and approval bodies?
- ii. Could this be phased to avoid a prohibition on any development commencing on all parts of the Proposed Development, before the details are approved?

9. ANY OTHER MATTERS

10. CLOSE OF HEARING