

From: [Steve Chamberlain](#)
To: [A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross](#)
Cc: [Hodder, Josh](#); [Michael Baker](#); [Walmsley, Tim](#); [REDACTED]; ["Christopher Anderson"](#)
Subject: RE: Written Representation
Date: 19 March 2019 13:55:56
Attachments: [20190228 SoCG Nancarrow FOR ISSUE v2 - Nancarrow changes.DOCX](#)

Hi Sian

Please find attached the 1st draft of the SOCG between Nancarrow and Highways England.

Amends made by Nancarrow are either highlighted in italics, or in an additional column where possible. We hope it make sense.

Please don't hesitate to contact me with any queries.

Best wishes

Steve

A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross

Statement of Common Ground with Nancarrow Farm

DRAFT 1 – FOR REVIEW

[Draft 2 – 19.03.19 – Nancarrow comments](#)

Document Control

Document Title	Statement of Common Ground with Nancarrow Farm		
Document Reference	Click here to enter text.		
PCF Stage		PCF Product	N
Document Status			

Prepared for:
Highways England

Prepared by:
Arup

Revision History

Revision	Date	Author	Notes
---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---

Arup Approvals

Revision	Role	Name	Date
Click here to enter text.			

Highways England Reviewers

Revision	Title	Name	Date
--			

Highways England Approval

Revision	Title	Name	Date
--	--	--	---

Table of contents

	Pages
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of this document	1
1.2 Structure of this SoCG	1
1.3 Status of this SoCG	1
2 Consultation	2
2.1 Role of Nancarrow Farm	2
2.2 Summary of consultation	3
3 Topics covered in this SoCG	7
4 Matters agreed	8
5 Matters outstanding	14
5.1 Principal matters outstanding	14
5.2 Specific matters outstanding	14
Appendix A Signing Sheet	40

Tables

Table 2-1 Pre-Application Consultation	3
--	---

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This document is a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between Highways England and Nancarrow Farm in relation to the A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross scheme. It has been prepared in accordance with DCLG (now Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) Guidance on the pre-application process¹.
- 1.1.2 The document identifies the following between the two parties:
- Matters which have been agreed
 - Matters currently outstanding (subject to negotiation or not agreed)
- 1.1.3 The SoCG will continue to evolve as the application for development consent progresses through the Examination process.

1.2 Structure of this SoCG

- 1.2.1 The SoCG is structured as follows:
- Section 2 states the role of Nancarrow Farm in the application and sets out the consultation undertaken since the Preferred Route Announcement in July 2017.
 - Section 3 presents the topics covered in this SoCG.
 - Section 4 lists those matters which have been agreed, including the date that this matter was agreed.
 - Section 5 is a table of matters outstanding, incorporating a description of the matter, the position of Nancarrow Farm, the position of Highways England and any actions taken to address the matter, and the date of the latest position including any further meetings planned regarding the matter.
 - Appendix A includes the signing sheet.

1.3 Status of this SoCG

- 1.3.1 A draft of this document was issued to Nancarrow Farm on 6 March 2019.
- 1.3.2 This SoCG is provided 'in draft' by Highways England.
- 1.3.3 Both parties will continue to review the matters that are still subject to negotiation and clarification.

¹ Department for Communities and Local Government. Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent. (2015)

2 Consultation

2.1 Nancarrow Farm

2.1.1 Nancarrow Farm refers to:

- an organic farm business; and
- *An Events business, offering food and farming experiences including Corporate events, Feast nights/dinners, Festivals and Weddings.*

Whilst the 2 businesses operate as separate entities, they are both interdependent, and marketed as one. Visitors visit 'the farm' and it is an intrinsic part of the experience.

2.1.2 It is situated adjacent to the existing A30. *Whilst the majority of land proposed to be acquired is from Nancarrow Farm organic farm business and whilst no land is proposed to be acquired from the licenced wedding venue, areas used by guests and staff ARE being acquired. (these include areas used for Animal Petting, Corporate team building activity and Staff parking)* Effects from the construction of the scheme on Nancarrow Farm wedding venue have been identified in the **Environmental Statement** (Document Reference 6.2).

2.1.3 This SoCG is shared with Mr Steve Chamberlain and Mrs Lucy Chamberlain (son-in-law and daughter of Mr Mewton), who have made representations as noted in Table 2-1 below. *Mr and Mrs Chamberlain are both partners in the organic farm business, land (to be acquired) owners, and the proprietors of the Nancarrow Farm events business. They represent the ninth generation of Lucy's family to farm at Nancarrow.*

2.1.4 Mr Peter Mewton is the owner of the land to be acquired from the Nancarrow organic farm business (alongside other parties in the same family).

Status in relation to the application

2.1.5 The land which constitutes Nancarrow Farm is under multiple ownership and tenancy. As per the submitted **Book of Reference** (Document Reference 4.3), plots of land comprising the farm have been identified to have the following status:

- Category 1 under section 57 of the Planning Act 2008
- Category 2 under section 57 of the Planning Act 2008
- Category 3 under section 57 of the Planning Act 2008

PLEASE CLARIFY WHAT THIS MEANS?

2.1.6 The owners and tenants of Nancarrow Farm have a status as Persons with an Interest in the Land (PILs) under section 44 of the Planning Act 2008.

PLEASE CLARIFY WHAT THIS MEANS?

2.1.7 The owners, lessees, tenants or occupiers of Nancarrow Farm were consulted during the statutory consultation on the scheme between January and March 2018. The owners, lessees, tenants or occupiers of Nancarrow Farm were notified that an application for a Development Consent Order had been made under section 56 of the Planning Act 2008 on 4 October 2018.

2.2 Summary of consultation

2.2.1 Highways England has been in pre-application discussions with Nancarrow Farm since October 2016. The parties have continued communicating throughout the progression of the project.

2.2.2 A summary of the discussions are captured within **Table 2-1**, comprised of meetings, emails, letters and formal consultation under the DCO application.

Table 2-1 Pre-Application Consultation

Date	Method	Topic	Consultation Details
31/07/2017	Meeting with Highways England at Sarah Newton MP surgery	Preferred route selection	Nancarrow Farm set out their opposition to the preferred route and option selection process around Marazanvose, including concerns raised about the assessments underpinning the Scheme Assessment Report.
21/08/2017	Letter from Highways England to Nancarrow Farm	Preferred route selection	The letter responds to the concerns that Nancarrow Farm had raised about the preferred route announcement and the scheme assessment process in the meeting at Sarah Newton MP's surgery on 31 July 2017. It responds to the concerns individually and then sets out the next stages of consultation that will be undertaken, inviting Nancarrow Farm to participate in consultation while also inviting them to continue discussions with Highways England on the scheme regarding mitigation elements of the scheme design.
13/09/2017	Meeting with Highways England	Preferred route selection and scheme design	The meeting was held to discuss the following aspects of the scheme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height of vertical alignment in the vicinity of the farm • Noise effects from height of road next to farm • Access across the new and existing A30 to northern fields from the farm, access to farmyard • Proximity of attenuation pond to wedding venue • Opposition to the preferred route and option selection process around Marazanvose including criticism of the assessments underpinning the Scheme Assessment Report
28/09/2017	Letter from Nancarrow Farm to Highways England	Response to letter dated 21/08/2017 re: route selection process	The letter provides a response from the legal representatives of Nancarrow Farm regarding the points made by Highways England in their letter to Nancarrow Farm dated 21/08/2017. It refutes the content of the responses that Highways England made to Nancarrow Farm's concerns on the route selection process and the content of the Scheme Assessment Report.
29/11/2017	Meeting with Highways England	Preferred route selection and scheme design	The meeting was held to discuss the following aspects of the scheme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height of vertical alignment in the vicinity of the farm • Noise effects from height of road next to farm • Access across the new and existing A30 to northern fields from the farm, access to farmyard • Proximity of attenuation pond to wedding venue • Opposition to the preferred route and option selection process around Marazanvose including

Date	Method	Topic	Consultation Details
			criticism of the assessments underpinning the Scheme Assessment Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction effects and impacts on wedding business
20/12/2017	Email from Nancarrow Farm to Highways England	Vertical alignment of the preferred route at Marazanvose, scheme assessment process, noise	Following the meeting on 29/11/2017, Nancarrow Farm set out their concerns over the design of the preferred route, specifically the vertical alignment at Marazanvose and the height increase of 5 metres in a cutting from 2 metres in a cutting. They state that this would undermine aspects of the scheme assessment process and conclusions which resulted in the route selection. The email also raises concerns relating to noise mitigation (lack of plans to use noise mitigation panels) and the noise survey and modelling methodology.
09/01/2018	Highways England to Nancarrow Farm	Response to letter dated 28/09/2017 re: route selection process	The letter sets out a response to the concerns raised by Nancarrow Farm on the route selection process and content of the Scheme Assessment Report. It reiterates that Option 7A is considered to be the best performing route through comparative assessment. It sets out that there is very limited scope to change the preferred route and invites Nancarrow Farm to participate in the next stages of consultation.
29/01/2018	Letter from Highways England to Nancarrow Farm	Notification of statutory consultation	As part of their statutory consultation duties, Highways England notified Nancarrow Farm via letter of the statutory consultation and invited them to meet with the project team. Relevant land plots and scheme drawings were provided with the letter.
14/02/2018	Meeting with Highways England	Preferred route selection, scheme design, mitigation, noise assessment	The meeting was held to discuss the following aspects of the scheme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposition to the preferred route and option selection process around Marazanvose including criticism of the assessments underpinning the Scheme Assessment Report Position of laybys at Marazanvose Provision of noise and landscape mitigation through false cutting and noise screening Critique of noise assessments and potential impact on wedding business Access across the new and existing A30 to northern fields from the farm, access to farmyard, access for walkers, cyclists and horse riders using the existing bridleway
07/03/2018	Email from Highways England to Nancarrow Farm	Noise assessment maps	Highways England sent Nancarrow Farm noise maps that had been requested by them at the previous meeting.
07/03/2018	Email from Nancarrow Farm to Highways England	Re: Noise assessment maps	Acknowledgement of receipt of the noise maps, and an additional request for the raw data of the noise model and for an additional map which is based on the preferred route vertical alignment with base level noise barriers.

Date	Method	Topic	Consultation Details
12/03/2018	Formal response to statutory consultation (online submission and email)	Summary of overall objection to scheme and route selection process	Nancarrow Farm submitted their formal response to the statutory pre-application consultation held between 29 January and 12 March 2018. The submission was made online in the form of answering the consultation questionnaire and via email with a written response. It set out the full nature of Nancarrow Farm's objection to the scheme including route selection, scheme design, mitigation, noise assessment and construction impacts.
29/05/2018	Letter from Highways England to Nancarrow Farm	Notification of targeted consultation	Highways England notified Nancarrow Farm via letter of the additional targeted consultation being undertaken and invited them to meet with the project team on either 6 or 7 June. This was part of a targeted consultation carried out with 117 Persons with an Interest in the Land (PILs) between 29 May and 27 June 2018.
07/06/2018	Meeting with Highways England	Access and scheme design, noise impacts, mitigation	<p>The meeting was held to feedback the changes to the scheme as a result of responses received at Statutory Consultation, and to discuss the targeted landowner consultation.</p> <p>The following aspects of the scheme were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to farmhouse around earthworks of the Green bridge • Critique of noise assessments and potential impacts on wedding business • Construction noise impact on business • Return of land to previous state used for existing A30 junction at Two Barrows underpass • Translocation of existing trees
20/06/2018	Email from Nancarrow Farm to Highways England	Noise assessment information	A follow-up email to that sent on 07/03/2018, requesting again that the raw data is sent, and also requesting the latest plans as shared in the meeting in early June (07/06/2018).
21/06/2018	Email from Highways England to Nancarrow Farm	Noise assessment information	Highways England provided the noise maps presented at the meeting and stated that the noise data requested would be provided in a few days. Highways England also sent the draft engineering drawings for further information.
28/06/2018	Email from Highways England to Nancarrow Farm	Noise assessment information	Highways England sent Nancarrow Farm the traffic flow data used to calculate noise levels from the existing and proposed A30 scheme at the chainage close to Nancarrow Farm.
28/06/2018	Email from Nancarrow Farm to Highways England	Noise assessment information	In response to the email sent 28/06/2018, Nancarrow Farm sent an additional question about the data that was sent requested the assumed noise level 'at source' based on the average speeds stated.
29/06/2018	Email from Nancarrow Farm to Highways England	Scheme design, response to targeted consultation	Nancarrow Farm sent through an update of their views following the meeting in June and the receipt of maps. This included their views on the following aspects of the design: noise mitigation and noise assessment, access to the property, loss of fields, the schedule of construction works,

Date	Method	Topic	Consultation Details
			removal of trees, removal of screening, utilities and services.
15/08/2018	Meeting with Highways England	Scheme design, route selection, construction impact	The meeting was held to discuss the following aspects of the scheme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response to matters raised in targeted consultation • Impacts during construction and mitigation measures • Optioneering process • Updates to access and design for submission
22/08/2018	Email from Nancarrow Farm to Highways England	DCO submission documents	Request from Nancarrow Farm regarding references to their property in the submitted DCO documents.
22/08/2018	Email from Highways England to Nancarrow Farm	Re: DCO submission documents	Confirmation from Highways England on the request made by Nancarrow Farm on 22/08/2018.
05/09/2018	Meeting with Nancarrow Farm	Compensation and construction effects	Meeting held between Nancarrow Farm regarding compensation payable and construction effects. Restriction of activities were agreed at the meeting (See also point 21 of section 5 of this document),
26/10/2018	Email from Highways England to Nancarrow Farm	Information request	A request from the Highways England Project Manager to Nancarrow Farm to send through dates that had previously been discussed. (See also point 21 of section 5 of this document),
29/10/2018	Email from Nancarrow Farm to Highways England	Re: Information request	Nancarrow Farm provided the information requested by Highways England on 26/10/2018, stating that they require urgent clarification on the programme of construction works and how it will impact their business.
09/11/2018	Meeting with Nancarrow Farm and Sarah Newton MP	Construction effects	A meeting was held with Nancarrow Farm and chaired by Sarah Newton MP regarding the construction effects of the scheme. HE undertook to consider restrictions of activity on certain dates. (See also point 21 of section 5 of this document),
15/01/2019	Meeting with Highways England, buildability advisors and Nancarrow Farm	Meeting	A meeting was held with Highways England's buildability advisors and Nancarrow Farm to discuss mitigation measures during construction.

3 Topics covered in this SoCG

3.1.1 The following table is a summary of the topics which are considered within this SoCG. The topics covered in section 4 this SoCG broadly align with Highways England's response to the Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation.

Topic number	Topic
1.	Engineering design (access)
2.	Construction activities
3.	Landscape and Visual (Chapter 7 of the ES)
4.	Noise and vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)
5.	Cultural Heritage

4 Matters agreed

4.1.1 The table below shows those matters which have been agreed by the parties, including that matters reference number, and the date and method by which it was agreed.

Table 4.1 – Matters agreed between Nancarrow Farm and Highways England

Reference	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
1. Engineering design (access)		
1.1.	<p>The proposed Nancarrow Farm access layout provides access to the farmyard from the adjacent Killivose Lane, whilst also facilitating access to the Green bridge for a tractor and trailer. A new realigned section of FP319/16/1 is provided to link to the new Bridleway (PR7) that passes over the green bridge (shown as PR7 on Sheet 4 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans, Document Reference 2.5(A)).</p> <p><i>It should be noted however that a green bridge in this location was not the preferred location for access, with a bridge at Kilivose lane Lane more beneficial (supported by the residents of Kilivose lane). The feasibility of this option was investigated, and the option turned down, in part, due to the vertical alignment and the structure therefore required. Vertical alignment at this point has now been lowered making a bridge in this location becoming more viable, requiring a lesser structure than the proposed green bridge. It would also retain access to Kilivose lane Lane to for residents and businesses. <u>Strategic land take to accommodate the green bridge and new access is significant, and far worse a solution than the current access onto the current A30. Consideration should be made to increased journey time, the practicality of large farm deliveries.</u></i></p>	<p>Meeting held 07/06/2018 Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018</p>
1.2.	<p><u>The scheme does not impede access from the farmyard to adjoining fields. This is as a result of the removal of an access track which was proposed from the farmyard to the east prior to the statutory consultation.</u></p> <p><i>Removal of an access track which was proposed from the farmyard to the east prior to the statutory consultation as it was deemed unviable. (it featured a narrow lane with 90 degree turns and cut off the farmyard from the rest of the farm) The revised access is more practical in terms of manoeuvring large vehicles and impedes less on access from the farmyard to adjoining fields, <u>although is significantly worse than the current access.</u></i></p>	<p>Meeting held 14/02/2018 Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018</p>

Reference	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
1.3.	The green bridge has been designed to maintain access to the adjacent fields and farmyard by minimising its footprint through increasing the slope gradient. <i>Further detailed design work will <u>should</u> be undertaken to ensure minimum impact on these strategically imperative fields, as well as access to 'Jose's meadow' (<u>the strip of land retained to the east of the green bridge</u>, currently cut off)</i>	Meeting held 07/06/2018 Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018
1.4.	A right of access will be granted over the green bridge for Nancarrow Farm to access the fields on the other side of the existing and proposed A30. <i>Detailed design will be undertaken to ensure sufficient space has been allowed to turn a tractor and bale trailer as agreed at the meeting 7/6/18. <u>The bridge structure should be capable of carrying tractor, trailer and up to 40 bales of silage/straw.</u></i>	Meeting held 07/06/2018 Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018
1.5.	Stepped pedestrian access (PR8) will be provided from FP319/16/1 to the new Bridleway (PR7) on the proposed green bridge. This is shown to the south of the scheme at Ch 7,315 (sheet 10, Environmental Masterplans, Figure 7.6, Document Reference 6.3). The existing and new paths are shown on Sheet 4 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans, Document Reference 2.5(A)).	Meeting held 07/06/2018
2. Construction activities		
2.1.	Highways England will restrict all construction activities until 1 June 2020 in the area of Nancarrow Farm (between chainage 6+700 and 7+700).	Meeting held 05/09/2018
2.2.	Highways England will restrict all construction activities on nine dates between June and September 2020 in the area of Nancarrow Farm (between 6+700 and 7+700). These dates are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Saturday 13 June 2020 o Saturday 20 June 2020 o Saturday 4 July 2020 o Saturday 18 July 2020 o Saturday 25 July 2020 o Saturday 8 August 2020 o Saturday 15 August 2020 o Saturday 29 August 2020 o Saturday 12 September 2020 	Meeting held 26/10/2018

Reference	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
2.3.	Restriction of construction activities will be confirmed through an appropriate mechanism between Highways England and Nancarrow Farm. <i>In order to avoid severe adverse business impacts, commitment will be made by XXX date.</i> <i><u>HE to commit to a date ASAP in order for our business to function in the immediate term.</u></i>	Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018
3. Landscape and Visual (Chapter 7 of the ES)		
<i>Mitigation</i>		
3.1.	At Marazanvose, mitigation comprises: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engineering design of the alignment and cutting to retain existing Cornish hedge on the Nancarrow side of the existing A30 • 5 to 10m proposed oak rich woodland on the cutting slope (between the existing A30 and the proposed new A30). • <i>It has been suggested that to ensure a faster establishment of visual barrier, that an alternative to 'oak rich' is considered in the Marazanvose area, and that species should be selected to replace the existing copse (which was planted as part of the community project) It has also been suggested that evergreen varieties are also incorporated to provide better visual screening to the residents of Marazanvose.</i> • <i>A minimum of 20% of the trees planted will be mature <u>feathered specimens (2.5m-3m)</u></i> <p>These measures are shown on sheets 9-11, Environmental Masterplans, Figure 7.6, Document Reference 6.3.</p>	Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018 Agreed June 2018.
3.2.	Adjacent to Nancarrow Farm, mitigation includes a 3m high close boarded timber fence and 5 to 40m of oak rich woodland screen planting at the top of the cutting from Chainage 6+800 to Chainage 7+350 (sheets 10-11, Environmental Masterplans, Figure 7.6, Document Reference 6.3). Combined with the minimum 2m cutting, this extends the visual and noise screening to a minimum total height of 5m along the highway boundary adjacent to Nancarrow Farm. These mitigation measures were designed into the scheme to address noise, visual and heritage effects. <i>What measures can be secured to ensure a minimum of 5m of screening is achieved in this area?</i>	Meeting held 07/06/2018 Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018
3.3.	Oak rich woodland planting on the cutting is proposed from Chainage 5+900 – Chainage 7+300 (Sheet 10-11, Environmental Masterplans, Figure 7.6, Document Reference 6.3).	Meeting held 07/06/2018

Reference	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
	<p><i>It has been suggested that to ensure a faster establishment of visual barrier, that an alternative to 'oak rich' is considered, and that species should be selected to replace the existing tree line. It has also been suggested that evergreen varieties are also incorporated to provide better visual screening to the residents of Marazanvose.</i></p> <p><i>A minimum of 20% of the trees planted will be mature <u>feathered</u> specimens <u>(2.5m-3m)</u></i></p>	<p>Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018</p> <p>Agreed June 2018.</p>
3.4.	The footprint of the green bridge has been minimised to reduce the loss of vegetation and Cornish hedgerows from existing field boundaries either side of FP319/16/1 (sheets 10-11, Environmental Masterplans, Figure 7.6, Document Reference 6.3).	Meeting held 07/06/2018
3.5	The existing mature oak rich field boundary to the south of Nancarrow Farm will be retained to filter views from the property to the site of the proposed attenuation pond. This is shown to the south of the scheme at Ch 7+140 on Sheet 10 of the Environmental Masterplans, Figure 7.6, (Document Reference 6.3).	Meeting held 07/06/2018
3.7	Specimen tree planting is proposed on the eastern end of the bridge embankment to replace the existing trees to be removed. This is shown at Ch 7+310 on Sheet 10 of the Environmental Masterplans, Figure 7.6, Document Reference 6.3.	Meeting held 07/06/2018
3.8	<p>The proposed Cornish hedgerow has been realigned following statutory consultation to retain corner boundaries of an existing field at Ch 7+320 to 7+550 (shown on Sheet 11, Environmental Masterplans, Figure 7.6, Document Reference 6.3).</p> <p><i>It had been agreed that damage to the existing field boundary could be avoided at chainage 7+400. This was confirmed via maps sent 21/06/19 and This is crucial to retain the historic field boundary, maintain visual screen from the Listed Farmhouse and Bridal Suite. We have not been notified of any changes to this plan but the latest drawing suggest otherwise. Please confirm asap.</i></p>	Meeting held 07/06/2018
3.9	It is proposed to break out and remove the road surface of the existing junction of the A30 with the C0089 (Ch 8,000 to 8,100, Sheet 11, Environmental Masterplans, Figure 7.6, Document Reference 6.3). This area will be made good with grading, top soiling and seeding and Cornish hedgerows to return to agricultural use. The existing island of woodland and scrub inside the junction would be retained.	Meeting held 07/06/2018

Reference	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
	<i>This has not been discussed in any detail, but Nancarrow would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further.</i>	
3.10	A new stock-proof timber post and three strained wire fence will be provided between the farm access track and the retained portion of the field to the south of the scheme at Ch+7110 to 7+290 (Sheet 10, Environmental Masterplans, Figure 7.6, Document Reference 6.3). <i>Any fencing included in the plan should be 'stock proof' featuring high tensile stock fencing (HT8030) with 2 strands of high tensile barbed wire. (3 strands of barbed wire is insufficient for sheep)</i>	Meeting held 07/06/2018
4. Noise and vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)		
<i>Mitigation</i>		
4.1.	Low noise road surfacing will be laid on all new and altered sections of the scheme (paragraph 11.9.6 of Chapter 11, Noise, of the Environmental Statement, Document Reference 6.2).	Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018
4.2.	Immediately adjacent to Nancarrow Farm, the vertical alignment has been lowered following statutory consultation, by up to approximately 2m, which in combination with noise barriers and landscape screening, significantly reduced the noise and visual impacts through this section, whilst still allowing an acceptable geotechnical (ground water) and highway drainage solution with associated outfall. <i>Nancarrow support the proposed noise barriers and minimum 5m clearance, but still challenge the raising of the vertical alignment from PRA. A 3m increase in vertical alignment represents a significant deviation from the route that was assessed, and the impact of this increase significantly affect all residents in Marazanvose. This has added further weight to Nancarrow's case against the route selection process which they consider flawed in a number of areas. (see matters outstanding)</i>	Meeting held 07/06/2018 Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018
4.3.	3m vertical close boarded timber fence on top of the cutting embankment are used from Chainage 6+840 to Chainage 7+520 (sheets 9-11, Environmental Masterplans, Figure 7.6, Document Reference 6.3). This extends the noise screening to a minimum total effective screening height of 5m along the highway boundary adjacent to Nancarrow Farm. <i>What measures/conditions could be secured to ensure this 5m clearance is achieved.</i>	Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018
4.4.	During construction the control of noise and vibration using Best Practical Means is incorporated within Annex K: Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan in the Outline Construction Management Plan (Document Reference 6.4, Appendix 16.1). The measures include:	Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018

Reference	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection of quiet equipment • Review of programme and methodology to consider quieter methods • Control of working hours • Provision of acoustic enclosure fencing where practicable <p><i>A far more detailed methodology statement should be outlined to ensure effects of construction will be minimised, taking into serious consideration the sensitivity to noise of a wedding ceremony.</i></p>	
5. Cultural Heritage		
<i>Mitigation</i>		
5.1.	<p>No specific mitigation measures are proposed for cultural heritage at Nancarrow Farmhouse. It is considered that measures proposed as landscape mitigation would ameliorate any impacts at Nancarrow as far as is practicable.</p> <p><i>It has been suggested that where possible, acoustic screening should be installed before construction takes place to minimise visual impact during works. Nancarrow's Grade II listed walled garden is used for wedding party photos, and the petting areas (to the west of the garages and lambing shed) are regularly used by guests so visual screening should be proposed.</i></p>	Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018

5 Matters outstanding

5.1 Principal matters outstanding

5.1.1 The principal matters that are outstanding include:

- Principle of development
- Consideration of alternatives (Relevant to Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement, Document Reference 6.2; Scheme Assessment Report, Document Reference 7.6; and Route Selection Report, Document Reference 7.7)
- Construction effects
- Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement, Document Reference 6.2)
- Landscape (Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement, Document Reference 6.2)
- Detailed construction plans

5.1.2 Highways England will continue to review the matters detailed in the table below.

5.2 Specific matters outstanding

5.2.1 The table below sets out the matters which are outstanding between Highways England and Nancarrow Farm. It replicates the Highways England response to the Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation.

5.2.2 The table describes the matter being discussed and Nancarrow Farm's position. Highways England's position, and any action which may be taken by Highways England in relation to the outstanding matter. The date the respective positions of the parties were reached is also presented.

Table 4.2 – Matters not agreed between Nancarrow Farm and Highways England

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	COMMENTS / ISSUED-RAISED FOLLOWING HE RESPONSE Nancarrow Response
1.	1. Principle of development		
2.	Nancarrow Farm comprises a	This is noted.	This should not be simply noted. It should be something to

	<p>Grade II listed Farmhouse, 100 acre certified organic farm, and award winning Events Venue with annual turnover of £1 million and economic contribution of nearly £3 million. The same family have lived and farmed at Nancarrow since 1782</p>		<p><u>be protected. One of Highway England's strategic objectives is to support economic growth & cultural heritage.</u></p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>By severing Marazanvose, and Nancarrow Farm, the impacts are multiple and complex including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing a small barn with permission to create a residential dwelling for farmer [redacted]. 	<p>Chapter 3 Consideration of Alternatives of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-056] provides information on the route selection process leading to the proposed route for the scheme. As stated at paragraph 3.7.7 of Chapter 3, three possible options for the alignment at Marazanvose were considered and the southern option closest to the existing carriageway was chosen. One reason this option was selected was that it would "avoid Marazanvose hamlet becoming an island in between the new and old A30 carriageways".</p> <p>In addition, the route selected would reduce the impact on the landscape and historic setting of Chyverton Registered Park and Garden and would also reduce the overall land take required by up to 31,100m² in comparison to the other options considered.</p> <p>Details of the route assessment process are provided in the Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) (Document Reference 7.6) [APP-050] and the Route Selection Report (Document Reference 7.7) [APP-051]. Furthermore comment reference no 10 - 16 provide further information relating to Highways England's route selection process at Marazanvose.</p> <p>The demolition of the small barn is required for the construction of the road in this location. Property and land affected by the scheme is subject to compensation in line with the compensation code.</p>	<p>As stated in July 2017. It is misleading to describe Marazanvose becoming an island between the new and old A30, Option 7B contained a section of new side road, running to the north of the main scheme, that would link the old A30. The effect of this would be to create a cul-de-sac at Marazanvose thus greatly increasing resident safety and reconnecting a community; which is one of the strategic aims of the scheme.</p> <p>The northern alignment would have seen little impact on Chyverton Registered Park and Garden, with both options passing the registered park on similar alignments. The business, visual, cultural heritage, living conditions and noise impacts would have been lower in comparison to the impact on these receptors at Nancarrow. Historic England in their letter of 8 September 2017 noted that the change in alignment was at the expense of Nancarrow. There would have been no requirement to demolish buildings, affect businesses or require the wholesale re-organisation of a functional farmyard.</p> <p>We accept that greater land take is required in order to bypass Marazanvose, but this should be considered acceptable for the public benefit that would result. Consideration should be taken to the level of strategic importance of the land being taken, not just area. In</p>

Formatted: No underline

			<p>addition, the proposed scheme has been developed 'off line' with a far greater land take than improving the existing road. We assume this additional land take has been justified to achieve the scheme aims but feel a similar justification (of land take) should be considered in order to avoid residential demolition, business loss, and to deliver better living standards to the community of Marazanvose.</p> <p>A northern alignment would not have required the acquisition of the barn which had planning permission for conversion into a residential dwelling.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing key strategic fields adjacent to the farmyard with no mitigation putting into question the feasibility of the farm 	<p>It is understood that the proposed scheme would impact on the operation of the farm. The correspondence log at Appendix B of this letter sets out communication from Preferred Route Announcement to the submission of this response. It shows that a number of meetings have been held with Nancarrow Farm to refine the design of the scheme as far as possible to enable farm operations to continue and the access arrangements proposed within the scheme are as requested by the farm to facilitate access to the adjacent green bridge.</p> <p>As outlined on page 166 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) [APP-029] a number of measures to mitigate the impact of the scheme on the business have been introduced, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The vertical alignment of the road has been lowered from the design presented at statutory consultation, resulting in reduced noise impacts. Further noise mitigation in the form of a 3m acoustic fence is proposed adjacent to the landholding. This 	<p>Whilst HE have proposed mitigation to reduce noise impact and provided access across the green bridge, no mitigation has been provided to address the strategic field land loss as stated in our representation.</p> <p>Whilst access across the green bridge is welcomed there will still be the need to relocate a barn, reconfigure field layout, re-design the farmyard and provide new accesses to fields. All of this needs to be addressed and paid for by Highways England before main construction works commence as part of an advanced compensation claim. These requirements would have been avoided by a northern alignment.</p> <p>The vertical alignment is still circa 2m above that presented at preferred route announcement. A significant deviation from the route assessed in the SAR.</p> <p>The provision of a 3m acoustic fence is welcomed but the impacts of raising the road have not been mitigated for the</p>

		<p>would result in a reduction in the level of noise in the area of the wedding business from current levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The access to the farm and the green bridge has been amended to facilitate access across the bridge from the farm for a tractor and trailer. This would provide direct access from the farm yard to fields to the north of the existing A30. 	<p>properties in Marazanvose.</p> <p>This is welcomed</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amended access to the farmyard from the adjacent Killivose Lane as requested by the farm. <p>The acquisition of land that is required for the scheme is subject to the payment of compensation in line with the compensation code.</p>	<p>This was only agreed to as being the least worst option of the alternative access arrangements put forward by Highways England.</p> <p>It is the acquisition of strategically important land, the impact of which has yet to be fully recognised by Highways England and which a statement regarding compensation does little to address</p>
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Damaging the setting of the Grade II listed Farmhouse and Garden 	<p>Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement, (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-059] assesses the impacts of the scheme on heritage assets. Paragraph 6.11.41 of this chapter states that the permanent effects of the scheme on the listed Nancarrow Farmhouse, and attached Wall (NHLE no. 1136610) would experience a moderate adverse impact.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.11.42 of Chapter 6 states that during construction of the scheme there would be temporary slight adverse effects on the significance of the farmhouse.</p> <p>The Planning Statement (Document Reference 7.1) [APP-045] assesses the scheme against policy, in particular the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN).</p>	

		<p>Paragraphs 5.120 to 5.142 of the NPSNN set out the requirements of national networks infrastructure in relation to the historic environment. It identifies that the impact on heritage assets that are both designated and non-designated should be considered, including their setting.</p> <p>The NPSNN sets out that the SoS should ascribe weight to heritage assets to align with their significance, such that the most important assets are given greatest weight. When a scheme will lead to substantial harm or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, it should be demonstrated that the loss or harm is necessary in order to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that loss or harm.</p>	<p>The impact on the non-designated historic hamlet of Maranzovose, which is suffering further segregation despite the opportunity to re-connect, was not included within the cultural assessment at route selection.</p> <p>Highways England have misinterpreted this as they have sought to focus on a minor harm to Chyverton Park whereas the alternative, (preferred route) causes substantial harm to designated and non-designated heritage assets</p>
		<p>Alternatively, it may be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the nature of the asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; no viable use of the asset can be found in the medium term; conservation through grant funding or charity/public ownership is not possible; or the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit for bringing the site into use. <p>Paragraph 6.3.71 of the Planning Statement concludes that the scheme would not result in substantial harm to the significance of heritage assets such that it would outweigh the public benefits of the scheme. This is in accordance with section 5 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN).</p>	<p>This has not been demonstrated. Nor has there been any formal consultation (prior to route selection) with Historic England in this respect. Historic England have never favoured the current alignment (despite previous statements to the contrary) and have noted that the alignment is at the expense of Nancarrow. A northern alignment would have had minimal adverse impact on any designated asset, and would result in a substantial reduction in the harm to designated and non-designated heritage assets. In addition, and Historic England should have been consulted on all routes being considered if their opinion is being used to support one of the options.</p>

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jeopardizing the Events business via disruption during construction works, and risk of increased noise, land loss, and visual impact post scheme 	<p>Chapter 12 People & Communities of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-065] assesses that the direct and indirect effects of the scheme would cause a slight adverse impact on the business at Nancarrow Farm during construction and operation. This is considered further in the response provided at comment reference no.14.</p> <p>With regard to land-take, Chapter 12 People & Communities of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-065] summarises the Agricultural Impact Assessment undertaken for the scheme. Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) (Document Reference 6.4, Appendix 12.5) [APP-366]. The AIA assesses the impact of the scheme on land use and the impacts on individual farm units (plots) forming part of a farm holding, taking into account agricultural land quality and</p>	<p>This is strongly contested and in total contradiction with HE's statement "<i>The likely effects of noise from the construction works reaching the barn and external wedding venue areas, is assessed as temporary significant.</i>"</p> <p>The business is currently looking at a 50% loss of turnover amounting to £540,000. This is somewhat more than a slight adverse impact. A "<i>slight adverse impact</i>" on the business at Nancarrow Farm during construction and operation may only be achieved with stringent mitigation and robust working restrictions allowing the business to function. There is no commitment on working restrictions out side of nine days in 2020 and the detail of such restriction has yet to be defined. It goes without saying that a northern alignment would not have required the same stringent mitigation or robust working restrictions.</p>
		<p>the likely impact on its functionality in terms of severance and access. It concludes in Table 12-23 of the Chapter that there would be a moderate adverse effect on agricultural land and farm holdings/plots during construction and operation of the scheme.</p> <p>Loss of property value as a result of the operation of the scheme, due to physical impacts (such as noise), may be compensable following the opening of the scheme in line with the Compensation Code.</p> <p>A response to the following specific impacts cited in this comment are provided at the following points in this table:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction: comment reference no. 21 Noise: comment reference no.23 — 26 Visual impact: comment reference no. 28 — 30 	<p>See previous comments regarding the need to relocate a barn, re-design the farmyard and provide new accesses to fields. All of this needs to be addressed and paid for by Highways England before main construction works commence as part of an advanced compensation claim.</p> <p>This is not Highway England's current stance which is that business losses arising from construction are not compensable. Accordingly, to avoid catastrophic adverse impacts on the business stringent mitigation and robust working restrictions must, therefore, be imposed. Highways England (Colin Bird) confirmed in a meeting in July 2017 that construction works in the vicinity of Nancarrow could be avoid on Wednesdays and Saturdays, however, Highways England are now not prepared to commit to this.</p>
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of existing access 	Access to the existing A30 would be provided via	As previously stated this proposal has been

	onto A30 and removal of established tree border.	<p>the adjacent Killivose Lane and Shortlanesend Road as agreed with the farm during ongoing engagement.. Access across the new and existing A30 will be provided for a tractor and trailer via the new adjacent green bridge.</p> <p>The removal of trees is necessary at this location in order to construct the scheme. However, new woodland edge and oak rich woodland planting is proposed in this location as shown on Sheet 10 of the Environmental Masterplans (Document Reference 6.3, Figure 7.6) [APP-190].</p>	<p>accepted as the least worst option proposed by Highways England</p> <p>As the new planting will take at least 15 years to mature there will be a severe adverse effect for this period for Nancarrow and the residents of Marazanvose.</p>
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severe damage to the setting of Nancarrow Villa. 	Please refer to the response provided at comment reference no. 5 which considers the impact on heritage assets.	Please refer to previous comments.
9.	2. Consideration of alternatives (Relevant to Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Document Reference 6.2; Scheme Assessment Report, Volume 7, Document Reference 7.6; and Route Selection Report, Volume 7, Document Reference 7.7)		

<p>10.</p>	<p>Flawed route selection process: The preferred route was selected instead of an alternative option which avoided severing Marazanvose, bypassing it to the North.</p>	<p>Highways England has sought to develop the alignment and design of the scheme through an iterative process, in which alternative options for the route have been considered.</p> <p>The design process has been informed by environmental, socioeconomic, technical and cost considerations, as well as feedback received during non-statutory and statutory consultation engagement with the public, landowners and other relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Details of the route assessment process are provided in the Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) (Document Reference 7.6) [APP-050]. The chosen option (Option 7A) was assessed to be the best performing alternative on 8 of 9 criteria as shown in Table 7-6 of the SAR. These criteria included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land acquisition • Risk of delay/cost due to utility works • Business impacts • Cultural heritage • Visual impact • Living conditions • Noise • Residential demolition • Most likely cost <p>Further information on the route selection process</p>	<p>The criteria used to justify route selection are critical to our argument. When assessing whether or not the process of route selection was flawed, it is critical that the assessment process is evaluated using these 9 criteria. We have outlined our issues with the assessment process using each as outlined. In each case, the 2 available routes should be assessed by comparing each option. It is our view that much of HE's response contains the introductions of new reasons, or comparing the merits of the preferred route versus the current situation, neither of which provides justification that the process of route selection wasn't flawed.</p>
-------------------	---	--	---

		<p>(Document Reference 6.2) [APP-056].</p> <p>Taking into account the concerns raised by Nancarrow Farm with the selected route, Highways England has undertaken a further, more detailed geometry assessment of the alternative alignment to the north of Marazanvose. This has concluded that the relaxed horizontal and vertical design required to route north of Marazanvose and return back to the same line as the existing A30 over the Two Barrows underbridge, would require 3 additional departures from minimum standards and would require significant verge widening to provide the necessary forward visibility. The alignment and cross-section of the new A30 and the parallel realigned existing A30 would have significant construction, land and compensation impacts and costs in comparison to the route proposed in the DCO application.</p> <p>A number of significant direct impacts of the alternative route have been identified, including on the adjacent Town & Country Motors business, the Nursery business and the outbuildings at the rear of Marazanvose (the route would be within 35m of rear of properties in Marazanvose), adjacent utilities including 133kV WPD pylons and a telecommunications mast and the existing Two Barrows underbridge. The route also requires an additional 1 km of realignment to the existing A30. In combination, the impacts of the alternative route would have significant construction, land and compensation costs over and above the selected route.</p> <p>Based on the above, the route selected is still considered by Highways England to perform the best in</p>	<p>There are already departures from minimum standards. Any additional departures could be justified by avoiding historic and heritage assets and in minimising business and economic disruption. This was not part of the assessment criteria used to justify the preferred route.</p> <p>These impacts on Town & Country Motors, the Nursery and the outbuildings at the rear of Marazanvose have not been referred to in previous studies. These are misleading references which are being used to justify a flawed route selection. Additional land take and construction costs can be justified by avoiding historic and heritage assets and in minimising business and economic disruption.</p> <p>Table 7-6 (the summary of criteria used for route selection) has been updated to take account of scheme developments. It still does not give basis for selecting the</p>
--	--	--	---

		relation to construction, land, compensation, environmental and cost.	current alignment and so it is difficult to see how Highways England have come to this conclusion.
11.	Highways agency incorrectly concluded that the preferred route performed better in terms of:		
12.	Visual Impact,	The Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) (Document Reference 7.6) [APP-050] assessed Option 7A as having a lesser impact on existing fields	In Highways England's letter of 21 August 2017 they accept that visual impact is worst for Nancarrow but claim it is better for residents of Marazanvose. This is not the

		<p>and boundary vegetation by maintaining a closer alignment to the existing A30. Option 7A resulted in the loss of one field and the reduction of six fields in size, compared to option 7B which would have severed eight fields and reduced the size of one field. By minimising harm to the historic field pattern, Option 7A was considered to accord better with the aims of NPSNN Paragraphs 4.28-4.35 and 5.143 to 5.161, which deal with good design and landscape and visual impacts.</p> <p>Chapter 7 Landscape of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-060] has assessed the visual impact of the scheme on workers at Nancarrow Farm, residents at the Farm and recreational users of the footpath 319/16/1 through the farm. The construction and residual visual effects have been assessed as moderate adverse on the bungalow at Nancarrow Farm, recreational users of the footpath through the farm and on outdoor workers at Nancarrow Farm. Visual effects on residents in Nancarrow Farm farmhouse are assessed as not significant.</p> <p>Sheet 10 of the Environmental Masterplans (Document Reference 6.3, Figure 7.6) [APP-190] show the screening that is proposed to mitigate the visual effects of the road on Nancarrow Farm.</p>	<p>case. The impact of removing any existing screening is not assessed. A northern alignment would have moved the scheme away from all receptors including the residents at Marazanvose, bypassing it to the North.</p>
<p>13.</p>	<p>Noise Impact,</p>	<p>Appendix B of the Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) (Document Reference 7.6) [APP-050] states that Marazanvose would experience an overall decrease in noise as a result of option 7B. It is accepted that this is not reflected in table 7-6 of the SAR. Appendix B of the SAR states that Marazanvose would have been likely to experience an increase in noise as a result of 7A. It is accepted that this is not reflected in table 7-6 of the SAR.</p>	<p>This is an acceptance that there was a clear misleading statement in the SAR. It also doesn't state what in the increase is noise is likely to be. Faster traffic means greater increases in noise levels.</p>

		<p>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-064] concludes that properties at Marazanvose would experience a reduction in noise of 1-5 decibels as a result of the new A30 being further away and significantly less traffic on the existing A30.</p> <p>For more detailed consideration of noise impacts of the scheme on Nancarrow Farm, please see the response to comment reference no. 23 — 26 in this table.</p>	
14.	Business Impact,	<p>The Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) (Document Reference 7.6) [APP-050] accurately states that option 7B would have severed more working fields than the preferred route and have an adverse impact on the Chyverton Park eventing arena. It is accepted in the SAR that impacts on businesses due to noise, landscape and visual effects could be mitigated to acceptable levels for either option.</p> <p>Taking into account the concerns raised by Nancarrow Farm with the selected route, Highways England has undertaken a further, more detailed geometry assessment of the alternative alignment to the north of Marazanvose. This has identified that the discounted option 7B would have required significant land take from Town & Country Motors that would be considered to</p>	<p>Conversely, the current scheme alignment impacts more businesses, most severely, and in the case of the events business it has yet to be demonstrated that these impacts can be mitigated. Any impact on the Chyverton Park eventing arena could be mitigated by a realignment of field boundaries.</p> <p>This has not been demonstrated. Neither has it been demonstrated that these impacts outweigh the potentially severe impacts to Nancarrow and the severe adverse impacts on the residents of Marazanvose.</p> <p>See table 7.6 for a summary of matters raised in relation to route selection in October 2017.</p>
		<p>have a significant land and compensation cost and would likely have a significant impact.</p> <p>Chapter 12 People & Communities of the</p>	

		<p>Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-065] Para 12.7.101 states "The approach to clarifying the sensitivity of tourism and recreation receptors has been agreed with Cornwall Council and Visit Cornwall, taking into account the nature of the asset, degree of permanence and ability to relocate, as well as location... For the purposes of this assessment... the more regional assets of Healy's Cyder Farm and NFH are of a medium sensitivity."</p> <p>Chapter 12 People & Communities of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-065] assesses that the direct and indirect effects of the scheme would cause a slight adverse impact on the business at Nancarrow Farm during construction and operation.</p>	<p>Why has this not been reflected in the choice of alignment?</p> <p>This is a very misleading statement and cannot be justified under any circumstances. It has been clearly demonstrated that the impacts during construction will be severe without stringent mitigation and robust working restrictions which Highways England will not commit to. Bookings need to be taken up to 2 years in advance and so the effects of this scheme are already having a negative impact which is not being addressed.</p>
<p>15.</p>	<p>Cultural Heritage,</p>	<p>As stated at page 167 of the Consultation Report (Document Reference 5.1) [APP-029], Option 7B (the discounted option) would involve the loss of woodland that is functionally part of Chyverton Park (a Grade II Listed Registered Park and Gardens), although this is not within the boundary of the designation. This would have harmed the setting of the Registered Park and Garden, including a number of Listed Buildings within Chyverton Park itself. Option 7A (the chosen route) avoided Chyverton Park by its location south of the existing A30.</p>	<p>How can this be a justification to the current scheme alignment? It was incorrectly stated that Historic England supported the chosen route when they were not consulted on the alternative (leading to HE retracting their statement in the SAR) Historic England have noted the current scheme alignment is at the expense of impacts to Nancarrow Farmhouse and wall. This has not been considered. Neither has the impact on the non-designated historic hamlet of Marazanvose been considered.</p>
<p>16.</p>	<p>Impact on Community.</p>	<p>It is important to note the impact of the</p>	<p>In this section we are challenging HE's route</p>

		<p>existing A30 on the Marazanvose community, in which properties in the hamlet are already divided. It is unclear as to what existing connectivity or community assets would be affected by the scheme which is beyond that of the current situation.</p>	<p>selection and the criteria used to justify one route versus the other. In this point, we refer to the criteria 'living standards'. The northern option provided a cul de sac in Marazanvose with very little traffic, reconnecting this community, and providing much improved, safer, quality of life versus the preferred option.</p> <p>The community is now separated further by two roads which jointly will carry more traffic, create more noise and be more visually intrusive. The potential to re-connect a community in a safe and tranquil setting has been ignored.</p> <p>When comparing the impact on Living Standards for both options, it is clear the Northern option performs better.</p>
		<p>Currently, residents are required to cross the existing A30 carriageway at grade to reach neighbouring properties on the other side on foot. Within the scheme, a bridleway would be provided on the proposed green bridge to connect Marazanvose with the lane U6082 and footpath FP 319/16/1 to the south. This is shown on Sheet 4 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Document Reference 2.5) [XX].</p> <p>Table 12-23 of Chapter 12 People and Communities of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-065] concludes that across the scheme, the overall impact on communities during operation would be slight beneficial in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Settlements and access to open space and services • Employment 	<p>The overall impact cannot be slight beneficial. The community is now separated further by two roads which jointly will carry more traffic, create more noise and be more visually intrusive. The potential to re-connect a community in a safe and tranquil setting has been ignored.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community safety • Health 	
17.	This has been formally challenged and a proper response has not been provided.	<p>Appendix B of this document sets out the correspondence between Highways England and Nancarrow Farm. It includes Highways England's response to objections raised by Mr Chamberlain in response to the Preferred Route Announcement on 3 July 2017</p> <p>It should be noted that this correspondence took place during the scheme design process and prior to the submission of the DCO application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter dated 21 August 2017 from Highways England to Mr Chamberlain following a meeting with representatives of 	
		<p>Nancarrow Farm and Sarah Newton MP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter dated 28 September 2017 from Tim Walmsley representing Steve Chamberlain to Highways England in response to the letter dated 21 August 2017 • Letter dated 9 January 2018 from Highways England to Mr Chamberlain in response to the letter dated 29 September 2017. • Highways England also provided a response to the matters raised by Nancarrow Farm in their response to the statutory consultation that took place between 29 January and 12 March 2018. This included points raised and responded to regarding the route selection process, and is provided in pages 142 to 170 of the Consultation Report (Document reference 5.1) [APP-029] <p>Highways England continue to engage with</p>	<p>It is still maintained than none of the correspondence received from Highways England actually answers the key the questions that have been raised. They contain a series of statements without any evidence to substantiate them.</p> <p>We attach table 7.6 which contains the latest evidence provided to justify route selection. In some cases HE have acknowledged our challenges, but others are still left unanswered.</p> <p>The cumulative result of the points raised suggests fundamental flaws in the route selection process. Rather than address our points directly, new reasoning (not included in the original rationale) has been introduced. A distraction from the issues being raised. We welcome the opportunity to formally review the route selection process</p>

		Nancarrow Farm.	
18.	Having reviewed the information provided, it would appear proper assessments were not undertaken for the Northern option prior to route selection.	The Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) (Document 7.6) [APP-050] sets out the assessment undertaken to support the Preferred Route Announcement which was made on 3 July 2017. See response to comment reference no.10.	Please see the updated Table 7-6. This clearly supports a northern alignment. No other conclusion can be gained.
19.	The alternative alignment should be properly considered before progressing. It delivers a far better outcome for local residents, community cohesion, businesses growth, heritage assets and wildlife.	The alternative option has been discounted for the reasons that are stated in the Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) (Document 7.6) [APP-050] and for the reasons outlined in response to comment reference no.10 above. Highways England's decision to select the route for which development consent is being sought was, in its view, the right one taking all competing considerations into account.	Please see the updated Table 7-6. This clearly supports a northern alignment. No other conclusion can be gained.
20.	3. Construction effects		
21.	<p>It is vital constraints can be placed on the construction plan to avoid severe damage to Nancarrow Farm and the wider economy. Works must avoid a minimum of Wednesdays & Saturday/Sundays to avoid wedding days which are the greatest income generator.</p> <p>The risk of long term damage to the reputation of the business is a risk unless a detailed construction plan is agreed to minimize the impacts at Nancarrow during and post construction.</p>	<p>At a meeting held on 5 September 2018 with Highways England and Nancarrow Farm, restriction of activities on dates with pre-existing bookings was discussed. Highways England agreed at this meeting to restrict construction activities until 1 June 2020.</p> <p>On 26 October 2018, Mr Chamberlain provided Highways England with nine dates between June and September 2020, where wedding bookings were pending. As a gesture of goodwill, and as the construction schedule was unavailable, Highways England agreed to restrict construction activities on these dates. The precise details of this remain subject to discussion and it is envisaged that they will be captured in an agreement to be entered into between Highways England and Nancarrow Farm.</p> <p>A meeting was held on 15 January 2019 to discuss the potential mitigation of construction effects including</p>	<p>This is not good enough in the circumstances. Losses are already being incurred. Accordingly, there is a pressing need for Highways England to commit to stringent mitigation and robust working restrictions otherwise they will undermine their own (albeit challenged) assessment of business impacts.</p> <p>Whilst this is welcomed Highways England need to be clear what such restrictions mean otherwise this this 'gesture' may be meaningless.</p>

		<p>noise between Highways England's buildability advisor and Mr Chamberlain.</p> <p>At this stage, Highways England is unable to commit to any further reduction in working hours above and beyond those measures in the outline CEMP. The control of noise and vibration, using Best Practical Means (BPM) is incorporated within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) (Document Reference 6.4, Appendix 16.1) [APP-375].</p> <p>This would include selection of quiet equipment, review of programme and methodology to consider quieter methods, appropriate location of equipment on site, control of working hours and the provision of acoustic enclosure screening where</p>	
		<p>practicable. If situations arise where despite the implementation of BPM the noise exposure exceeds the criteria defined in the outline CEMP, the main contractors may offer noise insulation or ultimately temporary re-housing. Further detail is provided in Annex K: Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP Annexes) (Document Reference 6.4, Appendix 16.1) [APP-376].</p> <p>In addition to the assessment of noise effects during construction reported in the Environmental Statement, Highways England have committed to, and are currently undertaking a more detailed assessment of the noise levels during construction by producing a construction noise model for the critical location of the events business. This will allow the business to listen to the predicted noise levels that will be experienced during construction compared with current levels. Actual noise levels have been recorded for the likely plant to be used through this section of the works from an active construction site as well as existing noise levels at the critical location of the business. It is</p>	<p>What will be offered if someone's wedding is ruined by construction activities? What will be offered to offset the ruined reputation of the wedding business? There has never been a quiet construction site. Due to the very sensitive nature of the events business there needs to be a commitment to robust working restrictions and stringent mitigation.</p> <p>Welcomed and awaited.</p>

		expected that this will be available for review with Nancarrow Farm for Deadline 2 (19 th March) of the Examination.	
22.	<i>4. Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Document Reference 6.2)</i>		
23.	It is inconceivable that a new, faster, closer and busier dual carriageway can be introduced IN ADDITION to the existing, albeit less congested, faster (and therefore louder) local road without there being a significant impact on noise in the area.	The proposed A30 would be mitigated to control noise levels such that the noise impacts would be minimal to the south of the scheme. This includes extensive measures designed into the scheme to reduce noise, including the vertical alignment (in cutting), low noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks to mitigate visual impact and reduce noise.	The noise assessments don't take into account the current peak time congestion which result in lower noise levels. A revised impact assessment and revised mitigation proposals are expected as a result.
		At Nancarrow Farm, the operational noise level changes with the proposed scheme would be negligible for most areas of the wedding venue. The resulting noise levels in all locations would be below the lower end of the appropriate external amenity noise criterion for this type of use, as set out within the ES. The existing A30 at Marazanvose would be considerably de-trafficked (traffic would be reduced to about 13% of existing traffic flow) which results in the predicted noise reductions around this road. Hence its noise contribution to the proposed A30 alignment at locations south of the scheme would be negligible. As a result of the above factors, it has been assessed that there would be no adverse significant noise effect in this area.	The noise assessments don't take into account the current peak time congestion which result in lower noise levels. A revised impact assessment and revised mitigation proposals are expected as a result. Maximum mitigation measures are required to ensure these predictions aren't underestimated. Data which demonstrates noise for previous schemes should be provided as ad hoc feedback suggests noise predictions are often understated.
24.	We would therefore challenge the validity of the noise assessment undertaken to date. The base levels stated	As described in Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-064], the baseline noise levels used for the assessment are determined using the	The noise assessments don't take into account the current peak time congestion which result in lower noise levels. A revised impact assessment and revised mitigation proposals are expected as a

	<p>are too high (compared to assessments we have undertaken previously),</p>	<p>Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN) prediction model, as required by the assessment guidance (DMRB HD 213/11).</p> <p>The established method is to use the Annual Average Weekday Traffic (AAWT) flows over an 18hr daytime period as an input to the noise model. The baseline traffic data for 2023 is taken from the traffic noise model using the established forecasting methods specified in DMRB.</p> <p>The noise assessments are therefore valid.</p>	<p>result.</p>
<p>25.</p>	<p>the post scheme targets, and the suggested mitigation insufficient,</p>	<p>As set out in Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-064],</p>	
		<p>a range of noise mitigation measures would be designed into the scheme to reduce noise impacts during operation, including vertical alignment, a low noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks.</p> <p>The use of vertical timber barriers to mitigate traffic noise impacts in this area, rather than the standard Cornish Hedgerow, permits closer alignment to the source due to reduced land take requirements. This maximises the potential benefit that noise screening can provide i.e. the closer the screening is to the source the greater the noise reduction.</p> <p>For the Nancarrow area, the noise barriers have been optimised to provide maximum benefit from both barrier height and length. Any further increase in either height or length would not result in any appreciable benefit in noise reduction beyond what has</p> <p>been proposed in Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-064].</p> <p>With these mitigation measures designed into the scheme at this location, it has been assessed that</p>	

		there would be no adverse significant noise effects.	
26.	risking significant damage to the Grade II listed setting, and a very noise sensitive business during and post construction.	<p>During construction</p> <p>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-064] section 11.11 Assessment of Effects, assesses the principle construction activities and provides a table detailing the daytime construction noise assessment</p> <p>Para 11.11.122 provides a summary of the direct effect on Nancarrow Farm and concludes that <i>"The likely effects of noise from the construction works reaching the barn and external</i></p>	<p><i>"The likely effects of noise from the construction works reaching the barn and external wedding venue areas, is assessed as temporary significant."</i></p> <p>The statement above demonstrates the need for robust working restrictions and stringent mitigation measures. Given those are yet to be offered, the statement <i>slight adverse impact on the business at Nancarrow Farm during construction</i> is misleading.</p>

		<p>wedding venue areas, is assessed as temporary significant."</p> <p>The control of noise and vibration, using Best Practical Means (BPM) is incorporated within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) (Document Reference 6.4, Appendix 16.1) [APP-375].</p> <p>Post construction</p> <p>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement (Volume 6, Document Reference 6.2) [APP-064] concludes in paragraph 11.11.83 that <i>"the mitigated scheme would result in small noise changes (increases and decreases less than 1dB) around most of the venue"</i> and some increase in the small barnyard area between the wedding venue and buildings (less than 3d B). It states that <i>"this is a relatively small level of impact would not meet the increase criterion for a potentially significant effect for a non-residential receptor"</i>.</p> <p>With regard to cultural heritage impacts, please refer to the response provided at comment reference no.5.</p>	
<p>27.</p>	<p>5. Landscape (Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Document Reference 6.2)</p>		

28.	Established, effective screening (25 year old mature native tree plantation on the farm) between the 2 roads is being removed meaning unacceptable visual impact on the residents of Marazanvose,	<p>As stated at Paragraph 7.11.28 in Chapter 7 Landscape of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-060] residential receptors in properties to the north of the existing A30, at Marazanvose (VP 12) would receive large adverse significant effects in year 1, reducing down to moderate adverse significant effects in year 15, as a result of mitigation.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation here comprises engineering design of the alignment and the northern cutting slope to protect and retain the existing Cornish hedge and associated vegetation back of the southern verge to the existing A30. Unfortunately, the woodland to the south of this boundary would need to be removed to make way for the alignment of the new A30. As a result of this the Scheme would give rise to large adverse visual effects from year 1 to year 14.</p> <p>To address these effects, landscape mitigation here takes the form of a 5 to 10m wide strip of oak rich woodland on the cutting slope. As this woodland establishes over a period of 15 years, it would increasingly screen views of the carriageway and would reduce visual effects. After 15 years residual adverse visual effects would be reduced to moderately significant.</p>	This was not taken into account in the provisional route assessment.
		In paragraph 6.3.80 of the Planning Statement (Document 7.1) [APP-045] it is concluded that the adverse, permanent impacts on visual receptors as a result of the scheme are not considered significant such that it would outweigh the public benefit of the scheme.	See previous comments regarding the significant adverse effect for the first 15 years.

<p>29.</p>	<p>screening the old road from Nancarrow.</p>	<p>As a result of the findings of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment reported in Chapter 7 Landscape of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-060] the landscape mitigation measures including substantial areas of woodland, hedgerow and tree planting have been included where appropriate to integrate the scheme into the landscape and where possible and appropriate screen views of the scheme.</p> <p>Full details of the landscape mitigation are provided Sheet 10 in the Environmental Master Plans (Document Reference 6.3, Figure 7.6) [APP-190].</p> <p>Several visual receptors at Nancarrow Farm (NFH) were assessed.</p>				
<p>Comment Reference No.</p>	<p>Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation</p>	<p>Highways England Response</p>				
		<p>Receptor</p>	<p>Construction visual effect</p>	<p>Yr 1 visual effect</p>	<p>Yr 15 residual visual effect</p>	
		<p>Residential receptors at the bungalow at NFH (VP 13)</p>	<p>Moderate adverse and significant</p>	<p>Large adverse significant</p>	<p>Moderate adverse and significant</p>	
		<p>Users of holiday accommodation at NFH (VP 13)</p>	<p>Slight adverse and insignificant</p>	<p>Moderate adverse significant</p>	<p>Slight adverse and insignificant</p>	

		Residential receptors at NFH (VP 14)	Slight adverse and insignificant	No change	Neutral
		People enjoying views to and from Grade II listed NFH and attached wall (1136610) (VP 14)	Slight adverse and insignificant	No Change	Neutral
		Pedestrians using footpath 319/16/1 (VP 15)	Moderate adverse and significant	Moderate adverse significant	Moderate adverse and significant
		Representative of	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
		views of outdoor workers at NFH (VP 15)	adverse and significant	adverse significant	adverse and significant
		<p>Embedded mitigation includes a 3m high close boarded timber fence at the top of the cutting, extending the noise and visual screening to a minimum total height of 5m along the southern edge of the scheme adjacent to Nancarrow Farm.</p> <p>In addition to this, landscape mitigation includes a continuous belt of woodland planting along the southern side of the scheme to further screen views. As this landscape mitigation establishes over 15 years, residual visual effects would reduce to moderate, slight and neutral levels.</p>			
30.	(This could be mitigated via fencing/hedging rather than waiting 15 years for the trees to grow)	There is a 3m high close boarded timber fencing proposed at the top of the cutting, extending the noise and visual screening to a minimum total height of 5m along the southern edge of the scheme adjacent to Nancarrow Farm.			

Please refer to **Environmental Masterplans** (Document Reference 6.3, Figure 7.6, Sheet 10 of 20) [APP-190].

31.	<i>6. Detailed construction plans</i>	
32.	Current plans for land take, access, and the green bridge require much more detailed improvements in order to reduce the impact on the operation of multiple businesses and homes.	The access arrangement proposed for the farm with the scheme is as requested by the farm and provides access from the adjacent Killivose Lane and facilitates access to the adjacent green bridge, to allow the farm to run a tractor and trailer from the farm yard to their fields to the north of the existing A30. The access layout also maintains access from the farm yard to the adjacent field to the west across the existing farm lane, which was identified by the farm as a critical field. Highways England and their buildability advisor will continue to engage with Nancarrow Farm with regards to detailed design and any access arrangement during the construction phase.

Appendix A Signing Sheet

A.1

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Nancarrow Farm
Name	
Position	
Date	

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Highways England
Name	Josh Hodder
Position	Project Manager
Date	