

# A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross TR010026

## 7.4(C) STATEMENTS OF COMMON GROUND

Planning Act 2008

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)  
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed  
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

Volume 7

April 2019



# Table of Contents

	Pages
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose	1
1.2 Structure	1
2 Position	2
2.1 Structure of SoCGs	2
2.2 List of SoCGs	2
2.3 SoCG requested by the Examining Authority and not provided	3
3 Status	5
3.1 Summary of current position	5
4 Commonality	8
4.1 Summary	8
4.2 General overview and principal matters outstanding	10
Appendix A Draft SoCG with Historic England	13
Appendix B Draft SoCG with Nancarrow Farm	14

## Table of Tables

Table 1-1 List of SoCGs	3
Table 1-2 Status of SoCGs at Deadline 3	6
Table 1-3 Table of Commonality	9

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose

- 1.1.1 This document has been prepared to provide a concise update on the position of Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) between Highways England and statutory consultees/interested parties in relation to the A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross (the scheme).
- 1.1.2 This document provides the Highways England understanding of the position with each party at Deadline 3.
- 1.1.3 Where necessary Highways England will continue to work with relevant parties and review any matters that are still subject to further discussion during the Examination Timetable.
- 1.1.4 This document will be updated further at relevant Examination deadlines where appropriate and where progress has been made.

## 1.2 Structure

- 1.2.1 This report is structured as follows:
- **Section 2** details the structure of each SoCG document and provides an up to date list of SoCGs at the point of the relevant deadline in the Examination.
  - **Section 3** provides an update on the status of each SoCG.
  - **Section 4** sets out the commonality between SoCGs and provides a summary of the principal matters outstanding.

## 2 Position

### 2.1 Structure of SoCGs

2.1.1 Each SoCG has adopted a consistent and standard format to provide clarity to other parties and ultimately the Examining Authority (ExA).

2.1.2 Each SoCG is structured in the following way:

- **Section 1** introduces the SoCG and a description of its purpose.
- **Section 2** states the role of each party (e.g. Natural England) in the process and details the consultation undertaken to date.
- **Section 3** sets out matters agreed.
- **Section 4** sets out matters which are subject to negotiation or not agreed.
- **Appendix A** contains a sign off sheet.

2.1.3 Additional appendices have been added to SoCGs where relevant to provide further information and context for the matters described in the respective documents.

### 2.2 List of SoCGs

2.2.1 The SoCGs seek to identify matters on which parties agree and to track progress towards the resolution of any matters where agreement has not yet been reached.

2.2.2 Highways England has undertaken early preparation of SoCGs with various bodies as identified in **Table 1-1**. This provides a list of SoCGs that are currently in place, along with identifying other bodies where an SoCG is currently being prepared.

2.2.3 Since the submission of the application for development consent, additional SoCGs have been requested by the ExA to be submitted during the course of the Examination. These have been requested through the Rule 6 Letter issued on 9 January 2019, the Preliminary Meeting held on 6 February 2019 and the Rule 8 letter issued on 13 February 2019.

2.2.4 Highways England will be seeking to enter into an SoCG with four of the parties requested by the ExA:

- Nancarrow Farm
- Truro Cycling Campaign
- National Farmers Union (NFU)
- St. Allen Parish Council

2.2.5 These are listed in **Table 1-1**.

**Table 1-1 List of SoCGs**

<b>Interested Party</b>	<b>Position</b>
<b>Statutory Consultee</b>	
Cornwall Council	SoCG in draft
Natural England	Final SoCG signed, all matters agreed
Historic England	SoCG in draft
Environment Agency	Final SoCG signed, all matters agreed
Nancarrow Farm	SoCG in draft
Truro Cycling Campaign	Final SoCG signed, all matters agreed
National Farmers Union (NFU)	SoCG in draft
St Allen Parish Council	SoCG in draft

## 2.3 SoCG requested by the Examining Authority and not provided

2.3.1 Highways England does not consider it is necessary or appropriate to develop and submit an SoCG with some of the parties as requested by the ExA. This is set out below for each party.

### Health and Safety Executive (HSE)

2.3.2 As set out in the **Comments on Relevant Representations** (Document Reference 8.1) [REP1-004] document submitted at Deadline 1, Highways England considers that all matters raised by the HSE in their Relevant Representation have been resolved through engagement and therefore an SoCG is not required.

2.3.3 On 13 February 2019, the HSE submitted a Position Statement to the ExA confirming that it does not proposed to enter into an SoCG as they are satisfied that their concerns have been addressed. The Position Statement was also submitted as a Written Representation at Deadline 2 [REP1-012].

### Western Power Distribution (WPD)

2.3.4 It is expected that the issues raised by WPD will be dealt with via a side agreement and therefore an SoCG is not considered necessary.

2.3.5 A summary of the current position with WPD is provided in the **Table of Position in Relation to Statutory Undertakers** (Document Reference 8.14) submitted at Deadline 3. This will be updated throughout the remainder of the Examination to reflect ongoing discussions between Highways England and statutory undertakers.

### Arqiva

2.3.6 As set out in the **Comments on Relevant Representations** (Document Reference 8.1) [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1, Highways England considers that all matters raised by Arqiva in their Relevant Representation have been resolved through engagement and therefore an SoCG is not required.

2.3.7 Arqiva have confirmed this in a Position Statement emailed to the ExA on 15 February 2019, which states that their objections have now been addressed and that they request to withdraw their Relevant Representation. Furthermore, the

Written Representation submitted by Arqiva at Deadline 2 [REP1-007] confirmed the formal withdrawal of previous representations.

### **Scottish Power Renewables (SPR)**

- 2.3.8 Highways England is undertaking ongoing engagement with SPR and it is expected that matters with this party will be resolved through a legal agreement. A Position Statement with SPR was submitted to the ExA on 5 February 2019 which sets out the current status of the discussions between both parties. For this reason, it is not considered that an SoCG is necessary at this time.
- 2.3.9 SPR submitted a Written Representation at Deadline 2 [REP1-026] which confirmed that discussions with Highways England regarding a separate legal agreement are ongoing.
- 2.3.10 A summary of the current position with SPR is provided in the **Table of Position in Relation to Statutory Undertakers** (Document Reference 8.14) submitted at Deadline 3. This will be updated throughout the remainder of the Examination to reflect ongoing discussions between Highways England and statutory undertakers.

## 3 Status

### 3.1 Summary of current position

3.1.1 This section provides an update on the status of each SoCG.

3.1.2 **Table 1-2** provides a high-level position and where necessary includes further detail to aid understanding of the ExA. In summary, the high-level positions used in **Table 1-2** are as follows:

- **SoCG in draft** – The SoCG has been drafted by Highways England and it has been shared with the other party for comment.
- **SoCG signed with matters outstanding** – The SoCG has been signed by both parties and work is ongoing to try and resolve remaining matters outstanding.
- **Final SoCG signed, all matters agreed** – The SoCG has been signed by both parties and all matters are agreed.
- **Final SoCG signed with matters outstanding** – The final version of the SoCG has been signed by both parties, and there remain matters outstanding that Highways England and the other party agree will not be resolved during Examination.

3.1.3 Where SoCGs have been submitted with matters subject to further discussion ('Signed SoCG with matters outstanding'), all parties will continue to review these matters in order that a final update can be provided during the Examination.

3.1.4 **Table 1-2** also provides a document reference which will be used for each SoCG once signed and submitted to the ExA. Any draft SoCGs updated at each deadline will be appended to this document.



Table 1-2 Status of SoCGs at Deadline 3

Document Reference (once signed)	Party	Position at submission	Position at Deadline 1	Position at Deadline 2	Position at Deadline 3	Position at Deadline 4
<i>Statutory Consultees</i>						
7.4.1	Cornwall Council	SoCG drafted by Highways England and reviewed by Cornwall Council.  SoCG submitted with the application in draft.	Draft SoCG updated by Highways England and reviewed by Cornwall Council.  Updated SoCG submitted at Deadline 1.	No change in position from Deadline 1.	No change in position from Deadline 1.	
7.4.2	Natural England	SoCG drafted by Highways England and reviewed by Natural England.  SoCG submitted with the application in draft.	Updated draft SoCG in progress and expected to be submitted at Deadline 2.	Final SoCG signed, all matters agreed.		
7.4.3	Historic England	SoCG to be submitted during Examination.	SoCG in draft - it has been shared with Historic England for comment	SoCG in draft, this has been shared with Historic England for comment.	SoCG in draft, this is submitted at Deadline 3.	
7.4.4	Environment Agency	SoCG to be submitted during Examination.	SoCG in draft - it has been shared with the Environment Agency for comment	Final SoCG signed, all matters agreed.		
<i>Interested Parties</i>						
7.4.5	Nancarrow Farm	/	Draft SoCG being prepared by Highways England based on response to Relevant Representation.	SoCG in draft – this has been shared with Nancarrow Farm for comment.	SoCG in draft, this is submitted at Deadline 3.	
7.4.6	Truro Cycling Campaign	/	Draft SoCG being prepared by Highways England based on	SoCG in draft - this has been shared with Truro Cycling	Final SoCG signed, all matters agreed.	

Document Reference (once signed)	Party	Position at submission	Position at Deadline 1	Position at Deadline 2	Position at Deadline 3	Position at Deadline 4
			response to Relevant Representation.	Campaign for comment.		
7.4.7	National Farmers Union (NFU)	/	Draft SoCG being prepared by Highways England based on response to Relevant Representation.	SoCG in draft – this is submitted at Deadline 2.	Updated draft SoCG in progress and expected to be submitted at Deadline 4.	
7.4.8	St Allen Parish Council	/	Draft SoCG being prepared by Highways England.	Draft SoCG being prepared by Highways England based on response to Written Representation.	SoCG in draft, this is expected to be submitted at Deadline 4.	

## 4 Commonality

### 4.1 Summary

- 4.1.1 This section of the report provides a summary of principal topics covered in the SoCGs and highlights where topics have been agreed, are subject to further discussion, or where a topic is not agreed.
- 4.1.2 The summary in **Table 1-3** is presented in such a way to show topics covered within the various SoCGs and any position for each topic. The topics are defined at a high-level to enable overview and comparison and may not reflect the structure of each individual SoCG.
- 4.1.3 A tick in the table indicates where a topic is relevant to a party. Where a tick is shown but the box is blank, no matters have yet been identified in relation to a relevant topic. Where a topic is not relevant to a party, it is shown as a blank in the table and not included within the SoCG.
- 4.1.4 The position for relevant topics are shown as follows:

	Topic agreed
	Topic subject to further discussion
	Topic not agreed

Table 1-3 Table of Commonality

Document Reference	Party	Topics																					
		Principle of Development	Project Description	Consultation	Consideration of Alternatives	Engineering Design	Approach to EIA	Air Quality	Cultural Heritage	Landscape and Visual	Ecology	Geology and Soils	Materials	Noise and Vibration	Road Drainage/Water Environment	People and Communities	Public Rights of Way	Consideration of Cumulative Effects	Environmental Management	Construction Effects	De-Trunking	Traffic and Transport	Development Consent Order
7.4.1	Cornwall Council	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
7.4.2	Natural England						✓		✓	✓	✓			✓									
7.4.3	Historic England					✓		✓	✓									✓					
7.4.4	Environment Agency					✓				✓				✓									✓
7.4.5	Nancarrow Farm	✓			✓	✓			✓				✓						✓				
7.4.6	Truro Cycling Campaign			✓		✓										✓							
7.4.7	National Farmers Union (NFU)					✓		✓			✓			✓				✓			✓	✓	
7.4.8	St Allen Parish Council																						

## 4.2 General overview and principal matters outstanding

4.2.1 The following section provides an overview of the position with each party and a summary of principal matters which are outstanding. The individual SoCGs should be referred to for the full detail on specific matters.

## 4.3 Statutory consultees

### Cornwall Council

4.3.1 An updated SoCG with Cornwall Council was included at **Appendix A** of the **Statements of Common Ground** (Document Reference 7.4(A)) [REP1-003] submitted at Deadline 1, 19 February 2019.

4.3.2 Since Deadline 2, Highways England has continued to engage with Cornwall Council Officers in order to progress matters in the SoCG. Cornwall Council attended the Issue Specific Hearings on the draft DCO and Walking, Cycling and Horseriding (WCH) on 3 and 4 April 2019 respectively. A Steering Group meeting was held on 15 April 2019 to discuss matters outstanding from the hearings, particularly with reference to WCH, and to arrange a further meeting relating to the de-trunking of the existing A30.

4.3.3 The principal matters that are currently outstanding include:

- Points of detail regarding draft ES Chapters and Environmental Masterplans.
- De-trunking of the existing A30 and measures to be funded by Highways England.

4.3.4 It is the intention of both parties that an updated, signed version of the SoCG will be provided at the appropriate deadline.

### Natural England

4.3.5 An SoCG was signed by both Highways England and Natural England on 18 March 2019 with all matters agreed.

4.3.6 The signed SoCG was submitted at Deadline 2 (Document Reference 7.4.2) [REP2-018].

### Historic England

4.3.7 Since Deadline 2, Highways England has met with Historic England on 25 March 2019.

4.3.8 The purpose of this meeting was to review matters arising from the submission of the Historic England Written Representation at Deadline 1 [REP1-013, REP1-014] and the Highways England response to the Written Representation as submitted Deadline 2 in **Appendix A** of the **Comments on Written Representations** document (Document Reference 8.6) [REP2-022].

4.3.9 On 8 April 2019, Highways England issued a revised draft SoCG and a draft of Outline CEMP Annex R Scheduled Monument Protection Plan for Historic England review and comment.

4.3.10 An unsigned, draft SoCG with Historic England is provided at **Appendix A** of this document.

## Environment Agency

- 4.3.11 An SoCG was signed by the Environment Agency on 13 March 2019 with all matters agreed.
- 4.3.12 The final, signed SoCG was submitted at Deadline 2 (Document Reference 7.4.4) [REP2-019].

## 4.4 Interested Parties

### Nancarrow Farm

- 4.4.1 Highways England issued a draft SoCG to Nancarrow Farm on 6 March 2019 for their review. Nancarrow Farm submitted a version of the draft SoCG directly to the ExA at Deadline 2, 19 March 2019 [REP2-032].
- 4.4.2 Since Deadline 2, Highways England has met with Nancarrow Farm on 20 March 2019 to discuss the draft SoCG. Following this meeting, Highways England issued an updated draft SoCG to Nancarrow on 26 March 2019 for their review.
- 4.4.3 Highways England and Nancarrow Farm had a teleconference on 29 March 2019 to further discuss the draft SoCG.
- 4.4.4 Highways England shared a draft legal agreement with Nancarrow Farm on 2 April 2019 for their review.
- 4.4.5 Nancarrow Farm attended the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing on 3 April 2019.
- 4.4.6 Nancarrow provided comments on the draft SoCG on 24 April 2019.
- 4.4.7 There are a number of matters outstanding, including the principle of the development, the proposed route and route selection process, impacts on the farm and events business (including noise, landscape and heritage effects) and construction timing and impacts.
- 4.4.8 An updated draft SoCG is provided at **Appendix B** of this document.

### Truro Cycling Campaign

- 4.4.9 Highways England met with Truro Cycling Campaign on 20 March 2019 to discuss the draft SoCG that was issued to them on 15 March 2019. At this meeting, Highways England also provided the Walking Cycling and Horse-riding Review Report requested by Truro Cycling Campaign. Confirmation in writing was provided outlining Highways England's commitment to the funding of a proposed cycle bridge at Chiverton Cross through Designated Funds, a separate project to the main DCO scheme.
- 4.4.10 On 1 April 2019, Truro Cycling Campaign received written confirmation from Cornwall Council of their commitment to an additional £2million for the proposed cycle bridge.
- 4.4.11 The meeting and written confirmations of commitment to a cycle crossing at Chiverton junction under the separate Designated Funds programme was sufficient to satisfy the primary matter outstanding between Highways England and Truro Cycling Campaign; the aspiration for a cycle crossing at Chiverton junction.

- 4.4.12 Subsequently, the draft SoCG was finalised with all matters agreed and signed by Highways England and Truro Cycling Campaign on 1 April 2019. This document is submitted at Deadline 3 (Document Reference 7.4.6).
- 4.4.13 Truro Cycling Campaign attended the Issue Specific Hearing on Walking, Cycling and Horseriding on 4 April 2019, in which they confirmed that their objection relating to the Chiverton cycle crossing had now been resolved.

#### **National Farmers Union (NFU)**

- 4.4.14 A draft SoCG with the NFU was submitted to the ExA at Deadline 2 in **Appendix A** of the **Statements of Common Ground** (Document Reference 7.4(B)) [REP2-017].
- 4.4.15 The NFU attended the second Issue Specific Hearing on the draft DCO on 3 April 2019.
- 4.4.16 On 9 April 2019, Highways England issued a draft of Outline CEMP Annex P Outline Soil Management Plan to the NFU for their review.
- 4.4.17 A telecon meeting with the NFU was held on 16 April 2019 and their comments on the Outline Soil Management Plan were received.
- 4.4.18 This additional annex to the Outline CEMP is submitted at Deadline 3 in the updated **Outline CEMP Annexes** (Document Reference 6.4(A)), taking into account the comments provided by the NFU.
- 4.4.19 In accordance with the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing Action Points [EV-008], Highways England expects to submit an updated draft SoCG with the NFU at Deadline 4.

#### **St Allen Parish Council**

- 4.4.20 Highways England issued a draft SoCG to St. Allen Parish Council on 26 March 2019.
- 4.4.21 St. Allen Parish Council met to discuss the content of the draft SoCG on 8 April 2019. Highways England subsequently attended a meeting with the chair of St. Allen Parish Council to discuss the draft SoCG on 15 April 2019.
- 4.4.22 Highways England is awaiting the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 15 April 2019 and will update the SoCG based on the minutes.
- 4.4.23 Highways England expects to submit a draft SoCG with St. Allen Parish Council at Deadline 4.

# Appendix A Draft SoCG with Historic England





**European Union**

European Regional  
Development Fund

**ARUP**

Working on behalf of



## **A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross**

# **Statement of Common Ground with Historic England**

### **Notice**

This document and its contents have been prepared and are intended solely for Highways England's information and use in relation to the A30 Carland Cross to Chiverton Scheme. Arup assumes no responsibility to any other party in respect of, arising out of or in connection with this document and/or its contents.

# Table of contents

	Pages
1 Introduction	i
1.1 Purpose of this document	i
1.2 Structure of this SoCG	i
1.3 Status of this SoCG	i
2 Consultation	ii
2.1 Role of Historic England	ii
2.2 Summary of consultation	ii
3 Matters agreed	iv
4 Matters outstanding	xi
4.1 Principal matters outstanding	xi
Appendix A Signing Sheet	xvii

## Table of Tables

Table 2-1 Consultation with HBMCE	ii
Table 3.1 Matters agreed between Historic England (HBMCE) and Highways England	iv
Table 4.1 Matters outstanding between HBMCE and Highways England	xii

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This document is a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between Highways England and Historic England (HBMCE) 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 process<sup>1</sup>.
- 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 stage.

## 1.2 Structure of this SoCG

- 1.2.1 The SoCG is structured as follows:
- Section 2 states the role of HBMCE in the application and sets out the consultation undertaken from 2016.
  - Section 3 lists those matters which have been agreed, including the date that this matter was agreed.
  - Section 4 is a table of matters outstanding, incorporating a description of the matter, the position of HBMCE, 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 This SoCG is a correct reflection of the position of the parties as of 24 April 2019 [Deadline 3]. Both parties will continue to review the matters that are still subject to negotiation/clarification.

---

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

## 2 Consultation

### 2.1 Role of Historic England

2.1.1 Historic England (HBMCE) is the public body that looks after England's historic environment.

2.1.2 Status in relation to the application –

- Statutory consultee under section 42(a) of the Planning Act 2008 ('the Act').

### 2.2 Summary of consultation

2.2.1 Highways England has been in consultation with HBMCE since late 2016. The parties have continued communicating throughout the progression of the project.

2.2.2 The consultation with HBMCE is set out below within Table 2-1, comprised of meetings and emails.

**Table 2-1 Consultation with HBMCE**

Date	Parties involved	Matters discussed
16/11/2016	WSP, HBMCE	Discussion on the implication of the scheme design on the Scheduled Monuments located adjacent to the Carland Cross roundabout junction and how the design could be improved to accommodate them. Discussion on impact on Listed milestone at Chybucca junction and that relocation to side road would be acceptable. Concerns over impact of Chiverton junction on St Peter's Church. Discussion over impacts of alternatives at Marazavose on Chyverton Park and Nancarrow Farm.
12/10/2016 non-statutory consultation Launch Event  Non-statutory consultation, 15 October 2016 to 2 December 2016	WSP, HBMCE	<p>As part of the scheme development, Highways England held a public consultation from 15 October 2016 to 2 December 2016.</p> <p><b>Consultation Report Appendices Part 1, Appendix B Report on Public Consultation (June 2017) including Addendum to Report on Public Consultation</b> (Document Reference 5.2) [APP-030]</p> <p>This section details the non-statutory consultation with consultees carried out between 15 October 2016 to 2 December 2016. Feedback from HBMCE is recorded under section 3.4.1 'Feedback from Section 42 consultee groups' as:</p> <p><i>"Historic England is interested in the effects of the scheme on the historic environment, such as scheduled monuments and listed buildings. It is recognised that a number of factors influence the choice of route location, including topography, settlements and environmental features. The proposals were not considered to contain any "showstoppers", however care is needed to minimise any harmful effects and opportunities to enhance the setting of historic assets should be considered. In particular, Historic England are keen to re-establish a connection between the barrows at Carland Cross by the removal of the section of the existing A30 between the existing junction and the heathland. Historic England would like to see the separation between the new A30 at Chybucca and the tumuli Scheduled Monument maximised as far as possible. Concerns were raised about the visual impact of the proposed junction at Chiverton on the Listed Church to the north. Potential impacts on the barrow</i></p>

Date	Parties involved	Matters discussed
		<i>group to the south of the existing Chiverton junction were of less concern but still need consideration. It was considered that the potential impacts on some of the historic assets is tolerable if a balance can be achieved with positive contributions elsewhere. It was seen as important to find the right long-term solution, so to avoid the need for further alterations in future years.”</i>
20/01/17	WSP, HBMCE	Discussion on junction layout options for Carland Cross, impact of options on Nancarrow Farm and Chyverton Park at Marazanvose, and options for Chiverton junction.
18/5/2017	WSP, HBMCE	Discussion on the implication of the preferred scheme design on the Scheduled Monuments located adjacent to the Carland Cross roundabout junction and treatment of section of existing A30.
Statutory consultation, 29 January 2018 to 12 March 2018	HBMCE	<p><b>Section 42 Consultation in 2018</b></p> <p>The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) was produced in consultation with key stakeholders.</p> <p><b>Consultation Report</b> (Document Reference 5.1) [APP-029]</p> <p>This details the statutory consultation with consultees carried out in accordance with section 42 of the Act between 29 January 2018 and 12 March 2018. Feedback from Section 42 consultee groups is recorded in Table 8.1 ‘<i>Summary of responses and regard had to response: section 42(1)(a)(b) prescribed consultees</i>’ of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>The matters raised by HBMCE and Highways England responses can be found on pages 81-85.</p>
15/01/2018	Arup, HBMCE	Discussion on the route being assessed, requirement for retaining structure to preserve scheduled barrow, summary of impacts at barrow cemetery at Carland Cross.
02/02/2018	Arup, Highways England, HBMCE	Discussion regarding options for lowering alignment to the north of Warrens Barrow at Carland Cross.
10/05/2018  12/06/2018	From Arup to HBMCE	<p>Email to HBMCE (twice) in advance of meeting, attached information requested by/promised to HBMCE. These were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nanteague Farm and Carland Cross Options Report</li> <li>• Photomontage from the barrow south of the existing A30 at Carland Cross</li> <li>• Before and after view from Warrens Barrow, looking towards Newlyn Down</li> <li>• Retaining Wall options report</li> </ul>
14/06/2019	From Arup to HBMCE	<p>Email to HBMCE attaching all ES Cultural Heritage appendices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volume 6 Document Ref 6.4 ES Appendix 6.1 Heritage assets</li> <li>• Volume 6 Document Ref 6.4 ES Appendix 6.2 Cultural heritage desk-based assessment</li> </ul>

Date	Parties involved	Matters discussed
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volume 6 Document Ref 6.4 ES Appendix 6.3 Geophysical report</li> <li>• Volume 6 Document Ref 6.4 ES Appendix 6.4 Trial trenching report</li> </ul>
14/06/2018	From Arup to HBMCE	Email to HBMCE attaching the general scheme arrangements
02/07/2018	Arup to HBMCE	Email to HBMCE attaching the trial trenching report in advance of meeting.
03/07/2018	Arup, Highways England, HBMCE	Meeting to discuss proposed trial trench to investigate Neolithic remains of possible national significance, Highways England approach to scheduling of remains on infrastructure schemes.
10/09/2018	Arup to HBMCE	Email to advise the A30 application has been submitted and is available on the PINS website
22/11/2018	HBMCE to PINS	Relevant Representation
01/02/2019	Arup to HBMCE	Issue of Detailed Response to Relevant Representation
11/02/2019	Arup and HBMCE	Meeting to discuss Highways England Response to HBMCE Relevant Representation
19/02/2019	HBMCE to PINS	Written Representation
24/03/2019	Arup to HBMCE	Issue of Detailed Response to Written Representation
25/03/2019	Arup and HBMCE	Meeting to discuss Highways England Response to HBMCE Written Representation and to further discuss matters outstanding
08/04/2019	Arup to HBMCE	Arup provided HBMCE with a draft SoCG for comment.
18/04/2019	Arup to HBMCE	Additional photomontages issued to HBMCE for review and comment: Photomontage at Four Burrows; Photomontage at the southern Carland Cross barrow; and Photomontage at the proposed viewing location towards Newlyn Downs.

### 3 Matters agreed

- 3.1.1 The table below shows those matters which have been agreed by the parties, including a reference number for each matter, and the date and method by which it was agreed. Further details pertaining to the matters agreed can be found appended in the **Comments on Relevant Representations** (Annex B of Document Reference 8.1) [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1; and **Comments on Written Representations** (Appendix A of Document Reference 8.6) [REP2-022] submitted at Deadline 2.

**Table 3.1 Matters agreed between Historic England (HBMCE) and Highways England**

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
<b>Pre-Examination</b>		
1	The overall assessment of the level of impact for the World Heritage Site is correct	Written representation 21/11/18
2	.... we welcome the reduction in traffic that the new route will bring...	Extract from written representation 21/11/18
3	<b>Warrens barrow (SM 29681; NHLE no. 1016888) and Round barrow cemetery 420m north-east of Higher Ennis Farm (SM 32903; NHLE no. 1020758).</b> We welcome the removal of the existing A30 from between these two separately designated elements of the round barrow cemetery at Carland Cross. This will reinstate the overall connectivity of the cemetery and allow for an improved management regime for Warren's barrow.	Extract from written representation 21/11/18
<b>Examination</b>		
<b>4. The Carland Cross round barrow cemetery as a whole (Written Representation section 6.2)</b>		
4.1	HBMCE and Highways England agree with the description of the asset.	Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019
4.2	HBMCE and Highways England broadly agree on the significance of the asset. Differences of opinion are academic and do not affect the outcome of the assessment and associated impact.	Written Representation 19/02/2019

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
		Written Representation response 24/03/2019
4.3	HBMCE and Highways England agree that the re-routing of the A30 would allow the link between Warrens Barrow and the round barrow cemetery 420m north east of Higher Ennis Farm to be re-established and appreciated.	Meeting with HBMCE 11/02/2019 Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019
4.4	Highways England has agreed to investigate the potential for environmental gain for the whole of the Carland Cross barrow cemetery.  [This is detailed further in Matters Outstanding. See Matter 22 Carland Cross in Table 4-1.]	Meeting with HBMCE 11/02/2019 Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019
<b>5. The scheduled monument Warren's Barrow (SM 29681; NHLE 1016888) (Written Representation sections 6.3 and 7.5)</b>		
5.1	It is considered that the overall impact at Warrens Barrow should be considered Large Adverse impact rather than Moderate. An Addendum to the Environmental Statement will be produced by Highways England and will be submitted at a later deadline.	Meeting with HBMCE 11/02/2019
5.2	HBMCE and Highways England agree that the proposed embankment at Carland Cross would result in the loss of views from Warrens Barrow towards Newlyn Downs	Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019
5.3	Highways England has agreed to clear the scrub present on Warrens Barrow during the construction phase. HBMCE has agreed to explore options for maintenance of the vegetation at Warrens Barrow to be implemented by Highways England.	Meeting with HBMCE 11/02/2019
<b>6. The scheduled monument round barrow cemetery 420m north east of Higher Ennis Farm (SM 32903; NHLE 1020758) (Written Representation sections 6.4 and 7.4)</b>		
6.1	HBMCE and Highways England agree that the asset will benefit from the removal of the current A30 which will allow for Warrens Barrow to be reunited with the cemetery as a whole.	Meeting with HBMCE 11/02/2019



Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
<b>7. The Scheduled Monument Two bowl barrows 290m and 375m north of Higher Ennis Farm (SM 32902; NHLE 1017050) (Written Representation sections 6.5 and 7.3)</b>		
7.1	HBMCE and Highways England broadly agree with the description and significance of the asset.	Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019
7.2	<p>HBMCE and Highways England agree with the impact on the asset, particularly the impact to the northernmost of the two barrows which will be bounded by the new carriageway.</p> <p>Highways England agrees with and highlights HBMCE's statement in its Written Representation:</p> <p><i>'The Scheme will result in the outlook from this barrow being a view immediately across the new carriageway of the A30 in a cutting immediately below the barrow. Although there will be a greater visual impact than the current A30, which is also adjacent, the lower level will help to offset the increased width and HBMCE consider the harm to the significance of this barrow from the new Scheme to be towards the middle of the less than substantial range.'</i></p>	Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019
7.3	<p>Following a request from HBMCE requesting an engineering solution be investigated to avoid harm to the setting of the northernmost barrow of NHLE 1017050, it has been agreed that a ground nail solution to the retained cut will avoid the need to encroach on the scheduled area. In addition, Highways England has agreed to carry out geophysical survey once scrub clearance has been carried out to fully define the area of the barrow to avoid disturbance during construction.</p> <p>Highways England agree with the principle of a programme of environmental works to benefit the barrows, and will continue to engage with HBMCE to achieve a satisfactory outcome.</p>	Meeting with HBMCE 11/02/2019 Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019
<b>8. The scheduled monument bowl barrow 500m north west of Higher Ennis Farm (SM 32901; NHLE 1017049) (Written Representation section 6.6)</b>		
8.1	HBMCE and Highways England agree with the description, significance and impact of this asset	Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
<b>9. Prehistoric long barrow and four round barrows 580m and 750m south west of Mitchell Farm (SM 32907; NHLE 1017350) (Written Representation section 6.7)</b>		
9.1	HBMCE has noted that the asset will be enveloped within a construction compound and have requested the CEMP includes for the protection of scheduled monuments. Highways England has agreed that a draft Scheduled Monument Protection Plan will be produced for HBMCE review and comment, the implementation of which will be secured as an Annex of the Outline CEMP. This is submitted at Deadline 3 as Annex R Scheduled Monument Protection Plan of the Outline CEMP Annexes (Document Reference 6.4(A)).	Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019
<b>10. The Four Burrows scheduled monument (SM 29602; NHLE 1016064) (Issue 8 Relevant Representation) (Written Representation sections 6.8, 7.2 and 7.8)</b>		
10.1	HBMCE agree that the visual impact of the current A30 as it passes Four Burrows would be reduced if a reduction in the width of the carriageway at this point was implemented. The existing A30 will be detrunked, operated and maintained by Cornwall Council as part of the local road network (to be secured by a legal agreement), however, it forms part of the strategic diversion route for the new A30, during planned maintenance works and for emergency incident management. As part of this diversion route for the strategic traffic from the new A30, there will be a minimum width requirement of 6.8m to allow two opposing Heavy Goods Vehicles to pass safely.	Meeting with HBMCE 11/02/2019
10.2	Highways England has reviewed this assessment and agree with HBMCE's position for this asset. The assessment in the Environmental Statement will be amended to reflect this and will be submitted at a later deadline.	Written Representation response 24/03/2019
<b>11. The scheduled monument bowl barrow 100m south west of Callestick Vean (SM 29618; NHLE 1016103) (Written Representation section 6.9)</b>		
11.1	HBMCE and Highways England agree with the description, significance and impact on the asset.	Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019
<b>12. The scheduled monument hill fort 250m south west of Tresawsen (SM 29671; NHLE 1016445) (Written Representation section 6.10)</b>		
12.1	HBMCE and Highways England agree with the description, significance and impact on the asset.	Written Representation 19/02/2019

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
		Written Representation response 24/03/2019
<b>13. The scheduled monument bowl barrow 130m south east of Penglaze (SM 29680; NHLE 1016887) (Written Representation section 6.11)</b>		
13.1	HBMCE and Highways England agree with the description, significance and impact on the asset.	Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019
13.2	HBMCE agree that the visual impact of the current A30 as it passes the Bowl Barrow would be reduced if a reduction in the width of the carriageway at this point was implemented. The existing A30 will be detrunked and operated and maintained by Cornwall Council as part of the local road network (to be secured by a legal agreement) , however, it forms part of the strategic diversion route for the new A30, during planned maintenance works and for emergency incident management. As part of this diversion route for the strategic traffic from the new A30, there will be a minimum width requirement of 6.8m to allow two opposing Heavy Goods Vehicles to pass safely. On this basis, Highways England and Cornwall Council can confirm that they will reduce the existing road width through this section adjacent to Bowl Barrow from its current width of 7.2m to the minimum requirement of 6.8m.	Meeting with HBMCE 11/02/2019
<b>14. The Three Burrows scheduled monument (SM 29604; NHLE 1016056) (Written Representation section 6.12)</b>		
14.1	HBMCE and Highways England agree with the description, significance and impact on the asset.	Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019
<b>15. Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site (NHLE 1000105) (Written Representation section 6.13)</b>		
15.1	HBMCE and Highways England agree with the assessment of the impact where it is anticipated that a slight beneficial effect will be experienced due to the loss of lighting at Chiverton Junction.	Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019
<b>16. Two individually listed Grade II Milestones (NHLE 1140923) and (NHLE 1394843) (Written Representation section 6.14)</b>		

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
16.1	<p>Any assets, including milestones, removed and intended for re-setting should be subject to a detailed works management plan detailing removal, transport storage and reinstatement details with significant dates identified.</p> <p>HBMCE are content that <i>Annex J: Methodology for the Milestone Protection Management Plan</i> of the <b>Outline CEMP Annexes</b> (Document Reference 6.4(A)), provides a detailed methodology to protect the two historic carved milestones which would be affected by the A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross scheme.</p>	<p>Meeting with HBMCE 11/02/2019</p> <p>Written Representation 19/02/2019</p> <p>Written Representation response 24/03/2019</p>
<b>17. The Grade I Listed Building at Trerice (NHLE 1328731) (Written Representation section 6.16)</b>		
17.1	<p>It was agreed that Highways England would undertake an assessment of the Grade I Listed Building at Trerice. This has now been completed, the assessment shows there is no impact to the asset. This will be included as an Addendum to the Environmental Statement and will be submitted at a later deadline.</p>	<p>Meeting with HBMCE 11/02/2019</p> <p>Written Representation 19/02/2019</p> <p>Written Representation response 24/03/2019</p>
<b>18. Mitigation Route Map (Written Representation section 7.9)</b>		
18.1	<p>HBMCE and Highways England agree that the Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation should cover:</p> <p><i>‘... archaeological monitoring of all excavation works as determined by the archaeological contractor who should be present during all relevant groundworks. An appropriate and proportionate response to the potential for archaeological remains should be identified as part of the WSI under the CEMP to be executed by a recognised professional and appropriately experienced archaeological team.’</i> (extract from HBMCE’s Written Representation)</p> <p>The WSI will be produced by the appointed archaeological contractors and an updated version of the WSI will be produced. An outline document is contained at Annex F: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation of the <b>Outline CEMP Annexes</b> (Document Reference 6.4) [APP-376].</p>	<p>Written Representation 19/02/2019</p> <p>Written Representation response 24/03/2019</p>
18.2	<p>HBMCE agree that Requirement 9 of the <b>draft DCO</b> (Document Reference 3.1(D)) secures a scheme for the investigation and mitigation of areas of archaeological interest, reflecting the mitigation measures included in <b>Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage</b> of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-059].</p>	<p>Written Representation 19/02/2019</p> <p>Written Representation response 24/03/2019</p>
<b>19. Development Consent Order (Written Representation section 8)</b>		

Matter reference number	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
19.1	HBMCE are satisfied that their concerns regarding encroachment within the scheduled monuments are adequately addressed as shown on Sheets 3, 6, 7, and 8 of the <b>Works Plans</b> (Document Reference 2.4(C)). In addition, HBMCE are satisfied that the requested amendments to the Outline CEMP protect the scheduled monuments sufficiently.	Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019
19.2	HBMCE and Highways England are in agreement that liaison with the local planning authority's archaeological advisor will be included within the <b>Outline CEMP</b> (Document Reference 6.4(A)).	Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019
19.3	HBMCE are satisfied that all other elements of the draft DCO are sufficient and any queries have been resolved via the Written Representation response.	Written Representation 19/02/2019 Written Representation response 24/03/2019
<b>20. Methodology (Issue 1 and Issue 2 Relevant Representation)</b>		
20.1	<p>Listing is a national designation, therefore Grade II Listed Buildings, which are considered to be of special architectural and historic interest, should be assessed alongside the other national designations and their significance not underplayed as regionally important.</p> <p>Highways England has followed the DMRB methodology with regard to the value of heritage assets.</p> <p>Highways England have agreed to review the assessment and produce a note to confirm that the significance of effect upon Grade II listed buildings would not differ if they were treated as high value.</p>	Meeting with HBMCE 11/01/2019
<b>21. Nancarrow Farmhouse and attached wall LBII (NHLE no. 1136610) and Chyverton Park RPGII (NHLE no. 1000512) (Issue 9 Relevant Representation)</b>		
21.1	<p>HBMCE remain unable to comment in detail on the relative historic environment impacts of the proposed route in relation to the above designated heritage assets since the previously requested options appraisal for the route between these designated heritage assets has not been supplied.</p> <p>However, it has been agreed that this is a matter for the Cornwall Council Historic Environment Team who are responsible for the management of Listed Buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens.</p>	Meeting with HBMCE 11/02/2019

## 4 Matters outstanding

### 4.1 Principal matters outstanding

- 4.1.1 The table below sets out the matters which are outstanding between Highways England and HBMCE.
- 4.1.2 The table describes the matter being discussed and the HBMCE'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 4.1 Matters outstanding between HBMCE and Highways England**

Matter reference number	HBMCE's position	Highways England position	Date of the position
<p><b>22. Carland Cross</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Carland Cross round barrow cemetery as a whole (Written Representation section 6.2)</li> <li>• The scheduled monument Warrens Barrow (SM 29681; NHLE 1016888) (Written Representation section 6.3)</li> <li>• The scheduled monument round barrow cemetery 420m north east of Higher Ennis Farm (SM 32903; NHLE 1020758) (Written Representation sections 6.4 and 7.4)</li> <li>• The Scheduled Monument Two bowl barrows 290m and 375m north of Higher Ennis Farm (SM 32902; NHLE 1017050) (Written Representation section 6.5)</li> </ul>			
22.1	<p>The impact on the barrow cemetery as a whole, including the two bowl barrows 290m and 375m north of Higher Ennis Farm; the round barrow cemetery 420m north east of Higher Ennis Farm; and Warrens Barrow has the potential to result in harm.</p> <p>HBMCE's position on this is clearly stated in detail in their Written Representation and can be summarised:</p> <p>HBMCE require the scheme to be lowered in order to minimise the following impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- loss of spatial references at the cemetery as a whole arising from the removal of its primary outlook, Warrens Barrow;</li> <li>- Loss of distant, commanding views resulting in loss of significance derived from this aspect of the setting of the barrows.</li> </ul>	<p>Highways England has concluded that there is no viable solution for substantial reduction in impact to the setting, in particular Warrens Barrow, however, Highways England will continue to explore this issue further at detailed design. A 0.5m change in vertical alignment is within the limits of deviation for the scheme, however it is not considered that lowering the scheme by 0.5m would make any discernible difference.</p> <p>Following the meeting between HBMCE and Highways England on 11 February 2019 and in the response to the Relevant Representation, it was agreed that a photomontage of the scheme from the barrow cemetery will be provided to HBMCE during the Examination. The location of this photomontages was agreed in a meeting on 25 March 2019. During this meeting, a photomontage at Warrens Barrow was also provided for consideration by HBMCE.</p> <p>HBMCE and Highways England are exploring and continuing to discuss a range of environmental benefits that the scheme could deliver to offset the impacts of the junction design, in addition to benefits already embedded in the design. These include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A viewing location adjacent to the new A30 carriageway replacing views from Warrens Barrow. Sheet 18 of the Environmental Masterplans will be updated to include this and will be provided to the</li> </ul>	<p>Meeting on 25 March 2019</p> <p>Photomontage issued on 18 April 2019</p>

Matter reference number	HBMCE's position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		<p>Examination at Deadline 4 (a draft will be provided to HBMCE once available).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A PRoW is currently proposed between Warrens Barrow and the barrows to the south. It is proposed a further PRoW is included to direct walkers, cyclists and horseriders to the proposed viewing location.</li> <li>- Interpretation boards will be installed in consultation with HBMCE.</li> <li>- Scrub clearance at Warren's Barrow during construction followed by barrow maintenance (to be explored by HBMCE) will allow the barrow to be removed from the Heritage At Risk register.</li> <li>- Continued consultation with HBMCE on the potential for the underpass to include archaeological interpretation to give further benefits.</li> </ul> <p>Highways England agreed to provide an additional viewpoint and photomontage at the proposed viewing location, this was agreed with HBMCE during the meeting on 25 March 2019. The viewpoint and photomontage has been provided to the examination and HBMCE for Deadline 3 in <b>Additional Photomontages</b> (Document Reference 8.16).</p> <p>Highways England will review and discuss any feedback provided by HBMCE on the Photomontages. Meeting scheduled with HBMCE for 29 April 2019.</p>	
<b>23. The Grade II Listed Building: Church of St Peter at Chiverton, Grade II (NHLE no. 1141481) (Written Representation section 6.15)</b>			
23.1	The church tower is a prominent landmark in views from most directions. HBMCE's is concerned that views from the A30 heading west from the general vicinity of the 'four burrows' scheduled monument will be obstructed by the proposed new junction. The significance of these views being that the church tower, the highest structure in the area	Alternative mainline vertical alignments and Chiverton junction layouts have been considered in this area to attempt to lower the level of the scheme and this was presented to HBMCE in early 2018. This confirmed that reducing the level of the scheme through this area would have significant engineering and drainage challenges and significant costs, impacts and risks associated with changing the design at this stage of development, including:	Set out in Written Representation response 24/03/2019



Matter reference number	HBMCE's position	Highways England position	Date of the position
	<p>at the time of construction, was a prominent focal point for the medieval congregation and an identifiable landmark for all.</p> <p>HBMCE has requested a viewpoint and visualisation is undertaken and prepared showing views from Four Burrows towards St Peters Church.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need to include an approximate 100m length of additional retaining wall along adjacent to the Starbucks to protect this business.</li> <li>• The need to relocate three drainage attenuation basins, with associated engineering difficulties (groundwater) and additional land take with new landowners affected, which would result in additional land costs and the need to re-consult with landowners in the area.</li> <li>• Increased risk of groundwater becoming a serious issue due to the existing high groundwater levels in the area, which would be very difficult to mitigate.</li> <li>• Increased earthworks resulting in additional fill and impacts on the overall scheme earthworks balance, with significant additional costs.</li> <li>• Increased noise impacts on the adjacent receptors with the alternative junction layout.</li> </ul> <p>On this basis, it was concluded that it is not possible to reduce the level of the scheme in this area. In addition, it was also concluded that there is no additional mitigation that could significantly affect the heritage assessment of this area.</p> <p>Highways England has assessed the impacts of the scheme by road users enjoying the views across the landscape, within which the tower of Grade II listed St Peter's Church and the nearby– Four Burrows Barrow Cemetery (1016054) in <b>Chapter 7 Landscape</b> of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-060] <i>Table 7-13 Summary of residual visual operational effects</i>. Here the residual visual operational effect is reported as <b>slight adverse</b>. Highways England consider there would not be significant landscape, visual or heritage effects on the setting or significance of the Scheduled Ancient Barrows at Four Burrows or on the Grade II Listed Church of Saint Peter.</p> <p>At meeting 11/02/19 Highways England undertook to provide a photographic representation of the view from the A30 to the west of Four Burrows. A viewpoint was agreed in a meeting with HBMCE on 25 March 2019 and the photo will be used for visualisation as agreed with HBMCE.</p>	

Matter reference number	HBMCE's position	Highways England position	Date of the position
		The photography will be centred on the Church and will be verifiable winter views taken using a 50mm fixed lens. This has been provided to the Examination and HBMCE at Deadline 3 in the <b>Additional Photomontages</b> (Document Reference 8.16).	
<b>24. Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Written Representation section 7.10)</b>			
24.1	HBMCE have requested location, extent, special provisions and liabilities of all concerned regarding the scheduled monuments affected or adjacent to the Scheme to be included in the CEMP.	<p>Highways England agree to update paragraph 16.8.10 of the <b>Outline CEMP</b> (Document Reference 6.4) [APP-375] to include the comments regarding training/site induction concerning the scheduled monuments. This will be provided to the Examination at Deadline 3 in the updated <b>Outline CEMP</b> (Document Reference 6.4(A)).</p> <p>The contractor and its sub-contractors will establish a regime of toolbox talks such that every employee receives a health, safety &amp; environmental briefing as appropriate, with a target of a minimum of one toolbox talk on an environmental topic per month.</p> <p>Protection of scheduled monuments has been added as a topic for a toolbox talk for all site staff. Additional information is also provided in Annex R: Scheduled Monument Protection Plan also submitted at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>Written Representation 19/02/2019</p> <p>Written Representation response 24/03/2019</p>
24.2	HBMCE have requested the methodology for the Outline Milestone Protection Management Plan to be agreed with the relevant Conservation Officer.	Annex J of the <b>Outline CEMP Annexes</b> (Document Reference 6.4) [APP-376 states "1.3.1 A full detailed CEMP will be produced during the detailed design stage of the scheme and agreed with HBMCE and the Senior Development Officer (Historic Environment) at Cornwall Council prior to construction."	<p>Written Representation 19/02/2019</p> <p>Written Representation response 24/03/2019</p>
24.3	HBMCE considers the production of an integrated interpretation strategy to be an essential outcome of the Scheme if it is to be considered as a mitigating factor in their landscape. This strategy should incorporate on-site interpretation.	Highways England agree that a high-level interpretation strategy will be included within the <b>Outline CEMP</b> (Document Reference 6.4(A)) and will be discussed with HBMCE. This will be provided at Deadline 5 of the Examination.	<p>Written Representation 19/02/2019</p> <p>Written Representation response 24/03/2019</p>
<b>25. Development Consent Order (DCO) – Limits Of Deviation (Written Representation section 8.2.2)</b>			

Matter reference number	HBMCE's position	Highways England position	Date of the position
25.1	<p>HBMCE is concerned that the 0.5m vertical limit of deviation at Carland Cross may limit any alternative engineering options that would reduce the impact on Warren's Barrow scheduled monument through reduction of levels. In order to reduce the obstruction of views and subsequent impact up upon Warren's Barrow and the round barrow cemetery scheduled monuments it would be necessary to reduce the levels of the slip road and car carriageway. HBMCE are informed that in order for this to be over 500mm. The scheme start point east of Carland Cross may need to move further east in order to accommodate this.</p>	<p>The scheme design cannot be changed beyond the limits of deviation expressed in Article 8 of the <b>draft DCO</b> (Document Reference 3.1(D)).</p> <p>As detailed in Highways England's response to the HBMCE Relevant Representation in Appendix B of the <b>Comments on Relevant Representations</b> (Document Reference 8.1) [REP1-004], the route is highly constrained horizontally and vertically in this area due to the abandoned quarry pond and bowl barrow (north of Higher Ennis Farm) to the west; the wind turbines and their exclusion zones and the Newlyn Downs European Designated Site (SAC) to the north; the tie-in to the existing A30 to the east; and, the tie-in to the existing Carland Cross roundabout to the south.</p> <p>Any lowering of the vertical alignment of the A30 and associated side roads at Carland Cross by anything more than 0.5m would result in a direct impact on the quarry pond and its water level; would require a change of form of retaining structure at the bowl barrow with an increased risk of impact on associated buried archaeology; would lead to encroachment into the wind turbine exclusion zones which is not permitted; and, would lead to increased programme and costs and health and safety risks with a longer length of tie-in works to the existing A30.</p>	<p>24 March 2019</p> <p>Set out in Written Representation response 24/03/2019</p>

# Appendix A Signing Sheet

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Historic England (HBMCE)
Name	
Position	
Date	

For signing	
Signed	
On Behalf of	Highways England
Name	
Position	
Date	

# Appendix B Draft SoCG with Nancarrow Farm



**European Union**

European Regional  
Development Fund

Working on behalf of



# **A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross**

## **Statement of Common Ground with Nancarrow Farm**

**DRAFT**

## 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	8
4 Matters agreed	9
5 Matters outstanding	15
5.1 Principal matters outstanding	15
5.2 Specific matters outstanding	15
Appendix A Signing Sheet	40

### Tables

Table 2.1 Consultation	3
Table 4.1 Matters agreed between Nancarrow Farm and Highways England	9
Table 5.1 Matters not agreed between Nancarrow Farm and Highways England	16

# 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 process<sup>1</sup>.
- 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. The document was discussed at a meeting held on 20 March 2019 and at a subsequent conference call on 29 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

2.1.2 Whilst the two 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.

2.1.3 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. This includes 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).

2.1.4 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.

2.1.5 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) and is partner in the farm business.

#### **Status in relation to the application**

2.1.6 The land which constitutes Nancarrow Farm is under multiple ownership and tenancy. As per the submitted **Book of Reference** (Document Reference 4.3(A)) [AS-034] 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

2.1.7 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.

2.1.8 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 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"> <li>• Height of vertical alignment in the vicinity of the farm</li> <li>• Noise effects from height of road next to farm</li> <li>• Access across the new and existing A30 to northern fields from the farm, access to farmyard</li> <li>• Proximity of attenuation pond to wedding venue</li> <li>• Opposition to the preferred route and option selection process around Marazanvose including criticism of the assessments underpinning the Scheme Assessment Report</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Height of vertical alignment in the vicinity of the farm</li> <li>• Noise effects from height of road next to farm</li> <li>• Access across the new and existing A30 to northern fields from the farm, access to farmyard</li> <li>• Proximity of attenuation pond to wedding venue</li> <li>• Opposition to the preferred route and option selection process around Marazanvose including</li> </ul>

Date	Method	Topic	Consultation Details
			<p>criticism of the assessments underpinning the Scheme Assessment Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction effects and impacts on wedding business</li> </ul>
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	<p>The meeting was held to discuss the following aspects of the scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposition to the preferred route and option selection process around Marazanvose including criticism of the assessments underpinning the Scheme Assessment Report</li> <li>Position of laybys at Marazanvose</li> <li>Provision of noise and landscape mitigation through false cutting and noise screening</li> <li>Critique of noise assessments and potential impact on wedding business</li> <li>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</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Access to farmhouse around earthworks of the Green bridge</li> <li>• Critique of noise assessments and potential impacts on wedding business</li> <li>• Construction noise impact on business</li> <li>• Return of land to previous state used for existing A30 junction at Two Barrows underpass</li> <li>• Translocation of existing trees</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Response to matters raised in targeted consultation</li> <li>• Impacts during construction and mitigation measures</li> <li>• Optioneering process</li> <li>• Updates to access and design for submission</li> </ul>
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.
18/03/2019	Highways England Landscape specialist	Phone call	Call to discuss queries regarding the landscape proposals in the vicinity of the scheme.
20/03/2019	Highways England and Nancarrow	Meeting	Meeting to present construction noise modelling and discuss the contents of the draft Statement of Common Ground.

Date	Method	Topic	Consultation Details
29/03/2019	Teleconference	Legal agreement and SoCG	Phone call to discuss the content of the SoCG and proposed legal agreement following the meeting held 20 March 2019.
24/04/2019	Email	Comments on SoCG	Nancarrow Farm sent an email to Highways England with their comments on the SoCG ahead of Deadline 3.

### 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.	<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(C)).</p> <p>Highways England accept that this was not the preferred option for the access, which was a proposed dedicated bridge across Killivose Lane. This was deemed unfeasible by Highways England. Highways England accept that the current access is better than the proposed access, and that it results in the loss of strategic land.</p>	<p>Meeting held 07/06/2018</p> <p>Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018</p>
2.	<p>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.</p> <p>The removal of an access track was proposed from the farmyard to the east prior to the statutory consultation as it was deemed unviable, as 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. Highways England understand that this is significantly worse than the existing access.</p>	<p>Meeting held 14/02/2018</p> <p>Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018</p>
3.	<p>The green bridge has been designed to maintain access to the adjacent fields and farmyard by minimising its footprint through increasing the slope gradient.</p> <p>Further detailed design work will be undertaken to ensure minimum impact on these strategically imperative fields, as well as access to 'Jose's meadow' (the strip of land retained to the east of the green bridge, currently cut off).</p>	<p>Meeting held 07/06/2018</p> <p>Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018</p>
4.	<p>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 with a tractor and trailer. 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.</p>	<p>Meeting held 07/06/2018</p>



Reference	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
		Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018
	The maximum load on the green bridge will be 31 tonnes, which is the maximum legal public road worthy tractor and loaded trailer. This will be the signed weight limit on the bridge.	Meeting held 20/03/2019
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)[APP-190]. The existing and new paths are shown on Sheet 4 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans, Document Reference 2.5(C)).	Meeting held 07/06/2018
	Signage or preferably a secure barrier will be provided to prevent unauthorised vehicles using the new bridleway (PR7) and the associated green bridge. In addition, a gate or stile will be included for FP319/16/1 on the Nancarrow Farm boundary.	Meeting held 20/03/2019
<b>2.Construction activities</b>		
6.	Highways England have committed to 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
7.	Removed until construction plan for drainage pond is agreed.	Meeting held 20/03/2019
8.	A 3m noise barrier will be implemented between Nancarrow Farm and the proposed construction works on the new mainline A30 and the attenuation pond (Pond No. 10) to mitigate the effects of construction noise. Highways England will commit to this being installed as part of the topsoil strip and prior to the main earthworks and bridge construction works commencing. This is likely to consist of a combination of soil bunds and an acoustic barrier (echo barrier or similar) mounted on temporary fence panels.	Meeting held 20/03/2019
9.	The Contractor will provide a Community Liaison Officer as standard who will be the main interface with all affected landowners and the local communities. For Nancarrow Farm, this role will include the co-ordination of the construction activities in the area with events taking place at Nancarrow Farm.	Meeting held 20/03/2019
10.	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"> <li>• Saturday 13 June 2020</li> <li>• Saturday 20 June 2020</li> <li>• Saturday 4 July 2020</li> <li>• Saturday 18 July 2020</li> </ul>	ui

Reference	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Saturday 25 July 2020</li> <li>• Saturday 8 August 2020</li> <li>• Saturday 15 August 2020</li> <li>• Saturday 29 August 2020</li> <li>• Saturday 12 September 2020</li> </ul> <p>This restriction will consist of the stopping of all construction activities in the area of Nancarrow Farm on the nine agreed dates between June and September 2020..</p>	
11.	Highways England presented noise modelling for construction to Nancarrow Farm on 20 March 2019.	Meeting held 20/03/2019
12.	<p>Restriction of construction activities will be confirmed through a legal agreement between Highways England and Nancarrow Farm.</p> <p>This legal agreement will be prepared and shared with Nancarrow Farm for Deadline 3 of the DCO examination.</p>	<p>Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2018</p> <p>Meeting held 20/03/2019</p>
<b>3.Landscape and Visual (Chapter 7 of the ES)</b>		
<b>13. Mitigation</b>		
14.	<p>At Marazanvose, mitigation comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engineering design of the alignment and cutting to retain existing Cornish hedge on the Nancarrow side of the existing A30</li> <li>• 5 to 10m proposed oak rich woodland on the cutting slope (between the existing A30 and the proposed new A30).</li> <li>• The species composition of Oak Rich woodland would be determined during detailed design. It is agreed that the mix would contain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ no more than 30% oak,</li> <li>○ 20% faster growing deciduous climax species such as cherry, field maple and willow,</li> <li>○ 20% evergreen species such as holly, pine and common box</li> <li>○ 20% of the total mix would be planted as 2.5m tall feathered trees</li> <li>○ 80% of the total mix would be planted as 1m tall 1+1 transplants.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The spatial arrangement of measures is shown on sheets 9-11, Environmental Masterplans, Figure 7.6, Document Reference 6.3.</p>	<p>Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2019</p> <p>Agreed in telephone conversation held on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2019.</p>
15.	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	Meeting held 07/06/2018

Reference	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
	<p>Chainage 7+350 (sheets 10-11, Environmental Masterplans, Figure 7.6, Document Reference 6.3) [APP-190/1].</p> <p>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.</p> <p>These measures will be reflected in the legal agreement to be agreed with Nancarrow Farm.</p>	Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2019
16.	<p>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) [APP-190/1].</p> <p>The species composition of Oak Rich woodland would be determined during detailed design. It is agreed that the mix would contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no more than 30% oak,</li> <li>• 20% faster growing deciduous climax species such as cherry, field maple and willow,</li> <li>• 20% evergreen species such as holly, pine and common box</li> <li>• 20% of the total mix would be planted as 2.5m tall feathered trees</li> </ul> <p>80% of the total mix would be planted as 1m tall 1+1 transplants.</p>	Agreed in telephone conversation held on 18 March 2019.
17.	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
18.	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) [APP-190].	Meeting held 07/06/2018
19.	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) [APP-190].	Meeting held 07/06/2018
20.	The proposed Cornish hedgerow has been realigned at Ch 7+320 to 7+550 following statutory consultation to protect and retain existing field pattern and vegetated Cornish hedgerow boundaries at the corner of an existing field at Ch 7+4854 (shown on the appended marked up extract of Sheet 11, Environmental Masterplans, Figure 7.6, Document Reference 6.3) [APP-191].	Meeting held 07/06/2018
21.	It is proposed to return 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) [APP-191] to Nancarrow (it had been acquired as part of the Zelah bypass scheme). This is welcomed by Nancarrow Farm	Meeting held 07/06/2018

Reference	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
	and it has been agreed that the parties will discuss this proposal and the future use of this land further.	
22.	<p>A new stock-proof 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) [APP-190].</p> <p>Stock proof fencing will be timber post and stock netting with the top two strands as barbed wire. The fencing detail would be agreed with the landowner during detailed design.</p>	Meeting held 07/06/2018
4.Noise and vibration (Chapter 11 of the ES)		
23. <i>Mitigation</i>		
24.	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) [APP-064].	Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2019
25.	<p>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.</p> <p>This position is notwithstanding Nancarrow Farm's view regarding the height of the road presented at Preferred Route Announcement and as set out in points 18 to 34 of section 5, Matters Outstanding, of this document.</p>	<p>Meeting held 07/06/2018</p> <p>Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2019</p>
26.	<p>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.</p> <p>These measures will be reflected in the legal agreement to be agreed with Nancarrow Farm.</p>	Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2019
27.	<p>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(A), Appendix 16.1). The measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selection of quiet equipment</li> <li>• Review of programme and methodology to consider quieter methods</li> <li>• Control of working hours</li> <li>• Provision of acoustic enclosure fencing where practicable</li> </ul>	Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2019

Reference	Matter which has been agreed	Date and method of agreement
	In addition to the measures outlined above, a detailed legal agreement will restrict activities, in order to minimise the effects of construction. This legal agreement is being pursued due to the significant sensitivity of a wedding ceremony to noise.	
<b>5.Cultural Heritage</b>		
<i>28. Mitigation</i>		
29.	<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>Acoustic screening will be installed before construction takes place to minimise visual impact during works. It is recognised that 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 in this location is proposed.</p>	Highways England response to Relevant Representation 19/02/2019

## 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 5.1 Matters not agreed between Nancarrow Farm and Highways England**

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
<i>1. Principle of development</i>			
1.	Nancarrow Farm comprises a 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.	This is noted.	<u>This should not be simply noted. It should be something to be protected. One of Highway England's strategic objectives is to support economic growth &amp; cultural heritage.</u>
2.	By severing Marazanvose, and Nancarrow Farm, the impacts are multiple and complex including;	<p><b>Chapter 3 Consideration of Alternatives</b> 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 <i>"avoid Marazanvose hamlet becoming an island in between the new and old A30 carriageways"</i>.</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 31,100m<sup>2</sup> in comparison to the other options considered.</p> <p>Details of the route assessment process are provided in the <b>Scheme Assessment Report (SAR)</b> (Document Reference 7.6) [APP-050] and the <b>Route Selection Report</b> (Document Reference 7.7) [APP-051]. Furthermore</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</p>

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		comment reference no 10 - 16 provide further information relating to Highways England's route selection process at Marazanvose.	<p>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 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>
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removing a small barn with permission to create a residential dwelling for farmer [redacted].</li> </ul>	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.	A northern alignment would not have required the acquisition of the barn which had planning permission for conversion into a residential dwelling.
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removing key strategic fields adjacent to the farmyard with no mitigation putting into question the feasibility of the farm</li> </ul>	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	<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</p>



Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		scheme are as requested by the farm to facilitate access to the adjacent green bridge.	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.
5.		<p>As outlined on page 166 of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (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"> <li>The vertical alignment of the road has been lowered from the design presented at statutory consultation, resulting in reduced noise impacts.</li> </ul>	The vertical alignment is still circa 2m above that presented at preferred route announcement. A significant deviation from the route assessed in the SAR.
6.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further noise mitigation in the form of a 3m acoustic fence is proposed adjacent to the landholding. This would result in a reduction in the level of noise in the area of the wedding business from current levels.</li> </ul>	The provision of a 3m acoustic fence is welcomed but the impacts of raising the road have not been mitigated for the properties in Marazanvose.
7.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	This is welcomed.
8.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amended access to the farmyard from the adjacent Killivose Lane as requested by the farm.</li> </ul>	This was only agreed to as being the least worst option of the alternative access arrangements put forward by Highways England.

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
9.		The acquisition of land that is required for the scheme is subject to the payment of compensation in line with the compensation code.	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.
10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Damaging the setting of the Grade II listed Farmhouse and Garden</li> </ul>	<p><b>Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage</b> 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>	The impact on the non-designated historic hamlet of Marazanvose, which is suffering further segregation despite the opportunity to re-connect, was not included within the cultural assessment at route selection.
11.		<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><b>The Planning Statement</b> (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</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

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		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.	
12.		<p>Alternatively, it may be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the nature of the asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site;</li> <li>• no viable use of the asset can be found in the medium term;</li> <li>• conservation through grant funding or charity/public ownership is not possible; or</li> <li>• the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit for bringing the site into use.</li> </ul> <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>	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, Historic England should have been consulted on all routes being considered if their opinion is being used to support one of the options.
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jeopardizing the Events business via disruption during construction works, and risk of increased noise, land loss, and visual impact post scheme</li> </ul>	<p><b>Chapter 12 People &amp; Communities</b> 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>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</p>

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
			mitigation and robust working restrictions allowing the business to function. There is no commitment on working restrictions outside 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.
14.		<p>With regard to land-take, <b>Chapter 12 People &amp; Communities</b> of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-065] summarises the Agricultural Impact Assessment undertaken for the scheme. <b>Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA)</b> (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 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>	<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>

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction: comment reference no. 35 - 36</li> <li>Noise: comment reference no.25</li> <li>Visual impact: comment reference no. 24</li> </ul>	
15.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removal of existing access onto A30 and removal of established tree border.</li> </ul>	<p>Access to the existing A30 would be provided via the adjacent Killivose Lane and Shortlanesend Road as agreed with the farm during ongoing engagement..</p> <p>Access across the new and existing A30 will be provided for a tractor and trailer via the new adjacent green bridge.</p>	As previously stated this proposal has been accepted as the least worst option proposed by Highways England
16.		<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 <b>Environmental Masterplans</b> (Document Reference 6.3, Figure 7.6) [APP-190].</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.
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Severe damage to the setting of Nancarrow Villa.</li> </ul>	Please refer to the response provided at comment reference no. 5 which considers the impact on heritage assets.	Please refer to previous comments.
<p><i>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)</i></p>			
18.	<p>Flawed route selection process:</p> <p>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</p>	

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		other relevant stakeholders.	
19.		<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"> <li>• Land acquisition</li> <li>• Risk of delay/cost due to utility works</li> <li>• Business impacts</li> <li>• Cultural heritage</li> <li>• Visual impact</li> <li>• Living conditions</li> <li>• Noise</li> <li>• Residential demolition</li> <li>• Most likely cost</li> </ul> <p>Further information on the route selection process leading to the proposed route for the scheme is provided in Chapter 3 Consideration of Alternatives of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-056].</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>
20.		<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</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>

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		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.	
21.		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.	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.
22.		Based on the above, the route selected is still considered by Highways England to perform the best in relation to construction, land, compensation, environmental and cost.	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 current alignment and so it is difficult to see how Highways England have come to this conclusion
23.	Highways agency incorrectly concluded that the preferred route performed better in terms of:		
24.	Visual Impact,	The <b>Scheme Assessment Report (SAR)</b> (Document	In Highways England's letter of 21 August 2017

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		<p>Reference 7.6) [APP-050] assessed Option 7A as having a lesser impact on existing fields 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><b>Chapter 7 Landscape</b> 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 <b>Environmental Masterplans</b> (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>they accept that visual impact is worst for Nancarrow but claim it is better for residents of Marazanvose. This is not the 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>
25.	Noise Impact,	<p>Appendix B of the <b>Scheme Assessment Report (SAR)</b> (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</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 in noise is likely to be. Faster traffic means greater increases in noise levels.</p>



Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		<p>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><b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration</b> 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. 25 in this table.</p>	
26.	Business Impact,	<p>The <b>Scheme Assessment Report (SAR)</b> (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 &amp; Country Motors that would be considered to have a significant land and compensation cost and would likely have a significant impact.</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>
27.		<p><b>Chapter 12 People &amp; Communities</b> of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-065] Para 12.7.101 states "<i>The approach to clarifying the sensitivity of tourism and recreation receptors has been agreed with</i></p>	<p>Why has this not been reflected in the choice of alignment?</p>

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		<i>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."</i>	
28.		<b>Chapter 12 People &amp; Communities</b> 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 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.
29.	Cultural Heritage,	As stated at page 167 of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (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.	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.
30.	Impact on Community.	It is important to note the impact of the 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.	In this section we are challenging HE's route 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

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
			<p>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>
31.		<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</p> <p>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 <b>Chapter 12 People and Communities</b> 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"> <li>• Settlements and access to open space and services</li> <li>• Employment</li> <li>• Community safety</li> <li>• Health</li> </ul>	<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>
32.	This has been formally challenged and a proper	Appendix B of this document sets out the correspondence between Highways England and Nancarrow Farm. It	It is still maintained than none of the correspondence received from Highways

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
	response has not been provided.	<p>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"> <li>• Letter dated 21 August 2017 from Highways England to Mr Chamberlain following a meeting with representatives of Nancarrow Farm and Sarah Newton MP</li> <li>• Letter dated 28 September 2017 from Tim Walmsley representing Steve Chamberlain to Highways England in response to the letter dated 21 August 2017</li> <li>• Letter dated 9 January 2018 from Highways England to Mr Chamberlain in response to the letter dated 29 September 2017.</li> <li>• 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 <b>Consultation Report</b> (Document reference 5.1) [APP-029]</li> </ul> <p>Highways England continue to engage with Nancarrow Farm.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to formally review the route selection process</p>
33.	Having reviewed the information provided, it would	The <b>Scheme Assessment Report (SAR)</b> (Document 7.6) [APP-050] sets out the assessment undertaken to	Please see the updated Table 7-6. This clearly supports a northern alignment. No other

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
	appear proper assessments were not undertaken for the Northern option prior to route selection.	support the Preferred Route Announcement which was made on 3 July 2017. See response to comment reference no.10.	conclusion can be gained.
34.	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 <b>Scheme Assessment Report (SAR)</b> (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.
<b>3. Construction effects</b>			
35.	<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 &amp; 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 noise</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>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</p>

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		<p>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 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 <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP Annexes)</b> (Document Reference 6.4, Appendix 16.1) [APP-376].</p> <p><b>UPDATE FOLLOWING COMMUNICATION IN MARCH 2019</b></p> <p>A mechanism has been proposed as part of a legal agreement with Nancarrow Farm to manage construction activities in the vicinity of the wedding venue for the duration of the construction period.</p> <p>The construction schedule is still being developed by the Contractor. The scheme must be open to traffic by the end of 2023, this hasn't changed during the period of engagement with Nancarrow Farm. However, it is highly</p>	<p>a commitment to robust working restrictions and stringent mitigation.</p> <p><b>UPDATE FOLLOWING COMMUNICATION IN MARCH 2019.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As it stands, HE have still only committed to restrict construction activities to 9 days between June 2020 and December 2023. We would anticipate hosting between 220-240 weddings during this time. Further bookings are unable to be secured until further assurances are made. This matter requires urgent attention.</li> <li>- Previously (during meetings in June, Aug &amp; September 2018) works had been proposed in the Nancarrow Farm area between June 2020 and December 2021. The new position introduces significant disruption for a further 2 years.</li> <li>- A draft legal agreement has been circulated which does not yet deal with the concerns outlined above.</li> </ul>

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		unlikely that there will be intense construction activity in the area of Nancarrow Farm for the full duration of the construction.	
36.		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 expected that this will be available for review with Nancarrow Farm for Deadline 2 (19 <sup>th</sup> March) of the Examination.	Welcomed and awaited.
<i>4. Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Document Reference 6.2)</i>			
37.	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.
38.		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	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

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		<p>appropriate external amenity noise criterion for this type of use, as set out within the ES.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>As a result of the above factors, it has been assessed that there would be no adverse significant noise effect in this area.</p>	<p>a result.</p> <p>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.</p>
39.	We would therefore challenge the validity of the noise assessment undertaken to date. The base levels stated are too high (compared to assessments we have undertaken previously),	<p>As described in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration</b> of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-064], the baseline noise levels used for the assessment are determined using the 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>	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.
40.	the post scheme targets, and the suggested mitigation insufficient,	As set out in <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration</b> of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2) [APP-064], 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	



Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		<p>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 <b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration</b> 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 there would be no adverse significant noise effects.</p>	
41.	risking significant damage to the Grade II listed setting, and a very noise sensitive business during and post construction.	<p><b>During construction</b></p> <p><b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration</b> 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 wedding venue areas, is assessed as temporary</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>

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		<p><i>significant."</i></p> <p>The control of noise and vibration, using Best Practical Means (BPM) is incorporated within the <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP)</b> (Document Reference 6.4, Appendix 16.1) [APP-375].</p> <p><b>Post construction</b></p> <p><b>Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration</b> 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.10-12</p>	
<b>5. Landscape (Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement, Volume 6, Document Reference 6.2)</b>			
42.	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 <b>Chapter 7 Landscape</b> 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</p>	This was not taken into account in the provisional route assessment.

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response	Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		<p>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>	
43.		<p>In paragraph 6.3.80 of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (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.</p>	<p>See previous comments regarding the significant adverse effect for the first 15 years.</p>
44.	<p>screening the old road from Nancarrow.</p>	<p>As a result of the findings of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment reported in <b>Chapter 7 Landscape</b> 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 <b>Environmental Master Plans</b> (Document Reference 6.3, Figure 7.6) [APP-190].</p> <p>Several visual receptors at Nancarrow Farm (NFH) were assessed.</p>	

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response				Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		Receptor	Construction visual effect	Yr 1 visual effect	Yr 15 residual visual effect	
		Residential receptors at the bungalow at NFH (VP 13)	Moderate adverse and significant	Large adverse significant	Moderate adverse and significant	
		Users of holiday accommodation at NFH (VP 13)	Slight adverse and insignificant	Moderate adverse significant	Slight adverse and insignificant	
		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 views of	Moderate adverse and significant	Moderate adverse significant	Moderate adverse and significant	

Comment Reference No.	Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation	Highways England Response				Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response
		outdoor workers at NFH (VP 15)				
		<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>				
45.	(This could be mitigated via fencing/hedging rather than waiting 15 years for the trees to grow)	<p>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].</p>				
<b>1. Detailed construction plans</b>						
46.	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.	<p>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</p>				

<b>Comment Reference No.</b>	<b>Nancarrow Farm Relevant Representation</b>	<b>Highways England Response</b>	<b>Nancarrow Farm Comment on Response</b>
		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	

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

