

M25 junction 28 improvement scheme

TR010029

9.119 Applicant's comments on London Borough of Havering's Deadline 8 submissions

Rule 8(1)(k)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Volume 9

June 2021

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

M25 junction 28 scheme

Development Consent Order 202[x]

9.119 Applicant's comments on London Borough of Havering's Deadline 8 submissions

Rule Number:	Rule 8(1)(k)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010029
Application Document Reference	TR010029/APP/9.119
Author:	M25 junction 28 improvement scheme Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
0	30 June 2021	Deadline 9

Table of contents

Chapter	Pages
1. Purpose and structure of this response	4
2. REP8-021 London Borough of Havering response to the Applicant's Statement of Commonality for Statements of Common Ground submitted at Deadline 7	5
3. REP8-022 London Borough of Havering response to the Applicant's updated draft Development Consent Order submitted at Deadline 7	6
4. REP8-023 London Borough of Havering response to the Applicant's Outline Traffic Management Plan submitted at Deadline 7	8
5. REP8-024 London Borough of Havering response to the Applicant's response to action points from Issue Specific Hearing 3	13
6. REP8-025 London Borough of Havering response to Applicant's Comments on London Borough of Havering Deadline 6 submission	15
7. REP8-026 London Borough of Havering response to the Examining Authority's Rule 9 and 17 letter (26 May 2021)	16
8. REP8-027 London Borough of Havering response to the Examining Authority's Rule 17 letter (27 May 2021)	22
9. REP8-028A London Borough of Havering response to Examining Authority's changes to the draft Development Consent Order	24

1. Purpose and structure of this response

- 1.1.1 This document provides the comments of the applicant, Highways England, in response to London Borough of Havering's representations (submitted to the Examining Authority (ExA) at Deadline 8 (9 June 2021) namely:
- London Borough of Havering - Response to the Applicant's Statement of Commonality for Statements of Common Ground submitted at Deadline 7 (REP8-021)
 - Response to Applicant's updated draft Development Consent Order submitted at Deadline 7 (REP8-022)
 - Response to Applicant's Outline Traffic Management Plan submitted at Deadline 7 (REP8-023)
 - Response to the Applicant's response to action points from Issue Specific Hearing 3 (REP6-024)
 - Response to the Applicant's comments on London Borough of Havering's Deadline 6 submission (REP6-025)
 - Response to the Examining Authority's Rule 9 and 17 letter (26 May 2021) (REP6-026)
 - Response to the Examining Authority's Rule 17 letter (27 May 2021) (REP6-027)
 - Response to the Examining Authority's Consultation draft Development Consent Order (REP8-028A)
- 1.1.2 Highways England has sought to provide comments where it is helpful to the Examination to do so, for instance where a representation includes a request for further information or clarification from Highways England or where Highways England considers that it would be appropriate for the Examining Authority (ExA) to have Highways England's views in response to a matter raised by an Interested Party in its representations. Where issues raised within a representation have been dealt with previously by Highways England, for instance in response to a question posed by the ExA in its first round of written questions or within one of the application documents submitted to the Examination, a cross reference to that response or document is provided to avoid unnecessary duplication. The information provided in this document should, therefore, be read in conjunction with the material to which cross references are provided.
- 1.1.3 In some cases, Highways England has made no comment to the response provided because in some cases, the written representation does not necessitate a response as the matter is closed.

2. REP8-021 London Borough of Havering response to the Applicant's Statement of Commonality for Statements of Common Ground submitted at Deadline 7

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
REP8-021-01	<p>I can confirm that LB Havering has reviewed this document and agrees with the majority of the content of the report that relates to LB Havering, with the exception of the position regarding the effects on the highway network from construction and operational issues. This position is currently unshaded (Table 6.1 of REP7-012) and Havering believes should be shown as RED. A number of issues concerning the impact on the local and strategic road network are not agreed as set out in section 10.2 and 10.3 of Table 3.1 on REP7-006</p> <p><i>Statement of Common Ground with London Borough of Havering.</i></p>	<p>This erratum is noted and an amended version of the Statement of Commonality is submitted at Deadline 9 (TR010029/EXAM/9.18(7)).</p>
REP8-021-02	<p>With regards to the Statement of Common Ground with London Borough of Havering (REP7-006), LBH would wish for section 7.3.1 to be updated to reflect the provision of the NMU route via Brook Street interchange.</p>	<p>This erratum is noted and an amended version of the Statement of Common Ground is submitted at Deadline 9 (TR010029/EXAM/9.8(3)).</p>

3. REP8-022 London Borough of Havering response to the Applicant's updated draft Development Consent Order submitted at Deadline 7

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
REP8-022-02	<p>In addition the ExA will recall that at ISH3 Transport for London (TfL) raised an issue concerning Requirement 13 Fencing and suggested that the language concerning deer should also cover during the period of construction because of the risk of roaming deer on the highways network. LB Havering supported this point. The Applicant appeared to acknowledge that this was a legitimate concern and indicated that they would consider modifying the language in Requirement 13 to reflect this (Page 18 of EV-046).</p> <p>Whilst Requirement 13 in REP7-016 has been updated to include Work No2 which is welcome, there is no reference to the provision of deer fencing during the construction period. LB Havering would encourage the ExA to request the Applicant reflect this in its next submission of the Draft DCO.</p>	<p>A new commitment has been added to the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) (TR010029/APP/7.3)(4), commitment GN0.1 in Table 1.1 to the effect that appropriate fencing and/or other measures will be installed during construction to reduce the risk of deer collisions with traffic along the A12 and other roads.</p> <p>This is secured under Requirement 4 as the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) 'must reflect the relevant mitigation measures set out in the REAC' and the 'construction of the authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the CEMP'.</p>
REP8-022-03	<p>LB Havering welcomes the amendments proposed by the Applicant to Requirement 14. However LB Havering would suggest that the wording underlined below should be included in point (1) of the Requirement as it is understood</p>	<p>The omission of these words was an error and are now included in the final version of the DCO submitted at Deadline 9 (TR010029/APP/3.1(8)).</p>

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
	<p>this has been agreed between the Applicant and Transport for London (TfL).</p> <p>Operation of M25 Junction 28 Roundabout</p> <p>14. —(1) No part of the new loop road forming Work No. 6 is to be opened for traffic until a plan for the M25 Junction 28 roundabout containing details of the proposed operation of traffic signal timings or such other related measures as may be reasonably practicable to prevent any increase in delays for traffic on the A1023 Brook Street entering the M25 Junction 28 roundabout arising as a result of the authorised development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State, following consultation with the highway authorities within the Order limits.</p>	

4. REP8-023 London Borough of Havering response to the Applicant's Outline Traffic Management Plan submitted at Deadline 7

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
REP8-023-02	<p>Our concerns at that time can be summarised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of clarity over the roles of the Highways England's contractor and delivery partner 2. A failure to recognise the specific status of LB Havering as a host local authority. 3. A failure to consider the unique transport circumstances of the residents of Woodstock Avenue in the OTMP and the lack of inclusion as a 'stakeholder group' in the same way that Maylands Golf Course, Grove Farm and Glebelands are. 4. Lack of commentary on closures of the A12 eastbound off-slip at M25 junction 28. 5. Issue of construction traffic using Petersfield Avenue and the control exercised over this issue. 6. The matter of parking for construction site operatives away from the designated work compounds. 	<p>See Highways England's responses to each of these concerns in the following sections.</p>
REP8-023-03	<p>It is noted that the performance of the TMP against Highways England's strategic objectives for such situations will now be formally measured on a red / amber</p>	<p>The Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is subject to both discharge of Requirement 10 in the dDCO (TR010029/APP/3.1(8)) and</p>

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
	/ green basis (para 1.1.4). What is unclear is how an adverse finding will be dealt with and how Highways England would instigate corrective action or indeed if the OTMP or the TMO will offer commitment to this.	<p>Internal quality assurance via Highways England's Product Control Framework (PCF).</p> <p>Highway England's Major Projects Customer Service Division review and sign off on the customer elements of the TMP which includes the 'Dynamic Roadworks Assessment' to ensure it has been designed to consider customers and that impacts have been minimised as far as reasonably practicable. In the unlikely event that there are elements of the proposed traffic management arrangements identified as red through the Dynamic Roadworks Assessment, then in the first instance Highways England will expect the Principal Contractor to review the proposed approach and amend the TMP to avoid these red impacts. If it is not reasonably practical to avoid any identified red impacts, then Highways England will expect the TMP to be amended to include additional mitigation measures to reduce the impact from red to amber or green. Only in very exceptional circumstances, where it could be demonstrated by the Principal Contractor that an alternative approach is not reasonably practicable, would Highways England approve a TMP containing elements identified as red through the Dynamic Roadworks Assessment.</p>
REP8-023-04	We still note the 'delivery partner' will be responsible for the development of the final TMP. The role of the Applicant in this activity has not been clarified. No clarity reflecting the status of LB Havering as a host borough has been given.	The final TMP falls under Requirement 10 of the DCO and will therefore be a Highways England document, since Highways England is the undertaker for the purposes of the DCO. It will be prepared on behalf of Highways England by the appointed Principal Contractor, but responsibility for the

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
		proposals and commitments contained within it will ultimately rest with Highways England. London Borough of Havering must be consulted on the final TMP under Requirement 10.
REP8-023-06	In para 1.1.6 we are of the view that the phrase 'substantially in accordance with' should be amended to reflect the ExA's preferred wording of the dDCO circulated at deadline 7. The word 'substantially' should be deleted. LB Havering will be welcoming the ExA proposals to delete the word "substantially" in a separate submission at Deadline 8.	As the detailed design of the Scheme and the associated method of construction are developed, it is likely that there will be a requirement to make some relatively minor modifications to the currently envisaged temporary traffic management arrangements. If necessary changes to the currently proposed arrangements contained in the Outline TMP (REP7-017) are overly restricted by the wording of the dDCO, then there is the risk that the Scheme could not be constructed in the most efficient manner, which could increase the Scheme's cost and lengthen the construction programme. Consequently, Highways England considers that 'the final TMP should be substantially in accordance with the Outline Traffic Management Plan' should remain in the dDCO to allow for some essential flexibility when preparing the final TMP. Please see Highways England's response to ExA's proposed schedule of changes to the dDCO (REP8-010).
REP8-023-07	We are now pleased that the May 2021 OTMP now recognises the issues facing Woodstock Avenue residents as a key theme for the TMP to address. We are also pleased to note that Table 2.3 now specifically sets out the adverse effect of A12 eastbound off-slip closures on Woodstock Avenue residents in the following terms "Any temporary road closure at junction 28 which would prevent	Section 2.3.12 of the Outline TMP (REP7-017) states 'Full road closures will need to be restricted to weekends or overnight'. Although an explicit commitment to minimise the closures of the A12 off-slip is not included in the Outline TMP (REP7-017), Highways England can confirm the intention that all temporary road closures, including for the A12 eastbound off-slip, will as far as reasonably practicable be kept

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
	this manoeuvre will result in a lengthy diversion". We also note that para 2.3.14 includes reference to "A12 eastbound off slip closures". What is still lacking however is a specific commitment to minimise the closures of the A12 off slip due to this significant adverse effect on local residents.	to the minimum necessary to construct the Scheme in an efficient manner.
REP8-023-09	We would wish to have explicit reference to all construction traffic not using the Petersfield Avenue junction as a site access route. Signing solely for preventing HGV movements will create doubts in driver's minds; a complete prohibition would appear more pragmatic.	Highways England can confirm that as stated in Section 2.3.4 of the Outline TMP (REP7-017), all construction traffic, not just HGVs, will be signposted to use the Gallows Corner junction to make U-turns, rather than using the Petersfield Avenue junction.
REP8-023-10	We are concerned that the previous wording which provide for sanctions against non-compliant contractors in terms of routing has been removed and replaced with vague assertions that issues can be raised with the principal contractor. Ultimately our view remains that Highways England are responsible for the management of their contractors and are accountable for their performance.	No wording relating to any potential sanctions against non-compliant contractors in terms of routing has been removed from the Outline TMP (REP7-017). The wording of Section 2.3.10 of the Outline TMP (REP7-017) is unchanged from the previous version but further clarification is provided in Sections 2.3.8. and 2.3.9. Highways England recognises that it is responsible for the management of its appointed contractors and will honour its obligation to fulfil this function. Also see Highways England response to REP8-023-4 above.
REP8-023-11	Para 2.3.48 reference is now made to "adequate car parking will be provided within the site compound to accommodate those workers who are unable to use alternative means of transport". LB Havering therefore agree with the ExA's proposed DCO changes to remove	Highways England has accepted the deletion of article 18(2)(c) "Authorise the use as a parking place of any road" in the dDCO. These words were removed from the draft DCO (REP8-002) submitted at Deadline 8.

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
	allowing unfettered parking on roads within the order limits as no parking should take place outside of the work sites / construction compounds.	

5. REP8-024 London Borough of Havering response to the Applicant's response to action points from Issue Specific Hearing 3

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
REP8-024-02	<p>Action Point 2. Havering notes that the process of funding approval that the Applicant has progressed in order to secure the NMU scheme and that the only condition attached to the funding is that it is carried out in line with the project summary that formed part of the application for funds. LB Havering has not had sight of the project summary and for completeness would be very grateful if a copy of this project summary could be forwarded to the Council. LB Havering would also be grateful if the draft planning obligation concerning the central section of the route could be reviewed by the Council and other interested parties prior to it being submitted to the ExA.</p>	<p>Highways England is not able to share the project summary with third parties due to financial confidentiality however it is considered that the summary provided in response to Action Point 2 in REP7-019 provides a suitable explanation of the delivery and costs of the NMU improvements.</p> <p>A draft of the planning obligation has been sent to London Borough of Havering for comment.</p>
REP8-024-06	<p>Action Point 11. LB Havering has reviewed the Updated Requirement 13(2) to ensure Work No 2 is added to those works not commenced until deer fencing is installed.</p> <p>Havering remains concerned that no provisions for deer fencing during construction has been included in the Updated Requirement even though this matter was discussed and agreed with the Applicant at ISH3 on 12 May 2021.</p>	<p>A new commitment has been added to the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) (TR010029/APP/7.3(4)), commitment GN0.1 in Table 1.1 to the effect that appropriate fencing and/or other measures will be installed during construction to reduce the risk of deer collisions with traffic along the A12 and other roads. This is secured under Requirement 4 as the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) 'must reflect the relevant mitigation measures set out in the REAC' and the 'construction of the</p>

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
		authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the CEMP'.

6. REP8-025 London Borough of Havering response to Applicant's Comments on London Borough of Havering Deadline 6 submission

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
REP8-025-02	Havering wishes to retain its position regarding the need for a Code Of Construction Practice and welcomes the ExA's proposed Requirement for a Code of Construction Practice as set out in the Schedule of ExA's recommended amendments to the Applicant's draft DCO Version 6 (PD-021) which will be the subject of a separate submission by LB Havering.	Highways England remains firmly of the view that a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) is not needed. Please refer to REP8-010 para 23.
REP8-025-06	With regards to the provision of noise mitigation measures for the residents of Grove (REP6 -036-04) LBH notes the Applicant's response. Havering welcomes the proposed Requirement for Grove Farm as set out in the Schedule of ExA's recommended amendments to the Applicant's draft DCO Version 6 [PD-021].	Highways England does not consider a separate requirement to be necessary or appropriate. Please refer to REP8-010 para 21 for detailed reasoning.

7. REP8-026 London Borough of Havering response to the Examining Authority's Rule 9 and 17 letter (26 May 2021)

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
REP8-026-01	<p>Having considered the Applicant's responses in Table 3.1 of REP7-029 to the comments LB Havering made at the recent Targeted Consultation concerning Change 8, we would welcome confirmation using Defra Biodiversity Metric v 2.0 that the quantity of compensatory woodland planting for this additional loss of priority habitat has taken into account the fact that The Grove lies within the Ingrebourne Valley SMI.</p> <p>We therefore suggest that this should be confirmed by submission of the metric calculations to support the HE view of significance of this effect, as it is not obvious that this information has been considered in the calculations.</p> <p>This evidence would inform whether the change falls within the assessment of the Environment Statement (ES) or not, however impacts on designated sites should be within scope. If the outcome does not change the significance from slight adverse then LB Havering would consider that this change does not affect the assessment of the ES.</p>	<p>The majority of the Scheme lies within Ingrebourne Valley Site of Metropolitan Importance (SMI). The Grove woodland is within the SMI and considered as part of the SMI in the assessment of effects. As indicated in LBH's response, the biodiversity assessment in the Environmental Statement (ES) (APP-029) concluded that the Scheme overall would have a slight adverse effect on the SMI, taking into account the impacts of the Scheme, compensation and mitigation and the size and nature of the SMI designated site.</p> <p>Prior to Change 8, the Scheme resulted in the loss of 0.5 ha of woodland from The Grove. Change 8 includes an additional 0.1 ha of loss from The Grove. The Change 8 report (REP7-029) describes that this additional loss of habitat within the SMI, changes the overall percentage of permanent loss of habitat within the SMI from 1.9% to 2% (when combined with Change 7). Additional woodland planting for Change 8 is proposed at a ratio of 1:4 (loss of 0.1 ha, planting 0.4 ha). Paragraph 2.4.4 of the Change 8 report concludes (REP7-029) that with the proposed additional compensatory tree planting, the residual effect of the Scheme on the SMI is unchanged at slight adverse.</p> <p>The quantity of the proposed compensation woodland planting has not been informed by any Defra Biodiversity Metric v2.0 (Biodiversity Metric) calculations. As part of a designated site, bespoke</p>

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
	<p>LB Havering would consider that Change 8 does not constitute a material change to the Application.</p>	<p>compensation has been designed taking into account the ecological features of the SMI.</p> <p>The assessment within the ES does not include the use of Defra Biodiversity Metric v2.0 within the methodology of assessment of effects and it has not been used to quantify loss and gain of habitats, or to influence the types of habitats created. As a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), there is currently no legislative or policy requirement for the Scheme to achieve a net gain for biodiversity. In the context of this assessment, and in the absence of a requirement for biodiversity net gain, assessment based on qualitative assessment of impacts and hectarage change, and change as a percentage of SMI area, remains Highway's England's preferred measure. However, in response to the question from LBH (REP8-026) and letter from ExA (PD-023), Highways England has undertaken simple Biodiversity Metric calculations in relation to Change 8 only in order to evidence the nature of the change.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Metric calculation tool has been used to determine the woodland baseline (existing) and predicted post intervention (habitat retention and creation) habitat units in relation to Change 8. The results are provided in the table below. It should be noted that for the wider Scheme, woodland planting has not been apportioned to individual areas of loss. To inform these calculations, a like for like planting area has been allowed for in relation to The Grove (0.5 ha planting for 0.5 ha woodland loss in original submitted design). The Biodiversity Metric results for The Grove woodland are set out below for the original proposal and including Change 8. For ease of</p>

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response																				
		<p>comparison, the total site baseline hectares for both scenarios is the same (2.9ha).</p> <p><u>Biodiversity Metric calculations for The Grove without Change 8:</u></p>																				
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1077 539 1686 667">Habitat</th> <th data-bbox="1686 539 1874 667">Baseline (pre-works)</th> <th data-bbox="1874 539 2123 667">Proposed (without Change 8)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1077 667 1686 826">The Grove woodland lowland mixed deciduous woodland; moderate condition; medium connectivity (based on high distinctiveness of habitat type); high strategic significance</td> <td data-bbox="1686 667 1874 826">2.3 ha</td> <td data-bbox="1874 667 2123 826">1.8 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1077 826 1686 1018">Area of neutral grassland (woodland planting area); other neutral grassland; moderate conditions; low connectivity (based on medium distinctiveness of habitat type); high strategic significance</td> <td data-bbox="1686 826 1874 1018">0.9 ha</td> <td data-bbox="1874 826 2123 1018">-</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1077 1018 1686 1177">Woodland planting; lowland mixed deciduous woodland; moderate condition; medium connectivity (based on high distinctiveness of habitat type); high strategic significance</td> <td data-bbox="1686 1018 1874 1177">-</td> <td data-bbox="1874 1018 2123 1177">0.5 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1077 1177 1686 1337">Grassland planting (species rich mix); other neutral grassland; moderate condition; low connectivity (based on medium distinctiveness); high strategic significance</td> <td data-bbox="1686 1177 1874 1337">-</td> <td data-bbox="1874 1177 2123 1337">0.4 ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1077 1337 1686 1390">Habitat units</td> <td data-bbox="1686 1337 1874 1390">43.19</td> <td data-bbox="1874 1337 2123 1390">30.70</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Habitat	Baseline (pre-works)	Proposed (without Change 8)	The Grove woodland lowland mixed deciduous woodland; moderate condition; medium connectivity (based on high distinctiveness of habitat type); high strategic significance	2.3 ha	1.8 ha	Area of neutral grassland (woodland planting area); other neutral grassland; moderate conditions; low connectivity (based on medium distinctiveness of habitat type); high strategic significance	0.9 ha	-	Woodland planting; lowland mixed deciduous woodland; moderate condition; medium connectivity (based on high distinctiveness of habitat type); high strategic significance	-	0.5 ha	Grassland planting (species rich mix); other neutral grassland; moderate condition; low connectivity (based on medium distinctiveness); high strategic significance	-	0.4 ha	Habitat units	43.19	30.70		
Habitat	Baseline (pre-works)	Proposed (without Change 8)																				
The Grove woodland lowland mixed deciduous woodland; moderate condition; medium connectivity (based on high distinctiveness of habitat type); high strategic significance	2.3 ha	1.8 ha																				
Area of neutral grassland (woodland planting area); other neutral grassland; moderate conditions; low connectivity (based on medium distinctiveness of habitat type); high strategic significance	0.9 ha	-																				
Woodland planting; lowland mixed deciduous woodland; moderate condition; medium connectivity (based on high distinctiveness of habitat type); high strategic significance	-	0.5 ha																				
Grassland planting (species rich mix); other neutral grassland; moderate condition; low connectivity (based on medium distinctiveness); high strategic significance	-	0.4 ha																				
Habitat units	43.19	30.70																				

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response		
		Change in habitat units		-28.92% (-12.49 units)
		Biodiversity Metric calculations for The Grove with Change 8:		
		Habitat	Baseline (pre-works)	Proposed (with Change 8)
		The Grove woodland lowland mixed deciduous woodland; moderate condition; medium connectivity (based on high distinctiveness of habitat type); high strategic significance	2.3 ha	1.7 ha
		Area of neutral grassland (woodland planting area); other neutral grassland; moderate conditions; low connectivity (based on medium distinctiveness of habitat type); high strategic significance	0.9 ha	-
		Woodland planting; lowland mixed deciduous woodland; moderate condition; medium connectivity (based on high distinctiveness of habitat type); high strategic significance	-	0.9 ha
		Habitat units	43.19	27.25
		Change in habitat units		-36.92% (-15.95 units)

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
		<p>It is important to note that these calculations relate to change 8 affecting The Grove woodland only and are provided for the purpose of responding to the query from LBH and ExA. The calculated modest additional loss of biodiversity units (-3.46) for The Grove needs to be considered in the context of the SMI as whole. In terms of the SMI, this change represents only 0.1% area change.</p> <p>Whilst the ratio of woodland loss to creation associated with Change 8 is 1:4, the negative change in habitat units shown by the metric result above is due to the multipliers used in the metric relating to 'temporal risk'. This takes into account how long different habitat types take to establish. As woodland habitats take a long time to establish, habitat units relating to woodland creation are substantially lower than baseline (existing) woodland habitat units. The fact that Change 8 has resulted in a greater loss of biodiversity units is because grassland creation which accrues more units per hectare in the metric, is replaced by woodland planting. The design of habitat creation associated with the Scheme and Change 8 has ensured there is no net loss of woodland area within the DCO boundary in terms of hectares of cover.</p> <p>As set out in paragraphs 7.9.8 and 7.9.9 of the biodiversity assessment (TR010029/APP/6.1), due to the design and location of the Scheme there will be an unavoidable permanent loss of land to the new loop road and slip roads, leading to an overall loss in cover of natural habitats. Therefore, there is limited space to provide a higher ratio of planting whilst also accommodating the need to mitigate for other habitats, rivers and species. The habitat reinstatement and creation</p>

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
		<p>proposals are primarily influenced by the potential impacts of the Scheme on important biodiversity resources and landscape receptors. The design has not been driven by any assessment using the Biodiversity Metric. Instead it takes a bespoke approach to compensation. The design balances the need to compensate for priority habitat such as woodland, with the need to accommodate mitigation for other habitats and species. This is also takes into account the constraints to the design (such as gas main diversion), requirements for landscape mitigation and the landscape context of the site.</p> <p>Although Change 8 results in a small increase in loss of habitat units for The Grove, this needs to be considered in the context of both the size of the SMI and the bespoke nature of the mitigation and compensation. Overall, Highways England concludes that the information presented above does not change the conclusion of residual slight adverse effect on the SMI as a whole.</p>

8. REP8-027 London Borough of Havering response to the Examining Authority's Rule 17 letter (27 May 2021)

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
REP8-027-02	<p>LB Havering maintains the position it provided in paragraph 10.1.2 of its Local Impact Report (REP1-031) and reiterates that it would expect the Greater London Authority (GLA) as author of the London Plan to have a view on the bearing of its own policy document on the Proposed Development. However, LB Havering considers that Policy H1 Increasing housing supply has not been appropriately considered by the Applicant and does have a bearing on the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Table 4.1 of Policy H1 sets the ten-year targets for net housing completions that each local planning authority should plan for. This includes targets for each borough in the wider north east sub-region in London including Havering, Redbridge, Waltham Forest and Barking & Dagenham.</p> <p>Through a number of representations during the Examination, LB Havering has consistently raised the concern that the traffic modelling undertaken by the Applicant has not fully taken into account sub-regional growth and therefore it is not possible to fully understand the impact the scheme will have on the Transport for London Road Network, or the network Havering is responsible for. This continues to be a matter of disagreement between</p>	<p>Highways England's position with regard to sub-regional growth and housing targets remains as set out in in paragraph 20.1.3 to 20.1.9 of REP3A-020 as referred to within the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between London Borough of Havering and Highways England (Section 10.0 of REP7-006).</p>

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
	<p>LB Havering and the Applicant and is recognised as such in the Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and LB Havering that was submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 7 (Section 10.0 of REP7-006).</p> <p>It should be noted that the minimum ten-year Housing Targets contained in Table 4.1 of the LondonPlan2021 are an increase from the ten-year targets contained in the 2016 London Plan. For example, Havering's ten year target has increased from 11,701 in the 2016 London Plan to 12,850 in the 2021 Adopted London Plan. Increases can also be found for a number of other London Boroughs in the east sub-region.</p>	

9. REP8-028A London Borough of Havering response to Examining Authority's changes to the draft Development Consent Order

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
REP8-028A-01	No 1. LB Havering remains of the view that the term “use of any street” should be deleted. LB Havering remains of the view that this power is excessive and goes beyond the need of the DCO.	Highways England agrees with the reasoning given by the ExA to retain these words in the schedule of ExA’s recommended amendments to the Applicants draft DCO Version 6 (REP8-010) and has no further comments.
REP8-028A-02	No 2. LB Havering welcomes the recognition by the ExA of Local Authority pressures and welcomes the recommended period of Deemed Consent being extended from 28 days that is currently set out in a number of Articles in the Applicants draft DCO, to 42 days. This additional two weeks will be important for Local Authorities many of whom have resourcing challenges at the present time which are likely to continue for the foreseeable future.	Highways England’s position remains as set out in its response to the schedule of ExA’s recommended amendments to the Applicants draft DCO Version 6 (REP8-010).
REP8-028A-03	No 3. LB Havering welcomes the proposal to delete Part 3, Article 18 (2) (C). LB Havering remains of the view that this power is excessive and goes beyond the need of the draft DCO.	This has been removed in the latest version of the DCO (TR010029/APP/3.1(8)).
REP8-028A-04	No 4. LB Havering welcomes this proposed change to the timescale for Deemed Consent for the reasons set out in response to No2.	Highways England’s position remains as set out in its response to the schedule of ExA’s recommended amendments to the Applicants draft DCO Version 6 (REP8-010).

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
REP8-028A-05	No 5. LB Havering welcomes this proposed change to the timescale for Deemed Consent for the reasons set out in response to No2	Highways England's position remains as set out in its response to the schedule of ExA's recommended amendments to the Applicants draft DCO Version 6 (REP8-010).
REP8-028A-06	No 10. LB Havering welcomes the ExA's proposal to delete the word "substantially" from Requirement 4. This will provide the Council with certainty that the content of the outline CEMP including S61 consents will be delivered through the final CEMP.	Highways England's position remains as set out in its response to the schedule of ExA's recommended amendments to the Applicants draft DCO Version 6 (REP8-010).
REP8-028A-07	No 11. LB Havering welcomes the ExA's proposal to delete the phrase "must reflect" and insert the phrase "is in accordance with..." which gives the Council certainty that the final CEMP will be in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in the REAC.	Highways England's position remains as set out in its response to the schedule of ExA's recommended amendments to the Applicants draft DCO Version 6 (REP8-010).
REP8-028A-08	No 12. LB Havering welcomes the ExA's proposal to delete the phrase "must reflect" and insert the phrase "be in accordance with..." which gives the Council certainty that the final LEMP will follow with the mitigation measures set out in the REAC. LB Havering also welcomes the deletion of the phrase "be substantially in accordance" for the reasons set out for No 10 above.	Highways England's position remains as set out in its response to the schedule of ExA's recommended amendments to the Applicants draft DCO Version 6 (REP8-010).
REP8-028A-09	No 15. LB Havering welcomes the ExA's proposal to delete "reflecting the" and insert the phrase "is in accordance with..." which gives the Council certainty that written details of	Highways England's position remains as set out in its response to the schedule of ExA's recommended amendments to the Applicants draft DCO Version 6 (REP8-010).

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
	Requirement 8 will be in line with the mitigation measures set out in the REAC.	
REP8-028A-10	No 16. LB Havering welcomes the ExA's proposal to delete the word "substantially" from Requirement 9 (2). This will provide the Council with certainty that the content of the outline Archaeological Management Plan (AMP) will be delivered through the final Archaeological Management Plan prepared by the appointed contractor.	Highways England's position remains as set out in its response to the schedule of ExA's recommended amendments to the Applicants draft DCO Version 6 (REP8-010).
REP8-028A-11	No 18. LB Havering welcomes the ExA's proposal to delete the word "substantially" from Requirement 10 (2). This will provide the Council with certainty that the content of the outline Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be delivered through the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) prepared by the appointed contractor. Furthermore LB Havering welcomes the deletion of the word "reflect" which gives the Council certainty that the final TMP will follow the measures that are set out in the REAC.	Highways England's position remains as set out in its response to the schedule of ExA's recommended amendments to the Applicants draft DCO Version 6 (REP8-010).
REP8-028A-12	No 19. LB Havering welcomes the ExA's proposal to delete the word "substantially" and "reflect" from Requirement 11 (2). This will provide the Council with certainty that the content of the outline Arboricultural Method Statement will be delivered through the final Arboricultural Method Statement prepared by the appointed contractor and in line with the mitigation measures set out in the REAC.	Highways England's position remains as set out in its response to the schedule of ExA's recommended amendments to the Applicants draft DCO Version 6 (REP8-010).

Response reference:	Representation Issue	Highways England Response
REP8-028A-13	No 20. LB Havering welcomes this proposed change to the timescale for Deemed Consent for the reasons set out in response to No2.	Highways England's position remains as set out in its response to the schedule of ExA's recommended amendments to the Applicants draft DCO Version 6 (REP8-010).
REP8-028A-14	No 21. LB Havering welcomes the proposed new Requirement for mitigation measures including visual screen and post construction noise monitoring to determine whether an acoustic screen would be required. Should the new Requirement be implemented into the final DCO it would help address LB Havering's concerns raised at Deadline 6 (REP6-036) for the need for a permanent acoustic noise barrier to be in place for the residents of Grove Farm.	Highways England's position remains as set out in its response to the schedule of ExA's recommended amendments to the Applicants draft DCO Version 6 (REP8-010).
REP8-028A-15	No. 23. LB Havering welcomes the proposed New Requirement for a Code of Construction Practise (CoCP) to be prepared and approved prior to the commencement of any development.	Highways England's position remains as set out in its response to the schedule of ExA's recommended amendments to the Applicants draft DCO Version 6 (REP8-010).

© Crown copyright (2021).

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/
write to the Information Policy Team, **The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU**,
or email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Printed on paper from well-managed forests and other controlled sources.

Registered office Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ
Highways England Company Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363