

Application by Highways England for the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling project
The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)
Issued on 20 December 2018

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information - ExQ1. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ2.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Annex E to the Rule 8 letter of 20 December 2018. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 1 (indicating that it is from ExQ1) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on archaeology and cultural heritage issues is identified as Q1.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please contact A303SparkfordtoIlchester@pins.gsi.gov.uk and include 'A303 Sparkford to Ilchester' in the subject line of your email.

Responses are due by **Deadline 2: 23 January 2019**.

Abbreviations used

PA2008	<i>The Planning Act 2008</i>		
Art	<i>Article</i>		
ALA 1981	<i>Acquisition of Land Act 1981</i>		
BoR	<i>Book of Reference</i>		
CA	<i>Compulsory Acquisition</i>		
CPO	<i>Compulsory purchase order</i>		
dDCO	<i>Draft DCO</i>		
EM	<i>Explanatory Memorandum</i>		
ES	<i>Environmental Statement</i>		
ExA	<i>Examining authority</i>		
IP	<i>Interested Party</i>		
LIR	<i>Local Impact Report</i>		
LOAEL	<i>Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level</i>		
LPA	<i>Local planning authority</i>		
MP	<i>Model Provision (in the MP Order)</i>		
MP Order	<i>The Infrastructure Planning (Model Provisions) Order 2009</i>		
		NMU	<i>Non-motorised user</i>
		NPS	<i>National Policy Statement</i>
		NSIP	<i>Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project</i>
		R	<i>Requirement</i>
		SI	<i>Statutory Instrument</i>
		SCC	<i>Somerset County Council</i>
		SSDC	<i>South Somerset District Council</i>
		SOAEL	<i>Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level</i>
		SoS	<i>Secretary of State (for Transport)</i>
		SoSHCLG	<i>Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government</i>
		SSSI	<i>Site of Special Scientific Interest</i>
		TP	<i>Temporary Possession</i>

The Examination Library: References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/TR010036-000363>

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

Citation of Questions: Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, eg ExQ1.1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.

Responses:

A significant number of the questions seek clarification, or deal with potential typographic or cartographic errors. The ExA is content for the applicant to deal with these through the use of errata sheet(s) if that would be easier and/or by indicating that they have been addressed in a revised version of a document (such as the dDCO) which is submitted in line with an existing Deadline. If the response is of that nature, then any response can refer to the relevant errata sheet or amended document.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.0	General and Cross-topic Questions	
1.0.1	IPs	<p>National Planning Policy Framework On 24 July 2018 the SoS MHCLG published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. The ES refers to the 2012 version and was drawn up taking account of that document. Could IPs set out any comments that they may have over changes that need to be addressed following the publication of the 2018 version of the Framework?</p> <p>It would be useful if the evaluation were presented in a separate document, in tabulated form which cross-refers to the relevant sections of the original (or subsequently amended) documentation where revision is necessary.</p> <p>Any further revisions to documents should refer to the 2018 version where relevant.</p>
1.0.2	SSDC	<p>Local Plan</p> <p>a) While various policies of the South Somerset Local Plan (2006 – 2028) have been cited by the Applicant, could the Council please provide a copy of the complete document and any associated policies map(s)?</p> <p>b) The Case for the Scheme [APP-149, paragraph 7.4.10] indicates that the Local Plan is currently being reviewed. Could the Council please indicate the latest situation, provide updated information as appropriate and advise what, if any, weight it considers should be given to this emerging Local Plan?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.0.3.	SSDC	<p>Local Plan</p> <p>a) The Applicant has quoted various development plan policies in the chapters of the ES. Does the Council consider that the policies cited are all those relevant to the proposal?</p> <p>b) If not could the Council please indicate which others it considers to be material and whether and/or how the proposal would comply or otherwise to that policy?</p>
1.0.4.	SCC	<p>Waste Plan</p> <p>a) While various policies of the Somerset Waste Core Strategy have been cited by the Applicant, could the Council please provide a copy of the complete document and any associated policies map(s)?</p> <p>b) The ES Vol 6.1 Chapter 10, Material Assets and Waste [APP-047] paragraph 10.3.26 indicates that the Somerset Waste Core Strategy is currently under review to be replaced by the Somerset Waste Plan.</p> <p>Could the Council please indicate the latest situation, provide updated information as appropriate and advise what, if any, weight it considers should be given to this emerging Local Plan?</p>
1.0.5.	SCC	<p>Waste Plan</p> <p>a) The Applicant has quoted various development plan policies in the chapters of the ES. Does the Council consider that the policies cited are all those relevant to the proposal?</p> <p>b) If not could it please indicate which others it considers to be material and whether and/or how the proposal would comply or otherwise to that policy?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.0.6.	Parish Councils	<p>Neighbourhood Plans</p> <p>a) Could the Parish Councils please confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Whether they are designated for the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans? (ii) If they are, at what stage have any Neighbourhood Plans reached? (iii) What weight, they consider should be given to any published document? <p>b) If any documents have been published, could the relevant Parish Council please provide a copy?</p>
1.0.7.	The Applicant	<p>Drawings</p> <p>There appears to be an error in the Engineering Sections drawings [APP-016] in the existing ground level for Work 11 – Track 2 at chainages 920, 940, 1100 and 1120. Can all these drawings please be checked?</p>
1.0.8.	The Applicant	<p>Drawings</p> <p>Various potential discrepancies are noted in reference to the dDCO section below (Annex A) Please ensure that these are resolved.</p>
1.0.9.	The Applicant	<p>Public Sector Equality Duty</p> <p>In considering the application, the SoS will be subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. Could the Applicant please set out its position in this matter as to how it has fulfilled the duty upon it to date, and how it considers the SoS can fulfil the duty?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.0.10	The Applicant	<p>Environmental Statement</p> <p>Under Regulation 21 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 there will be a duty on the SoS to consider whether it is appropriate to impose monitoring measures. If the SoS so chooses there is then an obligation to consider whether to make provision for potential remedial action, take steps to ensure that the type of parameters to be monitored and the duration of the monitoring are proportionate to the nature, location and size of the proposed development and the significance of its effects on the environment, and consider, in order to avoid duplication of monitoring, whether any existing monitoring arrangements carried out in accordance with an obligation under the law of any part of the United Kingdom, other than under the Directive, are more appropriate than imposing a monitoring measure.</p> <p>Could the Applicant please set out what potential remedial action may be needed, and what, if any, monitoring would be required, and explain how it would be secured in the dDCO?</p>
1.0.11	The Applicant	<p>Clarification</p> <p>The dDCO [APP-017/AS-007/AS-008] refers to 6 multi-purpose tracks, works No 3, 4, 11, 12, 57 and 58. These are shown on the Works plans but there appears to be no description of what these are within the ES. Can the Applicant explain to what extent impacts associated with these works have been assessed within the ES?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.0.12	The Applicant	<p>Clarification</p> <p>a) The resultant significant effects, post implementation of the mitigation measures are presented within the ES Chapter 15 [APP-052]: Summary, Table 15.1: Summary of significant residual effects. Within this Table, the effects on receptors are classified into whether they are adverse or beneficial, during construction or operation, and whether the effects would be temporary or long term. Effects in ES Chapter 12 [APP-049] are discussed in terms of temporary and permanent.</p> <p>Please clarify whether there is a difference between long term and permanent. If so, please explain the difference?</p> <p>b) Could the Applicant provide a description of effects that are deemed, respectively long term and permanent? This may be easiest in tabular form.</p>
1.1.	Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	
1.1.1.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification</p> <p>In Appendix 6.1 to the ES [APP-067] paragraph 4.6.7 there is reference to "a new underbridge joining Traits Lane on the south side of the A303 with a road named Camel Hill on the north side". This underbridge does not appear to be part of the proposals set out in the dDCO. Could this reference be explained?</p>
1.1.2.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification</p> <p>In Appendix 6.1 to the ES [APP-067] Table 7.2 (page 71) for the reference for St Michael's Hill in the column headed "Significance of effect", there are comments about "If remains ...". What is this referring to?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.3.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification Appendix 6.1 of the ES [APP-067] page 98 under MM49 gives the name of the heritage asset as "DELISTED", and then makes reference to "An early 19th century cottage and show with matching 20th century additions that has been removed from the Listed." On page 122 what is understood to be this building is referred to as "Robinson's Antiques, High Street, Queen Camel". Can the identification on page 98 please be confirmed and corrected?</p>
1.1.4.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification In Appendix 6.2, Hazlegrove House Registered Park and Garden Statement of Significance of the ES [APP-068] some of the cross referencing has gone awry – figures in the sections are said to be N.X when shown as N+1.X, for example see paragraph 5.5.4 first line with Figure 5.7 below. Could this please be checked and re-issued as necessary.</p>
1.1.5.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification Appendix 6.2 to the ES [APP-068] paragraph 7.4.3 refers to a "final version of this report". Is such a document to be provided, and if so can it be provided?</p>
1.1.6.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification Paragraphs 6.4.4 to 6.4.6 of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the ES [APP-043] refer to various documents setting out the heritage assets that have been scoped in and out of assessment. For example, in paragraph 6.4.5 is stated "This agreed list has informed the assessment and can be found in Appendix B of Appendix 6.2 Cultural Heritage DBA". However, Appendix 6.2 is the "Hazlegrove House Registered Park and Garden Statement of Significance". The Applicant is therefore asked to clarify these references and re-issue/set out in a table of errata as appropriate.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.7.	The Applicant	Clarification Paragraph 6.7.16 of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the ES [APP-043] refers to Ilchester to being 7 km to the north east, when it is to the west-southwest. Could this reference be checked and any other such similar matters be addressed in a table of errata?
1.1.8.	The Applicant IPs	Heritage assets (generally) a) Paragraph 6.6.1 of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the ES [APP-043] indicates that the assessment area has been identified at 1 km (plus a small number of additions). While this is based on professional judgement, what other distances were considered as part of the original assessment? b) Why were these rejected? c) Do IPs consider that the assessment area is appropriate?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.9.	The Applicant	<p>Heritage Assets (generally)</p> <p>a) ES Volume 6.3 Appendix 3 paragraph 7.3.1 [APP-067] states that “effects of Moderate to Very Large are considered significant”. From this, all heritage assets identified within the study area and included within the ES Volume 6.3 Appendix 6.1 Table 7.2 with a less than “Moderate” level of significance has been scoped out.</p> <p>However, it is possible that less than moderate effects may, in combination, result in moderate or greater level of effects which should, using this approach, have been scoped in.</p> <p>Could the Applicant please re-assess the effects to ascertain whether or not in combination effects of “less than moderate” would have a moderate or greater effect? This may be easiest to explain in tabular form.</p> <p>b) If the results of these in combination effects would have a moderate or greater effect, could these please be assessed and if any conclusions amended as appropriate?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.10.	The Applicant	<p>Heritage Assets (generally)</p> <p>The ES utilises the HA208/07 definition of direct impacts which includes the following effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degradation/destruction of unknown archaeological remains; • Physical alterations to heritage assets; • The effect of increased noise, light and air pollution on heritage assets; <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact on views and historical setting caused by the Proposed Development. <p>Indirect effects are defined by HA208/07 as being “impacts arising from the scheme where the connection between the scheme and the impact is complicated, unpredictable or remote.” It is noted that indirect effects have not been identified or assessed within the ES Cultural Heritage chapter [APP-043].</p> <p>Could the Applicant explain why an assessment of the potential indirect effects has not been undertaken, particularly with regard to the potential for changes in the hydrological and hydrogeological setting of the study area, having the potential to impact buried known and unknown archaeological remains?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.11.	The Applicant	<p>Heritage Assets (generally) The temporal scope of the assessment is outlined within the ES Cultural Heritage chapter section 6.8 [APP-043]. The temporal scope is divided into temporary and permanent construction impacts, and operational impacts. This approach differs from HA208/07 which includes descriptions of the time periods for short term, medium term, long term, and permanent effects.</p> <p>Could the Applicant explain why the cultural heritages assessment's temporal scope differs from HA208/07 guidance?</p>
1.1.12.	The Applicant	<p>Heritage Assets (generally) a) In Tables 6.4 and 6.5 of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the ES [APP-043] mitigation measures are described within the Description of Impact column, but it is not clear whether the Significance of Effect column includes the described mitigation measures.</p> <p>Could the Applicant confirm whether the Significance of Effect column within these tables takes into account the mitigation measures described in the Description of Impact column?</p> <p>b) If the mitigation measures are not included in the Significance of Effect column, could the Applicant provide an updated Significance of Effect for the heritage assets?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.13.	The Applicant	<p>Heritage Assets (generally)(vibration) The Proposed Development indicates that an increase in Heavy Good Vehicles (HGVs) is anticipated, but the potential effect arising from the vibrations caused by the HGVs on historic buildings or other heritage assets such as Scheduled Ancient Monuments has not been assessed. Could the Applicant please set out an assessment on heritage assets of the effects of vibrations caused by HGVs?</p>
1.1.14.	The Applicant	<p>Heritage Assets (generally)(lighting) a) Lighting, both constructional and during operation, can be considered a nuisance. However, there is no evidence within the ES Appendix 6.5 Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance [APP-146] that construction lighting effects have been fully assessed. It is noted that the Cultural Heritage chapter [APP-043] Table 6.4 states that construction lighting will affect the heritage settings of Eyewell House and Hazlegrove House and associated Registered Park and Garden (RPG). Furthermore, Table 6.5 states that Hazlegrove House Group heritage setting will be adversely impacted by lighting columns for the first few years. No description of how construction and operational lighting has been assessed or, how the effect has been quantified is included within the ES.</p> <p>Could the Applicant provide a description of the methodology used to determine the significant effects of construction and operational lighting on the heritage assets, with particular reference to Eyewell House, Hazlegrove House Group, and Hazlegrove Group RPG?</p> <p>b) Could the Applicant please indicate how long “the first few years” referred to above would be?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.15.	The Applicant The Gardens Trust (or Somerset Gardens Trust if acting is as its deputy) Historic England	Heritage Assets (generally) (landscape and visual effects) a) The Proposed Development indicates that an increase in Heavy Good Vehicles (HGVs). It is not clear if the HGV heights have been taken into consideration when assessing the effect on the heritage assets with respect to viewpoints. Could the Applicant state if HGV height has been taken into account when assessing the heritage assets with respect to viewpoints? b) If HGV height has not been taken into account, could the Applicant explain their approach to the proposed mitigation measures to reduce the potential impact of HGV height on heritage assets with respect to viewpoints?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.16.	The Applicant The Gardens Trust (or Somerset Gardens Trust if acting as its deputy) Historic England	Hazlegrove House and Hazelgrove House RPG a) Historic England [RR-018] has indicated that it is in discussions with the Applicant "on the exact extent of landscape mitigation proposals: including whether the height of screening bunds could be increased to screen the full height of a HGV when viewed from key viewpoints within the RPG". Can Historic England confirm which bund(s) as shown on the Works Plan [APP-006] it is referring to? b) If the bunds to the north side of the proposed road at the end of the vista from Hazlegrove House were to be raised in height what effects would this have? This question should be answered in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Land-take• Landscape effects• Visual effects• Noise effects

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.17.	The Applicant SSDC Historic England The Gardens Trust (or Somerset Gardens Trust if acting is as its deputy) Affected Landowners	Hazlegrove House RPG a) The proposal involves works within the Hazlegrove House Registered Park or Garden (RPG). What criteria were used to judge where the physically unaffected land of the RPG would be located? b) What alternatives were considered for the extent of the physically unaffected land of the RPG, and why were they rejected? c) Is the loss of cultural heritage the minimum necessary to deliver the benefits of the proposal? d) Are there alternatives, perhaps involving different land-takes, which would better ensure the significance of the heritage asset was maintained? e) When considering the level of harm to the heritage asset, what level of harm would be caused? Such an assessment should be justified.
1.1.18.	The Applicant SSDC Historic England The Gardens Trust (or Somerset Gardens Trust if acting is as its deputy) Affected Landowners	Hazlegrove House RPG a) Table 6.4, second row, of the Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the ES [APP-043] in respect of the temporary effects on Hazlegrove House RPG states that there were be a change from “arable farmland to construction area”. While it is appreciated that the field being utilised is arable farmland, given that the parkland is predominantly pastoral is this statement clear? b) If not, does this affect the conclusions?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.19.	The Applicant SSDC Historic England	<p>Hazlegrove House RPG</p> <p>a) In Table 6.4, second row, of the Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the ES [APP-043] assessing the effects on the Hazlegrove House RPG there are references to a “construction compound” and an “ancillary construction compound”. However, these are not shown on the works plan. Have they been omitted from the works plan or no longer proposed?</p> <p>b) Does the assessment set out in the ES need to be updated to take account of the final proposal?</p>
1.1.20.	The Applicant	<p>Hazlegrove House RPG</p> <p>a) As precise details of the planting scheme would be subject to a Requirement of the DCO how is it possible to be satisfied that any proposed landscaping screening would reflect the character of the park (ES paragraph 6.13.1 of Chapter 6 [APP-043])?</p>
1.1.21.	The Applicant SSDC Historic England Affected Landowners	<p>Archaeology</p> <p>a) It is noted in paragraph 6.5.2 of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the ES [APP-043] that field evaluation (trial trenching and/or geophysical survey) has been undertaken as regards archaeology with the results submitted as other environmental information to support the DCO application during the examination period. When are the results likely to be available?</p> <p>b) What arrangements are in place to disseminate these results and take the results into account, if necessary, within the ES and dDCO?</p> <p>c) If the results are already available, has the field work revealed any previously unknown archaeological remains?</p> <p>d) If so, what is the significance of these remains and what effects would the proposal have upon them?</p> <p>e) Does this affect the conclusions and if so, in what way?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.22.	The Applicant Historic England Affected landowners	<p>Camel Hill Romano-British Settlement Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)</p> <p>a) As regards Camel Hill SAM group is it agreed that the methods of mitigation are sufficient to ensure that any negative effects are kept to a minimum?</p> <p>b) If not, how could they be improved?</p> <p>c) What degree of harm, if any, would be caused to the SAM?</p>
1.1.23.	The Applicant Historic England Affected landowners	<p>Downhead Medieval Settlement Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)</p> <p>Historic England's Relevant Representation [RR-018] notes that a habitat mitigation area is to be located in proximity to the monument. What would be the effects of this mitigation area on the SAM?</p>
1.1.24.	The Applicant Historic England Affected landowners	<p>Downhead Medieval Settlement Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)</p> <p>a) As regards Downhead Medieval Settlement SAM group is it agreed that the methods of mitigation are sufficient to ensure that any negative effects are kept to a minimum?</p> <p>b) If not, how could they be improved?</p> <p>c) What degree of harm, if any, would be caused to the SAM?</p>
1.1.25.	SSDC Historic England The Gardens Trust (or Somerset Gardens Trust if acting as its deputy)	<p>Archaeology</p> <p>Due to the uncertainties involved in identifying archaeological sites from aerial photography, could the heritage stakeholders state whether they are in agreement with the Applicant's interpretation of the aerial photography as listed within Appendix 6.1, Appendix D of the ES [APP-067]?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.26.	The Applicant SSDC Parish Councils Historic England	<p>Queen Camel and West Camel Conservation Areas and Heritage Assets to the south</p> <p>a) During construction and when operative, when the A303 is closed, the diversion route will be to the south and diverted traffic may travel through Sparkford, Queen Camel and West Camel. This is assessed in the ES Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment Table 7.2 pages 62 and 63 [APP-068] in respect of both the construction and operational periods. Do all parties agree with this assessment, and if not, could the reasoning please be explained?</p> <p>b) What measures would be in place to ensure that any effects on these heritage assets were mitigated?</p> <p>c) How would these measures be secured?</p>
1.1.27.	The Applicant SSDC Sparkford Parish Council Historic England	<p>Listed buildings in Sparkford</p> <p>a) It is indicated that there would be an increase in traffic on Sparkford High Street as a result of the proposal. This increase would be in proximity to listed buildings. What effect would the proposal have on these heritage assets?</p> <p>b) If this results in any degree of harm, what measures would be in place to ensure that any effects on these heritage assets were mitigated?</p> <p>c) How would these measures be secured?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.28.	The Applicant SSDC Historic England	<p>Listed milestone</p> <p>a) Paragraph 6.9.8 of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the ES [APP-043] sets out the proposal is to remove the nineteenth century listed milestone and replace it at “an appropriate point on the new A303 which would retain its historic setting”. Please could further analysis to justify this quote be undertaken taking account of the nature of the road when the milestone was originally installed, now and for the future?</p> <p>b) In relation to the milestone the works are described as “Temporary Moderate Adverse” and “Permanent Slight Adverse.” While historic fabric is to be retained (in the sense that the milestone is to be physically removed and replaced) won’t this result in the total loss of fabric. When considering the level of harm to the heritage asset, what level of harm would be caused? Such an assessment should be justified.</p> <p>c) Where in the dDCO Requirements it is provided that the milestone is to be relocated?</p> <p>d) What arrangements are in place to see whether, if the milestone was replaced, it was re-considered for listing?</p>
1.1.29.	The Applicant SSDC Historic England	<p>Non-designated heritage assets</p> <p>a) Section 4.9 of Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment [APP-067] sets out a list of non-designated heritage assets. It is indicated that these were “identified due to their historic value and the potential for this value to be impacted by the scheme”. Could it be clarified against what objective criteria was this list drawn up?</p> <p>b) What measures were taken to identify any other potential non-designated heritage assets (apart from the 2018 investigations on site of non-identified archaeological remains)?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.30.	The Applicant	<p>Non-designated heritage assets</p> <p>a) Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the ES [APP-043] only assesses the effect on a single non-designated heritage asset, Pepper Hill Cottage (paragraph 6.7.23). Why were the effects assessed for only this asset and not others?</p>
1.1.31.	SSDC The Applicant	<p>Non-designated heritage assets</p> <p>a) Does the Council does have a list of non-designated heritage assets? b) If it does, what assessment has been made of the effect of the proposal on the significance of the heritage assets within the relevant area? c) If it does not, what measures have been undertaken to ascertain whether any non-designated heritage assets are affected by the proposals, and what assessment has been made of the effect of the proposal on the significance of these heritage assets?</p>
1.1.32.	The Applicant SSDC	<p>Pepper Hill Cottage</p> <p>a) Regarding Pepper Hill Cottage, is it agreed that the methods of mitigation are sufficient to ensure that any negative effects are kept to a minimum? b) If not, how could they be improved?</p>
1.1.33.	The Applicant SCC SSDC	<p>Queen Camel Bridge</p> <p>a) The bridge across the River Cam at Queen Camel is said to be of historic interest and is subject to a 7.5 tonne weight limit. The diversion route when the A303 is closed would be across this bridge. What analysis has been undertaken as to whether the bridge should be considered to be a non-designated heritage asset? b) Should it be considered as a non-designated heritage asset? c) Have any surveys been undertaken to ensure that the use of this bridge by large HGVs on diversion will not affect the structural integrity of the bridge, and thus any historic interest it may possess? d) If so, what are the results?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.34.	The Applicant SCC Affected Parish Councils	<p>Celtic Way</p> <p>a) Table 12.10 of the ES Chapter 12 People and Communities [APP-049] refers to the Celtic Way as a route that visits more than 100 pre-historic sites through South Wales and the South West. Could more detail be provided as to what the Celtic Way is, how it came about, what level of use is there of it and similar?</p> <p>b) Should this route be considered to be a non-designated heritage asset?</p> <p>c) The NPSNN, in paragraph 2.9, indicates that “development will be needed to ... enhance accessibility for non-motorised users”. Could it be explained, specifically, how the proposal would meet this criteria for those using the Celtic Way?</p>
1.2.	Air Quality and Emissions	
1.2.1.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification</p> <p>In paragraph 5.8.2 of Chapter 5 Air Quality of the ES [APP-042], first bullet, there is footnote 49. However, the text of this footnote is missing. Could it please be included?</p>
1.2.2.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification</p> <p>In paragraph 5.10.14 of Chapter 5 Air Quality of the ES [APP-042] there is reference to the PM₁₀ results being in Appendix 5.1, Volume 6.2. However, we do not appear to have been provided with this document. Can it please be so provided?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.2.3.	SSDC Natural England	Whitesheet Hill SSSI Are the parties satisfied, as identified in paragraph 5.10.32 of Chapter 5 Air Quality of the ES [APP-042], with the analysis undertaken by the Applicant so that it can be satisfactorily concluded that the proposal would not have a significant effect on Whitesheet Hill SSSI?
1.2.4.	SSDC Natural England	Stockton Wood and Down SSSI Are the parties satisfied, as identified in paragraph 5.4.4 of Chapter 5 Air Quality of the ES [APP-042], that as Stockton Wood and Down SSSI lies further than 200 m of the ARN it would not be materially affected in air quality terms by the proposal?
1.2.5.	SSDC	Approach a) Is the Council satisfied with the overall approach of the Applicant to dealing with Air Quality? b) Does it have any specific criticisms it would like to make?
1.2.6.	The Applicant	Receptors a) Is it correct that receptor 18 (The Witches) is both the highest concentration of PM ₁₀ (paragraph 5.10.19 of Chapter 5 Air Quality of the ES [APP-042]), and also the greatest improvement in annual NO ₂ concentrations (paragraph 5.10.28 of the same document) in the Do-Something scenario? b) If so, can the implications of this be explained?
1.3.	Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))	
1.3.1.	The Applicant	Clarification In the Consultation Report - Annex N [APP-037] the response to consultation page 11 indicates "mammal underpasses" in the plural. However only a single badger tunnel appears to be proposed. Could this be clarified?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.3.2.	The Applicant	<p>Ground Investigation</p> <p>a) Paragraph 9.5.2 of ES Chapter 9: Geology and Soils [APP-046] states that the Ground Investigation work does not cover the entire route and was not designed for the current Proposed Development. The ES explains that the information can be extrapolated to the wider area with a reasonable degree of confidence. Can you provide further justification for this statement?</p> <p>b) What do you consider a 'reasonable degree' to be?</p> <p>c) Can you confirm if the scheme specific ground investigation has been completed and submitted?</p> <p>d) Has this found any significant effect?</p> <p>e) Can the Applicant explain whether any follow up survey work is required?</p>
1.3.3.	The Applicant	<p>Biodiversity (generally)</p> <p>The ES does not specifically outline the design objectives (as opposed to operational objectives) of the proposed development. Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-045] refers to better design being an objective of the UK Post 2010 Biodiversity Framework. Paragraph 8.3.19 of Chapter 8 states that the design, including proposals for lighting, should ensure it does not cause severance or is a barrier to movement.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.5.4 of ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-045] states there will be no net loss of habitat of conservation value as any habitat loss would be replaced on a like for like minimum requirement. Further details of habitat loss and gain are provided in paragraph 8.9.3. Can the Applicant confirm where and how this is secured in the dDCO?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.3.4.	The Applicant Natural England SCC SSDC	<p>Habitats (generally)</p> <p>a) The Councils in their representations [RR-040 and RR-041] indicate approximately 91 ha of habitat clearance would be undertaken as part of the proposed scheme, 77.4 ha would be temporarily damaged and 13.7 ha permanently removed. Does the Applicant agree with these figures?</p> <p>b) If not could its figures be provided, perhaps best in tabulated form?</p> <p>c) It is stated that there would be a net gain in priority habitat (see paragraph 8.10.58 of Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-045]. Could the Applicant please set out why it considers the gain in priority habitat should be given more weight than the overall loss of habitat?</p>
1.3.5.	The Applicant Natural England	<p>Reptiles</p> <p>a) Paragraph 3.4.2 of the Appendix 8.7 Reptile Technical Report [APP-080] indicates that due to a lack of suitable places to put felt tiles for the reptile survey, the population may have been slightly underestimated. Can the Applicant confirm by how much they consider this under estimate to be?</p> <p>b) Can Natural England confirm if they consider the approach taken by the Applicant to be suitably precautionary and in line with principles of worst case scenario?</p>
1.3.6.	The Applicant SSDC	<p>Veteran Trees</p> <p>a) In appendix 6.2 to the ES [APP-068] paragraph 6.6.6 refers to veteran trees having been "designated". Could the parties explain who designated these trees and why they were so designated?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.3.7.	The Applicant	<p>Veteran Trees</p> <p>a) Paragraph 5.32 of the NPSNN states the SoS should not grant development consent for any development that would result in the loss or deterioration of ... veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the national need for and benefits of the development, in that location, clearly outweigh the loss. ... Where such trees would be affected by development proposals, the applicant should set out proposals for their conservation or, where their loss is unavoidable, the reasons for this.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 175 c) states “development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons^{FN} and a suitable compensation strategy exists”.</p> <p>^{FN} (in original) - For example, infrastructure projects (including nationally significant infrastructure projects, orders under the Transport and Works Act and hybrid bills), where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat.</p> <p>Is it specifically proposed to set out a compensation strategy?</p> <p>b) If so, could details of the asserted compensation strategy be set out, along with details of how it is, specifically, to be secured in the dDCO?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.3.8.	The Applicant Natural England	Need for Habitats Regulations Assessment/Appropriate Assessment What, if any, implications are there from the Court of Justice decisions in the cases of <i>People over Wind</i> , <i>Peter Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta Case C-323/17</i> , and <i>Brian Holohan, Richard Guilfoyle, Noric Guilfoyle, Liam Donegan v An Bord Pleanála C-461/17</i> to the consideration of this matter?
1.3.9.	Natural England IPs	Habitats Assessment a) The Applicant has concluded, paragraph 6.1.1, in its Habitats Regulations Assessment Finding of No Significant Effects Report [APP-147] "there would not be likely significant effects upon ... European sites, either alone, or in combination with other schemes as a result of the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling scheme". Do the parties agree with this conclusion? b) If not, any party is requested to explain and evidence the basis for their position?
1.4.	Noise and Vibration	
1.4.1.	The Applicant	WHO Noise Guidelines The WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region were published in October 2018. Could the Applicant confirm whether these guidelines will have any implications on the noise assessment conclusions within the ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration [APP-048].
1.4.2.	The Applicant	Noise Could the Applicant indicate where in the dDCO is it provided that the low noise surface shown to be used in paragraph 11.5.13 of Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-048] would be so used?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.4.3.	The Applicant Affected IPs	<p>Noise</p> <p>a) Table 11.3 in Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-048] indicates The Methodist Church is seen as being of High Sensitivity. However, the nIa (Noise Important Area) does not seem to include this building (Figure 11.1). Is there a particular reason for this?</p> <p>b) What would be the implications if the nIa were to be extended to include this building?</p>
1.4.4.	The Applicant SSDC	<p>Noise</p> <p>a) Paragraph 11.10.29 of Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-048] indicates that there would be, in the worst case, 100 additional construction related vehicles per day. The assumption is that this would be 200 movements per day. The lowest road traffic volume is about 58 vehicles/hour (paragraph 11.10.31 of the same document) and a 25% increase would be needed to create a significant effect.</p> <p>However, it is not clear what the distribution of the construction related traffic movements would be, and thus whether it would be “grouped”, thereby in any hour creating a significant effect.</p> <p>While the $1\text{dB}_{\text{LA}10, 18\text{hr}}$ is based over the 18 hour period, this does not mean that within a shorter time period the effect would not be significant. What consideration has been given to assessing the effects over a shorter time period given the potentially grouped nature of likely movements?</p> <p>b) If such consideration were undertaken, what would the results be?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.4.5.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification Table 11.3 in Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-048] sets out the sensitivity criteria used. The low category includes residences not occupied during the daytime. Have any residences that could potentially be affected by the scheme been categorised as low sensitivity?</p>
1.4.6.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification a) Have the potential noise impacts of the scheme on the residents and business at Sparkford Hall been assessed? b) If so, where do we find this information?</p>
1.4.7.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification Why does Table 11.9 in Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-048] use the noise insulation regulations rather than the WHO guidelines for the daytime threshold for SOAEL?</p>
1.4.8.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification Para 11.10.18 of Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-048] states that there are no residential receptors within 50m of the batching plant compound. The four site compound areas are shown of Figure 2.9 but it is not shown which one would host the concrete batching plant. Can the Applicant identify which compound will host the concrete batching plant?</p>
1.4.9.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification The noise and vibration assessment study area is described in Section 11.6 of Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-048]. The study area for construction noise and vibration is 300m from the Proposed Development's order limits. The study area for operational noise is 1km from the Proposed Development order limits with a calculation area of 600m from the Proposed Development order limits. Why are the calculations limited to 600m?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.4.10.	The Applicant	Clarification The Short Term and Long Term noise survey locations are not numbered on Figure 1.1 in Appendix 11.1 Baseline Noise Survey Results [APP-090]. For clarity, can the Applicant provide a plan showing clearly labelled noise monitoring locations?
1.4.11.	The Applicant	Clarification The operational study area depicted in Figure 11.1 in Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-048] is inconsistent with the operational study area described in Chapter 11 section 11.6. Can this be rectified please?
1.4.12.	The Applicant	Baseline Para 11.10.36 in Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-048] assesses construction noise over an 18 hour period, but traffic is more likely to be diverted during peak and daytime hours. Have you assessed the noise impacts during these periods?
1.4.13.	The Applicant	Baseline Long Hazel Park has not been assessed as a residential receptor. What is the reason for this?
1.4.14.	SSDC	Baseline a) Does the Council agree that the LOAEL and SOAEL levels used at Table 11.5 in Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-048] are appropriate? b) If not what alternative levels do you suggest and why?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.4.15.	The Applicant	<p>Baseline</p> <p>a) The Transport Report [APP-150] and the CoMMA Report[APP-151]refer to the higher traffic flows at weekends particularly during the summer. These represent a substantial increase in traffic (about 35%). The effect of this seasonal increase on noise does not appear to have been assessed. What is the reason for this?</p> <p>b) To what extent are the much high levels of traffic during these periods likely to impact on noise within the study area?</p>
1.4.16.	The Applicant	<p>Baseline</p> <p>The proposed bunds have been taken into account as part of the mitigation during the operational phase. What assumptions regarding the size position and extent of the bunds have been used when assessing the effect of the bunds on noise levels?</p>
1.4.17.	The Applicant	<p>Baseline</p> <p>A number of the measurements taken to inform the baseline noise assessment were taken over the period of 28 February – 1 March. This included a period of low temperatures and snow in many locations.</p> <p>The weather conditions in both the local and wider area would have been likely to affect traffic levels and perhaps speed. How has this matter been addressed in the baseline results?</p>
1.4.18.	The Applicant	<p>Baseline</p> <p>a) Can the Applicant explain the extent to which relevant consultation bodies were engaged in agreeing the appropriate baseline data?</p> <p>b) Can the Applicant also explain the extent to which they consider the baseline assessment to accurately represent the entirety of the noise assessment study areas?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.4.19.	The Applicant	Baseline Can the Applicant explain why no vibration baseline has been undertaken, and confirm the extent to which this has been agreed with relevant consultation bodies?
1.4.20.	The Applicant	Baseline a) Can the Applicant explain why no baseline noise survey or noise assessment focussing on operational traffic noise diverting from the A303 to local roads within Sparkford and West Camel have been undertaken? b) In the absence of any survey data how can the Applicant be confident that noise increases will not give rise to significant adverse effects given the predicted increase in traffic on these roads?
1.4.21.	SDDC	Mitigation a) The ES para 11.10.66 [APP-048] sets out the intended mitigation for the residential properties at Annis Hill Farm and The Spinney. Do you consider the mitigation to be adequate? b) What reduction in noise would it achieve?
1.4.22.	The Applicant	Mitigation Can the Applicant explain why no mitigation measures have been proposed to prevent and/ or reduce significant effects occurring at The Spinney and Annis Hill Farm during the operation of the Proposed Development?
1.4.23.	The Applicant	Mitigation Can the Applicant provide evidence that secondary glazing and trickle vents will prevent significant effects occurring at The Spinney and Annis Hill Farm during the operation of the Proposed Development?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.4.24.	Paul Griffiths	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>In his representation [RR 03]Paul Griffiths suggests the use of planted bunds in critical locations to address the issue of road noise. The scheme makes provision for several bunds.</p> <p>Are there additional locations where you consider the use of bunds would be desirable? If so why?</p>
1.4.25.	John Plested	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>In his representation [RR13] John Plested expressed concern about the adequacy of the proposed fencing.</p> <p>a) You request that Buffalo fencing is installed on the top of the bund to provide protection against noise. Please indicate which bund.</p> <p>b) Why is the fencing currently proposed inadequate/unsuitable?</p>
1.4.26.	The Applicant	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>a) Can the Applicant provide evidence that the alternative mitigation measures described within the ES Chapter 11[APP-048], paragraph 11.9.6 and 11.9.7 in conjunction with the noise barrier will prevent significant effects being experience to the 10 closest residential receptors during the construction period?</p>
1.4.27.	The Applicant	<p>Monitoring</p> <p>a) Can the Applicant explain why no noise monitoring measures have been proposed, considering that noise levels during the construction period, baseline year (2023) and design year (2038) may differ from the noise models?</p> <p>b) Can the Applicant explain the extent to which monitoring of the mitigation required to address anticipated significant effects has been considered and what if any remedial actions would be required?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.5.	Landscape and Visual Effects	
1.5.1.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification</p> <p>a) Ground levels are discussed in several places in Chapter 2 of the ES [APP-039]. Paragraph 2.5.229 states that lighting columns should be no higher than 10 metres above ground level. To what extent has the proposed lighting been taken into account within the landscape and visual impact assessment?</p> <p>b) Could we please be referred to the relevant sections detailing this particularly taking into account any changes of ground level upon which the lighting would be located?</p>
1.5.2.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification</p> <p>Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-044] paragraph 7.10.8 in the ES (Vol 6.1) does not conclude correctly. What should this say?</p>
1.5.3.	The Applicant SSDC SCC Historic England Natural England	<p>Clarification (Key views)</p> <p>a) Paragraph 7.4.9 of Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-044] indicates Key Views within Figures 7.8a to 7.8g which would seem to indicate seven views. However, Figure 7.6 (Key Views) is on five sheets indicating nine key views (numbered 10, 12, 14, 28, 30, 36, 38, 44 and 45).</p> <p>Could this please be clarified, both how many there should be and the criteria against which they were selected?</p> <p>b) Could we be directed to a plan, or could a plan be prepared, showing the key views, particularly identifying those used for the photomontages?</p> <p>c) Do the parties agree that these are the key views? If not, which additional views should be considered?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.5.4.	The Applicant SSDC SCC Natural England	Approach Figure 7.1 of Volume 6.2 of the ES [APP-117] sets out the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) used for the consideration of landscape and visual effects. Was this zone agreed with the Councils and other stakeholders prior to the effects being assessed?
1.5.5.	The Applicant SSDC SCC Natural England Historic England	Approach a) Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-044] explains that the landscape assessment has assessed residential receptors in small groups rather than individually and paragraph 7.7.30 states that the visual assessment has been undertaken by only assessing high sensitivity receptors. Are these approaches justified in all circumstances? b) If not, what alternative approach should be utilised and why?
1.5.6.	The Applicant IPs	Approach a) Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-044] section 7.8 sets out the potential impacts. Do the parties agree with the proposed landscape and visual effects as set out by the Applicant? b) If not, how and why do they disagree?
1.5.7.	The Applicant SSDC SCC	Approach a) Table 7.1 of Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-044] sets out landscape sensitivity to change evaluation and value criteria. Registered parks and gardens appear in both High and Medium Sensitivity to change categories. Could it be clarified what approach has been followed? b) How has this approach influenced the overall assessment? c) Do the Councils agree with this approach?
1.5.8.	SSDC	Baseline Does the Council agree with the baseline for landscape and visual effects as described in paragraphs 7.4.5 and following in Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-044]?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.5.9.	The Applicant SSDC	<p>Baseline</p> <p>Paragraph 7.7.1 of Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-044] describes the A303 transportation corridor as a discordant feature within a predominantly rural landscape. The A303 corridor is an ancient route, likely to have been in existence since at least the Roman period (see paragraph 6.7.5 of Chapter 6 of the ES [APP-043]) and thus has formed part of the landscape for many years. Could the Applicant please clarify the extent of the harm that it considers the current road and its use causes to both the landscape and in relation to visual effects?</p>
1.5.10.	The Applicant Historic England National Trust	<p>St Michael's Hill</p> <p>a) Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-044] paragraph 7.6.1 sets out the study area. The Cultural Heritage assessment [APP-043] paragraph 6.6.2 includes the effect from St Michael's Hill in the proximity of Montacute House and this is also referenced by the National Trust [RR-029].</p> <p>However, the landscape and visual effects from St Michael's Hill do not appear to have been assessed. Why was this viewpoint omitted from the assessment?</p> <p>b) What are the landscape and visual effects from this location and are they significant?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.5.11.	The Applicant Historic England National Trust	St Michael's Hill a) In the Appendix 6.1 of the ES, Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment [APP-067] on page 71 as regards the significance of effect it is stated: "Neutral evaluation, if remains are present and it is not possible to retain them in situ, an appropriate archaeological level of recording will be undertaken in accordance with an agreed WSI". Given the distance to St Michael's Hill could the second part of this statement please be justified?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.5.12.	The Applicant	<p>Bunds</p> <p>a) Paragraph 7.9.2 of Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-044] indicates that the bunds are 2 m in height. However, the engineering sections [APP-016] “Bunds and False Cuttings” indicates that changes in heights between existing ground levels and the top of the proposed bunds would be up to 12.655 m (at chainage 180 on Bund 5), and 12.057 m (at chainage 300 on Bund 4).</p> <p>While it is appreciated that the adjoining ground levels will be altered, could sections be prepared across the width of the works including through the bunds from where existing ground level is unchanged on the south side to the equivalent on the north side? More than one section should be provided for each bund to show the effects along the length of each bund.</p> <p>b) What will be the gradients on the sides of the bunds?</p> <p>c) Will the bunds be supported through their own weight, or will engineering works be required to ensure their long term retention?</p> <p>d) What measures will be necessary to ensure the long-term maintenance of planting upon each bund and how will these be secured in the dDCO?</p> <p>e) Could we be directed to where, specifically, the height of the bunds has been assessed in both landscape and visual terms?</p>
1.5.13.	The Applicant	<p>Design of landscape mitigation</p> <p>What arrangements in the dDCO are in place to ensure that the landscaping is in line with the proposals assessed in the ES and that it is maintained in the long-term?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.5.14.	The Applicant	<p>Construction effects Lighting during construction can be considered a nuisance. However, as set out above in respect of heritage effects there is no evidence within the ES Appendix 6.5 Statement Relating to Statutory Nuisance [APP-146] that construction lighting effects have been fully assessed.</p> <p>Could the Applicant provide a description of the methodology used to determine the significant effects of construction lighting on the landscape and those living in the vicinity of the construction site?</p>
1.6.	Socio-economic Effects on surrounding Communities	
1.6.1.	The Applicant	<p>Clarification</p> <p>a) In undertaking the secondary sift of alternatives in the Assessment of Alternatives [APP-040], the results of which are set out in Table 3.1 it is stated, for People and Communities ES Chapter 11 [APP-049](page 11), that one dwelling, in West Camel, would need to be demolished for Option A2 (which became the application scheme).</p> <p>There is no other reference to this, nor is it assessed in the third sift. Chapter 12 of the ES Vol 6.1 [APP-049] paragraph 12.8.1 fourth bullet indicates no residential properties would be demolished. Can this discrepancy please be explained?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.6.2.	The Applicant	<p>Alternatives</p> <p>a) In the Assessment of Alternatives [APP-040] Table 3.2 under Material Assets in the column discussing Option 2 is reference to Option 1. Is this a typographic error?</p> <p>b) Similarly, under Road Drainage and the Water Environment, in the column discussing Option 1 is reference to Option 2. Again, is this a typographic error?</p>
1.6.3.	The Applicant	<p>Baseline</p> <p>a) Why was the Study Area boundary ES Chapter 12 People and Communities [APP-049] drawn at 250m given that it excludes the surrounding communities?</p> <p>b) What factors were taken into account in arriving at this boundary?</p> <p>c) The Scoping Report requested that the study area should be extended account impacts on settlements such as Queen Camel. Can you direct us to where this has been done?</p>
1.6.4.	The Applicant	<p>Baseline</p> <p>a) Have any additional receptors been assessed since the preparation of the ES?</p>
1.6.5.	The Applicant	<p>Baseline</p> <p>a) In the Scoping Opinion [APP-054], it is suggested that the Walnut Tree PH, The Davis Hall, and the WCPC playing fields West Camel would be included as part of the baseline. Please direct us as to where we can find this information.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.6.6.	The Applicant	<p>Baseline</p> <p>a) The criteria for determining the magnitude of impact as described in ES Chapter 12 Table 12.8 [APP-049] is not succinct. The criteria states <i>many receptors; moderate number of receptors; small number of receptors</i>, but has not assigned a numerical value to these terms, making it unclear how the criteria has been determined.</p> <p>Please provide succinct definitions for the terms <i>many receptors; moderate number of receptors; and small number of receptors</i> as stated within Table 12.8 of the ES.</p>
1.6.7.	The Applicant	<p>Baseline</p> <p>a) ES Chapter 12: People and Communities [APP-049] makes no reference to the use of a Rochdale envelope.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm that the assessment for People and Communities has been based on relevant parameters such as the longest duration of construction works, largest volume of waste generation or maximum disruption for NMUs?</p> <p>b) If these maximum parameters have not been assessed, can the Applicant explain what assurance there is for avoiding harm?</p>
1.6.8.	The Applicant	<p>Economic Effects</p> <p>a) How will the scheme support economic growth?</p> <p>b) Where has this been assessed?</p> <p>c) Where are the areas that will benefit economically located?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.6.9.	The Applicant	<p>Economic Effects</p> <p>a) The ES Chapter 12 People and Communities [APP-049], section 12.8 Potential Impacts, makes no reference to any potential impact on the businesses identified within the Local Impact Area Figure 12.4, or route reliant businesses, during the construction and operation phases. Furthermore, no reference to local businesses is made when describing the local economic effects of the scheme.</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide evidence that no effects, positive or negative, will occur to the businesses identified within Figure 12.4?</p> <p>b) If effects to the local businesses will occur, can the Applicant describe these effects?</p>
1.6.10.	Mr & Mrs Charles & Clare Garrard	<p>Economic Effects</p> <p>In their representation [RR4] Mr & Mrs Garrard expressed concern about the financial effect of the proposal on their business, The Red Lion PH.</p> <p>a) What proportion of your trade comes from drivers using the A303? b) Is there any evidence to support this view? c) Why do you consider the scheme will adversely impact on your business?</p>
1.6.11.	A W & D W Hewlett	<p>Economic Effects</p> <p>a) How would temporary possession of land plots 5/13b and 7/1b as shown on the Land Plans [APP-005] affect the use of and viability of your dairy farm? b) Could this harm be mitigated? c) If so, how?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.6.12.	The Applicant	<p>Economic Effects</p> <p>a) ES Chapter 12, 12.4.29 [APP-049] states that the effects on severance of the land, husbandry, access, and drainage for individual farm businesses will also be considered.</p> <p>b) Please advise us where we can find this information.</p>
1.6.13.	Church Commissioners for England	<p>Economic Effects</p> <p>In their representation [RR 31] The Church Commissioners for England expressed concern about the effect of particular aspects of the proposal on their Yeovil estate, including Higher Farm and Courty & Speckington Farm. Please provide a plan showing the extent of land concerned in each title.</p>
1.6.14.	John Plested	<p>Economic Effects</p> <p>In his representation [RR13] John Plested expressed concern about the effect of the scheme on his manege.</p> <p>a) Please provide a plan showing the location of the manege relative to the scheme.</p> <p>b) Is your concern regarding the ability to continue using the manege related to the physical encroachment of the scheme on your land, or the effects of traffic arising from the scheme on the manege?</p> <p>c) You suggest that it may be necessary to relocate the manege to a more suitable location. Do you anticipate that this would be within your property?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.6.15.	The Applicant	<p>Amenity Effect In his representation [RR27] Mr James March Smith expressed concern about the lack of information he has received in respect of some aspects of the proposal.</p> <p>a) Have details of proposed timings of works, diversions, access during construction, temporary lighting, and noise and pollution, in so far as they would affect Sparkford Hall, been made available to Mr James March Smith?</p> <p>b) If not, why not?</p>
1.6.16.	The Applicant	<p>Social/Amenity Effect</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant explain the reasoning behind the conclusion at ES Chapter 12 paragraph 12.8.1 [APP-049] that permanent land acquisition of parking areas, access roads and/ or gardens will not affect the residents' access or use of their property?</p>
1.6.17.	James March Smith	<p>Social /Amenity Effects In his representation [RR27] Mr James March Smith expressed concern about the proposed changes to the PRow routes</p> <p>a) Please provide details of the mitigation you have proposed and the reasons you consider it to be necessary.</p> <p>b) To what extent is the footpath used by customers?</p> <p>c) Would the proposed diversion be a benefit of the scheme or deterrent?</p> <p>d) Why?</p> <p>e) How will the change in road surface affect the business?</p>
1.6.18.	The Applicant	<p>Social Effects</p> <p>a) The ES paragraph 12.10.9 and Table 12.21 [APP-049] assess the effect land take from private properties as moderate adverse overall. What is the methodology underpinning this assessment?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.6.19.	The Applicant	<p>NMU Effects</p> <p>a) The Transport Report [APP-150] paragraph 2.4.4 refers to working with local Non-Motorised User (NMU) groups to help inform a design acceptable to pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Which groups have you engaged with and what was the outcome of discussions?</p>
1.6.20.	The Applicant	<p>NMU Effects</p> <p>The ES Chapter 12 People and Communities [APP-049] considers the effect of the scheme on NMUs.</p> <p>a) You state the number of users of public footpaths was low. b) How many surveyors were used? c) Where were they located? d) What times were each PRow surveyed? e) Have you conducted any evening or weekend surveys since the submission of the ES?</p>
1.6.21.	The Applicant	<p>NMU Effects</p> <p>a) The ES Chapter 12[APP-049], paragraphs 12.4.11- 12.4.14 and table 12.10 addresses amenity in relation to NMUs. It focusses on the type of crossing and air quality. A number of the existing PRows cross fields and then the A303 and continue through a relatively tranquil environment.</p> <p>What regard has been had to other qualities such as tranquillity, visual effects and convenience when assessing the effect on NMUs?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.6.22.	The Applicant	<p>NMU Effects</p> <p>a) The ES chapter 12 [APP-049] concludes that the scheme would have a beneficial effect on physical activity. Where do we find the evidence that underpins this conclusion?</p> <p>b) Have you assessed whether the longer journey time, the less direct route, and less tranquil setting may dissuade people from walking and/or cycling?</p>
1.6.23.	The Applicant	<p>NMU Effects</p> <p>a) It is not clear how the mitigation measures and new proposed routes for NMUs have been determined.</p> <p>The CoMMA report [APP-151] states that journey lengths would increase by more than 500m for 8 journeys and by 0 - 250m for 2 journeys. It is noted that due to the proposed stopping of connection Y30/ 28 with the A303, the proposed new route is 5.2km where as an alternative route proposed by the LPA's reduces the distance by 1.5km.</p> <p>Could the Applicant explain the methodology used for determining the new routes for non-motorised users, with respect to the shorter alternative Y30/28 to A303 route proposed by the SSDC and SCC?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.6.24.	The Applicant	<p>NMU Effects</p> <p>a) The Hazlegrove Underbridge includes facilities for pedestrians and other NMUs. To what extent has the convenience of the route for NMUs wishing to cross the A303 been taken into account?</p> <p>b) Given the length of the underbridge and the proposal to light it only during the day time how safe an environment would it provide for pedestrians and other NMUs?</p>
1.6.25.	The Applicant	<p>NMU Effects</p> <p>a) The NPSNN paragraph 3.17 expects applications to identify opportunities to invest in infrastructure where communities (including pedestrians and cyclists) appear to be severed by the road network. It also expects applications to address historic problems, by designing and delivering schemes taking into account accessibility requirements for all, including disabled users. To what extent has the scheme done this?</p> <p>b) Where is the evidence to support this view?</p>
1.6.26.	The Applicant	<p>NMU Effects</p> <p>a) SCC and SSDC in their representations [RR 40 and RR 41] suggests that there may be unrecorded rights of way.</p> <p>b) What steps have been taken to identify such rights of way?</p> <p>c) Have any additional rights of way been identified?</p> <p>d) If so, what effect is the scheme likely to have on these rights of way?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.6.27.	The Applicant	<p>NMU Effects</p> <p>a) The ES Chapter 2 [APP-039], Figure 2.13 illustrates a signed cycle way which is proposed. It states that the drawing is an extract, but it is not clear what the drawing is an extract from.</p> <p>Can the Applicant clarify if Figure 2.13 is an extract of a drawing contained elsewhere in the ES?</p> <p>b) Please provide a key to accompany Figure 2.13 as it is currently not clear exactly what the Figure is showing?</p>
1.6.28.	Iain Aird	<p>NMU Effects</p> <p>a) You state [RR-036] that a pedestrian/cyclist access (underpass or light bridge) from Camel Hill to Gason Lane is necessary in the interests of pedestrian/cyclist safety. Is this in addition to that provided by the proposed underbridge?</p> <p>b) If so why?</p>
1.6.29.	The Applicant	<p>NMU Effects</p> <p>Please explain how and with reference to what design approaches and standards the proposed NMU routes will be made accessible to disabled people and other people with accessibility issues</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.6.30.	Hazlegrove School	<p>Traffic Issue Hazlegrove Preparatory School [RR08] expressed concern about the effect of the scheme on school related traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Does the school have day pupils? b) If so how many? c) Do they generally arrive by car or is there a school bus service? d) How many staff are employed at the school? e) What are the peak times for arrivals and departures? f) Are there any existing issues with traffic congestion at peak times?
1.6.31.	The Applicant	<p>Traffic Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The ES Chapter 12 [APP-049] para 12.8.2 (8th bullet point) suggests that the scheme would improve the journey time to community facilities in the study area. This would seem to be inconsistent with the increase in traffic shown on figure 7.1. Please explain the basis for the conclusion.
1.6.32.	The Applicant	<p>Traffic Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The ES para 12.8.2 (10th bullet point) states that the scheme would improve journey times to future development in the local area. Please explain how this conclusion has been reached. b) Which journeys do you anticipate will be improved? c) Where is the evidence for this?
1.6.33.	The Applicant	<p>Traffic Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The ES para 12.8.2 (11th bullet point) states that there would be increased indirect employment opportunities related to reduced congestion and improved journey times. b) Where do you anticipate the increased employment opportunities would be situated?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.6.34.	The Applicant	Traffic Issue a) When is it proposed to close Traits Lane and the Podimore Slip road? b) Are there practical difficulties with closing these roads earlier in the construction process?
1.6.35.	Councillor Mike Lewis	Traffic Issue In his representation [RR37] suggests that Traits Lane and the Podimore Slip Road should be closed early. a) What is the benefit to the local community of closing Traits Lane and the Podimore Slip Road earlier in the construction programme? b) What evidence do you have of community support of this action?
1.7.	Traffic and Transport	
1.7.1.	The Applicant	Transport Objectives a) The Transport Report [APP-150] paragraph 5.1.2 states that railway improvements would not entirely solve all of the identified problems in the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester scheme location. b) Which problems would a railway not resolve? c) Would the proposed scheme solve all of the problems? d) Would it create other problems?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.7.2.	The Applicant	<p>Nature of proposal</p> <p>a) A number of respondents believe that the intention is to upgrade the road to an expressway in the future.</p> <p>In the Response on Consultation Annex N, page 22 3 "Need for Project" [APP-037] it is stated that it is not currently proposed to upgrade the A303 in this section to an expressway. However, in the Appendix A of the Funding Statement [APP-021, AS-009/AS-010] the extract from the Road Investment Strategy indicates "this long-term programme will transform this route into an Expressway to the South West". Can these two statements please be reconciled?</p>
1.7.3.	The Applicant	<p>Scheme Alignment/Arrangement</p> <p>a) Queen Camel Parish Council [RR07] is concerned that the arrangements for vehicles to join the eastbound A303 from the A359 (south) will encourage drivers to take a shortcut through Sparkford village since this would be a more direct route.</p> <p>Have the effects of the scheme on this junction been modelled?</p> <p>b) Have alternative traffic arrangements been considered?</p>
1.7.4.	Sparkford PC	<p>Scheme Alignment/Arrangement</p> <p>a) In what way does the Hazlegrove junction fail to comply with the DMRB? [RR18]</p>
1.7.5.	The Applicant	<p>Scheme Alignment/Arrangement</p> <p>a) What alternative access arrangements have been considered for the Andrea Mattia Diner and the adjacent filling station?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.7.6.	SSDC, SCC	<p>Scheme Alignment/Arrangement You state [RR40 and RR41] that the scheme will provide less direct access to RNAS Yeovilton and the Fleet Air Museum. Do your concerns relate to access from the east-bound direction, or do you consider that access will be less direct from the west-bound direction as well?</p>
1.7.7.	Mr & Mrs Charles & Clare Garrard	<p>Scheme Alignment/Arrangement In their representation [RR04] Mr & Mrs Garrard are concerned about the effect of the proposal on access to the village of Babcary.</p> <p>The Steart Hill overbridge would appear to provide access to Steart Hill. Can you clarify why the village would be cut off from the south side of the A303?</p>
1.7.8.	The Applicant	<p>Compounds</p> <p>a) The draft Traffic Management Plan [APP-150, Appendix A, paragraph 2.2] indicates that there will be a compound on the north side of the A303. However, this does not appear to be shown on the Works plan. Could the Applicant therefore clarify whether such a compound is proposed?</p> <p>b) If not, what arrangements are in place to ensure works traffic gaining access to and from the compounds on the south side of the A303 to the works on the north side would not cause undue interference with traffic continuing to travel along the A303 during the construction works?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.7.9.	The Applicant SCC SSDC	<p>Traffic Management Plan</p> <p>a) The draft Traffic Management Plan [APP-150, Appendix A, paragraph 2.3.5] indicates to construct the works it is proposed, on a small number of occasions, to suspend the current 7.5 tonne weight limit (except for access). Can the reasoning behind the imposition of the existing weight limit please be explained, and what effects, its temporary suspension would have?</p> <p>b) What is proposed to mitigate the effects of the temporary suspension?</p>
1.7.10.	Cliff Baker	<p>Traffic Assessment</p> <p>a) You suggest that the traffic count was carried out in the wrong location. Would your suggested position be likely to result in a materially different number of vehicles to the extent that you consider the figure put forward by the Applicant is not representative, or is it that you consider that the traffic would be experienced in a different manner from the suggested location?</p> <p>b) Where and what time of day do you believe the traffic to be at its worst?</p>
1.7.11.	The Applicant	<p>Traffic Assessment</p> <p>a) The NPSNN states (paragraph 4.6) that applications for road projects should usually be supported by a local transport model to provide sufficiently accurate detail of the impacts of a project. Where do we find this detail?</p> <p>b) Have you assessed the scale and distribution of the increase in traffic within Sparkford?</p> <p>c) If so, where is this information?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.7.12.	The Applicant	<p>Traffic Assessment</p> <p>a) The Transport Report [APP-150] paras 7.1.1 – 7.1.4 purports to set out the local impacts of the scheme. Has the effect of these additional traffic movements on junction capacity (taking account of any cumulative effects) within Sparkford and West Camel been assessed? If so, what was the outcome?</p> <p>b) Do the effects of this additional traffic need to be mitigated? If so, what measures are proposed and how will they be secured?</p>
1.7.13.	The Applicant	<p>Traffic Assessment</p> <p>a) The Transport Report [APP-150] Tables 7.1-7.3 (p38-39) use max RFC or DoS. How do we know which measurement has been used?</p> <p>b) Do the different measurements give different outcomes?</p> <p>c) What does IP at Table 7.2 mean?</p> <p>d) Under the Do Minimum scheme the B3151-A303 junction experiences a substantial increase in excess of the junction capacity. What are the assumptions underlying this increase?</p>
1.7.14.	SSDC, SCC, West Camel PC, Queens Camel PC, Sparkford PC	<p>Traffic Assessment</p> <p>a) Are you satisfied that the CoMMA report [APP-151] provides sufficient information to allow you to assess/comment on the traffic implications of the scheme on the local road network?</p> <p>b) If not what additional information would be required?</p>
1.7.15.	The Applicant	<p>Traffic Assessment</p> <p>a) The CoMMA report [APP-150] identified issues regarding the potential impact on Sparkford High Street - The Avenue and Podimore Roundabout. What would be the effect of the scheme on these junctions?</p> <p>b) Is mitigation required?</p> <p>c) If not why not?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.7.16.	SSDC,SCC	<p>Traffic Assessment You comment [RR40 and RR41] that only limited construction methodology and traffic management proposals have been submitted to date. Does this comment refer to the construction period only, or are you seeking further information regarding traffic management during the operation phase?</p>
1.7.17.	The Applicant	<p>Traffic Assessment Do the traffic forecasts within the ES chapter 12 [APP-049] and the Transport Report [APP-150] include the cumulative effects?</p>
1.7.18.	The Applicant	<p>Highway Safety a) Paragraph 4.7.1 of the Transport Statement [APP-150] cites 34 collisions on this stretch of the A303. Figure 9.1 indicates that the accidents are focussed at the roundabouts at either end of the scheme and the A303/B3151junction. How will the proposed scheme improve road safety at these locations and on this stretch of road generally? b) Did any of the recorded accidents involve NMU's?</p>
1.7.19.	The Applicant	<p>Highway Safety a) The Transport Report [APP-150] paragraph 9.1.1 considers collisions in the study area. What were the parameters for defining the study area? b) To what extent were any of these accidents due to the nature of the existing A303? c) What is the justification for the conclusion that accidents within the wider area will reduce to the extent suggested in the Transport Report (Table 9.2.2) as a consequence of the scheme?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.7.20.	The Applicant	Highway Safety a) The CoMMA Report [APP-151]Table 6, p541 projects the number of future fatalities. How is this figure arrived at? b) What assumptions is it based on? c) What geographical area does it cover?
1.7.21.	The Applicant	Highway Safety a) Has the potential safety implications of the reduction in the number of crossing points for NMUs been assessed? b) What, if any, measures are proposed to prevent NMUs crossing the road other than at the formal crossing points?
1.7.22.	Phil Gamble	Highway Safety a) In what way does the scheme fail to address major safety issues? b) What evidence is there to support this view?
1.7.23.	The Applicant	Highway Safety a) Would a Pegasus crossing at the northern end of Plowage Lane (as suggested by the British Horse Society [RR06] for both users of the restricted byway to the south, and horseriders and cyclists using the old A303 to reach the Steart Hill bridge be beneficial to highway safety? b) If not, why not?
1.7.24.	Iain Aird	Highway Safety a) Please explain why you consider the temporary (haulage/non road legal vehicle) road on Camel Hill to be a danger to traffic.[RR36] b) Is there any evidence to support this view?
1.8.	Flooding/Drainage Strategy	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.8.1.	Environment Agency	<p>Clarification The Environment Agency states [RR-034] that the proposals lie outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3. Does this include the area near Traits Lane/Blackwell Lane (Plot reference 7/7b, as shown on the Lands Plan [APP-005])?</p>
1.8.2.	The Applicant	<p>Effects on unlicensed water abstractions a) The Environment Agency advises [RR-034] that there may be unlicensed potable water abstractions within a 50m radius of Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1). What steps have been taken to identify these supplies? b) What, if any, supplies have been identified? c) What provision has been made for the protection of these supplies?</p>
1.8.3.	The Applicant	<p>Ground water In order to ensure that controlled waters are adequately protected, the Environment Agency [RR-034] requests that Part 4, Section 20 of the dDCO be extended to include dissolved pollutants and discharges to the ground, due to the potential for pollution of groundwater in the underlying Secondary A aquifer. Is there any reason why the dDCO should not be extended to include this requirement?</p>
1.8.4.	Mr Roy Lawrenson	<p>Flood Risk a) Is the flood risk assessment you refer to in your representation [RR-039] the one submitted by the Applicant [APP-059]? b) If so, please direct us to the relevant part of the report. c) If not, please provide a copy of the relevant report.</p>
1.8.5.	Cllr Mike Lewis	<p>Flood Risk a) Please provide details of the dates, location and severity of the flooding you refer to in your representation [RR-037]. b) Please provide details of the possible cause/source of flooding.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.8.6.	The Applicant Environment Agency SCC Church Commissioners for England	<p>Flood Risk</p> <p>a) The Church Commissioners for England indicate [RR-032] that in respect of Land at Higher Farm the outfall from pond 1 (Plot reference 1/4a on Lands Plan [APP-005]), could lead to 3.47 ha of the highway draining onto adjoining land, which allegedly is low lying and suffers from poor drainage. What evidence is there to support or refute this assertion?</p> <p>b) Can it be demonstrated that the proposal will not increase flood risk in this area?</p>
1.8.7.	The Applicant Environment Agency SCC Church Commissioners for England	<p>Flood Risk</p> <p>a) The Church Commissioners for England indicate [RR-032] in respect of Land at Courty & Speckington Farm (south of A303) that part of the highway would drain in to this area which allegedly is particularly wet. What evidence is there to support or refute this assertion?</p> <p>b) Can it be demonstrated that the proposal will not increase flood risk in this area?</p>
1.8.8.	The Applicant	<p>Management and Maintenance of drainage</p> <p>a) Has the phasing/temporary drainage during the construction period been taken into account?</p> <p>b) If so, what are the proposed arrangements and how are they secured by the dDCO?</p>
1.8.9.	The Applicant	<p>Management and Maintenance of drainage</p> <p>a) What provision has been made for the future maintenance/management of the drainage scheme?</p> <p>b) Have these measures been included in the dDCO?</p> <p>c) If not, why not?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.8.10.	The Applicant	<p>Geology and soils</p> <p>a) Paragraph 9.5.3 of Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-046] indicates that scheme specific ground investigations were undertaken in June 2018. Does the drainage strategy need to be revised in the light of the ground investigations?</p> <p>b) If so, in what way?</p>
1.8.11.	The Applicant SSDC	<p>Geology and soils</p> <p>a) Paragraph 9.6.1, first bullet of Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-046] indicates that a 250 m buffer outside the scheme side for consideration of contamination has been used. Is this distance appropriate?</p> <p>b) If not, what alternative distance should be used and what are the implications of this?</p>
1.8.12.	The Applicant	<p>Climate</p> <p>Paragraph 13.3.5 of Chapter 13 of the ES [APP-050] indicates that the latest UK Climate Projections are to be published in late 2018. This has now occurred. Consequently, what are the implications for the consideration of this project?</p>
1.9.	Cumulative Effects	
1.9.1.	The Applicant	<p>Baseline</p> <p>The ES Chapter 14 Combined and Cumulative Effects [APP-051] excludes developments of less than 150 dwellings from the assessment of cumulative effects. What is the justification for this?</p>
1.9.2.	SSDC	<p>Baseline</p> <p>What is the current situation as regards the proposed Garden Settlement?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.9.3.	The Applicant	Baseline The ES Chapter 14 [APP-051] sets the Zone of Influence for Cumulative Effects at 2km. What parameters were used to determine the Zone of Influence?
1.9.4.	The Applicant	Baseline The ES Chapter 14 [APP-051] does not include the A303 Stonehenge and A358 Taunton to Southfields schemes in the assessment of cumulative effects? a) What is the justification for this? b) The Stonehenge Application has been accepted for examination. Should it therefore be assessed as a Tier 1 development?
1.9.5.	SCC SSDC	Baseline a) Can the Councils confirm that they agree with the long list of sites identified in Table 14.6 of the ES Chapter 14 [APP-051]? b) Are the Councils aware of any other developments which should be included within the cumulative assessment?
1.9.6.	The Applicant SCC SSDC	Baseline a) For the purpose of this assessment the cut-off date for including additional developments was 12 April 2018. Can the Applicant state if a further cumulative assessment will be undertaken for sites identified within the ZoI? b) Are the Councils content with the Applicant's approach to the potential need for further cumulative assessments? c) Can the Applicant and Councils confirm whether they are aware of any additional other plans or developments that should be included in the cumulative effects assessment since April 2018?
1.10.	Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017, AS-007/AS-008]	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.10.1.	The Applicant	<p>Whole dDCO Annex A sets out a schedule setting out potential typographic and associated cartographic errors which the Applicant may wish to consider.</p>
1.10.2.	The Applicant	<p>General matter a) The dDCO does not contain specific information regarding size of earth bunds. ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-048] states that seven bunds would be provided along the length of the Proposed Development, the ES explains that two noise bunds, each 2 m high would be provided where the B3151 joins the A303 near Hawk House. The 7 bunds are contained within the dDCO as Works 22, 23, 55, 56, 82, 89, and 90. Can the Applicant confirm the dimensions of all the bunds and ensure these are contained in the dDCO? b) Can the Applicant explain how the dimensions have been established relevant to the cut/fill anticipated for the Proposed Development, including consolidation, and the assessments undertaken in the ES?</p>
1.10.3.	The Applicant	<p>Telecommunications duct Works No 8 in the draft DCO [APP-017] is for the installation of a new telecommunications cable and sub duct within existing duct, this is not mentioned in the Project Description to the ES. Can the Applicant confirm that the installation of the new telecommunications cable and sub duct has been assessed within the ES and identify this location?</p>
1.10.4.	The Applicant	<p>Road Closures What provision is there in the dDCO to ensure that detailed measures for road closures are agreed with the Local Highway Authority and Local Planning Authority?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.10.5.	SCC SSDC	<p>Detailed design approvals</p> <p>a) You state that the dDCO will require provisions to address the detailed design elements and agreement for the associated fees associated with some technical elements. Which elements do you refer to?</p> <p>b) What safeguards are you seeking?</p> <p>c) Has this matter been discussed with the Applicant?</p>
1.10.6.	The Applicant SCC	<p>De-trunking</p> <p>a) Has there been any progress on the arrangements with the local highway authority for those parts of the road to be de-trunked?</p> <p>b) If so how is this to be secured?</p>
1.10.7.	The Applicant	<p>Annis Hill Farm</p> <p>Does the dDCO make provision for replacement fencing and the relocation of water troughs at Annis Hill Farm?</p>
1.10.8.	The Applicant	<p>Introductory text</p> <p>The introductory text refers to a "single appointed person" when, of course, the ExA is a two-person panel. Could this please be amended?</p>
1.10.9.	The Applicant Environment Agency SCC SSDC	<p>Article 2(1)</p> <p>a) Limits of deviation: Are the limits of deviation considered to be reasonable in all the circumstances?</p> <p>b) Watercourse - "except public sewer or drain". Is this terminology clear?</p>
1.10.10.	The Applicant Environment Agency Statutory parties	<p>Article 3</p> <p>a) Disapplication of legislative provisions. Is the Environment Agency content with this?</p> <p>b) What is the latest position as to other consents and agreements that will be necessary?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.10.11.	The Applicant SCC	Article 13 (as a whole) Is SCC as local highway authority content with these provisions?
1.10.12.	The Applicant SCC	Article 13(6) Are there any bridges (not over/under an existing or proposed trunk road) being constructed under non trunk roads? Examples may be the badger tunnel and/or any other passes under the side roads.
1.10.13.	The Applicant	Article 14(2) & (7), and Article 18(1), (2) & (3) All the above have the phrase "On such day as the undertaker may determine ...". How are these to be defined and promulgated in case enforcement is needed?
1.10.14.	The Applicant	Article 18(3) This indicates that parking is permitted for up to two hours. However, the key to each of the Traffic Regulation Measures Plans [APP-011] indicates eight hours. Which is correct?
1.10.15.	The Applicant SCC Somerset Constabulary	Article 19(11) a) What happens if the chief officer of police does not respond? b) Is the default time period appropriate given the different time periods set in Article 19(5)?
1.10.16.	The Applicant Historic England SSDC	Article 21 Given these protective works could be to a listed building, do any particular provisions needed to be included in such a scenario?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.10.17.	The Applicant IPs	<p>Article 33(1)(d) and Article 33(4)(b) & (c)</p> <p>a) The explanatory memorandum [APP-018] explains (4.122 (b)) these provisions are to allow permanent works to be left at the end of the temporary possession.</p> <p>If these works are needed as mitigation but the land “returned” to the (original) owner what is there to stop the mitigation being removed and/or not maintained (other than in the short term pursuant to Article 34), thereby not securing its effects in the long term?</p> <p>b) Are there any examples of these “permanent” works which form part of the mitigation requirements of the scheme?</p>
1.10.18.	The Applicant IPs	<p>Article 43(1)</p> <p>a) How does this provision ensure that the final versions of these documents are those referred to?</p> <p>b) Is this the complete list of drawings and documents?</p>
1.10.19.	The Applicant	<p>Article 47(12)</p> <p>This is defined (Article 2(1)) as being the Secretary of State for Transport, but should this Article specifically refer to the Secretary of State for Justice as that person to whom an application would have to be made apart from the Order?</p>
1.10.20.	The Applicant	<p>Schedule 1 – Works 10, 39, 40 and 99</p> <p>The wording of these sections includes some elements of “works” but also, potentially, a material change of use of land. Is the wording appropriate in all the circumstances? Could the matters be defined more clearly?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.10.21.	The Applicant	<p>Schedule 1 – Work 10</p> <p>a) No works are shown on the Works Plan [APP-006, AS-004] (the arrow goes to an area of “white” paper.</p> <p>b) Is this in fact an “associated development” and thus should be located at the end of the main works with Works 39, 40, 59 and 99 (but see also below)?</p>
1.10.22.	The Applicant Owner of Hawk House Ltd	<p>Schedule 1 – Work 16</p> <p>Is there a reason why no access is proposed to the “Garage” to the west of Hawk House, or is this accessed in some other way?</p>
1.10.23.	The Applicant	<p>Schedule 1 – Work 69</p> <p>Is the Applicant satisfied that this work can be contained within the Order Lands?</p>
1.10.24.	The Applicant	<p>Schedule 1 – Work 75</p> <p>See comment on Schedule 1 Work 43 (perhaps should reference sheet 2 as well as sheet 3)</p>
1.10.25.	The Applicant	<p>Schedule 1 – Works 100 and 101</p> <p>Is “retention of ... woodland” actually a “work”?</p>
1.10.26.	The Applicant	<p>Schedule 2 – Requirement 3(2)(e) and (f)</p> <p>See potential typographic error as well.</p> <p>a) Are all of these, particularly works associated with the diversion of existing utilities, necessary for “out of hours” working?</p> <p>b) Could the reasoning be explained in each case?</p>
1.10.27.	The Applicant IPs	<p>Schedule 2 – Requirement 3(4)</p> <p>In the definitions it indicates that the HEMP is “to be to be developed towards the end of the construction of the authorised development”, but in Requirement 3(4) it is stated to be “upon completion”. These two would appear to be inconsistent. Could this please be resolved?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.10.28.	The Applicant	<p>Schedule 2 – Requirement 3 The Environment Agency [RR-034] requests Requirement 3 is amended to include a specific need to submit a Pollution Incident Control Plan, to ensure environmental pollution prevention and emergency response procedures are developed and implemented. It indicates the measures must be appropriate to the potential risk of the specific works being undertaken, impacting upon identified environmental receptors.</p> <p>The Environment Agency further notes that Requirement 3 does not specify consultation with the Environment Agency. Due to potential risks to environmental receptors during construction it requests that it has the opportunity to comment on the CEMP and also the HEMP to ensure longer term risks can be adequately mitigated. With reference to the record of sensitive environmental features and Groundwater Monitoring Strategy, the Agency indicates it may hold information that would assist in determining sensitive environmental receptors.</p> <p>Can we please have the Applicant’s response to these comments?</p>
1.10.29.	The Applicant	<p>Schedule 2 – Requirement 5(1) How is “landscaping” defined so as to ensure that planting, cuttings, and false cutting mitigation measures will all be secured?</p>
1.10.30.	The Applicant SSDC SCC	<p>Schedule 2 – Requirement 5(2) Is it appropriate to refer to a specific British Standard, since they have a habit of going out of date (see alternative wording in draft Requirement 6)?</p>
1.10.31.	The Applicant	<p>Schedule 2 – Requirement 6(1) a) Is there a date by when the mitigation needs to be completed? b) Should this be included within the Requirement?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.10.32.	The Applicant	<p>Schedule 2 – Requirement 6(3) Could the Applicant state whether and how any monitoring and maintenance of the landscape planting, cuttings, and false cuttings screening will occur to ensure that the landscape planting mitigation measures remains effective?</p>
1.10.33.	The Applicant	<p>Schedule 2 – Requirement 8 The Environment Agency [RR-034] recommends the following with regard to contaminated land management:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, when dealing with land affected by contamination. 2. Refer to the Environment Agency Guiding principles for land contamination for the type of information that it requires in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site. The Local Authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health. 3. Consider using the National Quality Mark Scheme for Land Contamination Management which involves the use of competent persons to ensure that land contamination risks are appropriately managed. <p>Could the Applicant set out its response to this recommendation?</p>
1.10.34.	The Applicant	<p>Schedule 2 – Requirement 9 a) The wording of first two lines of sub-paragraph 9(1) is not clear (too many “for”s). Could this please be re-drafted? b) What does “sub-written” mean?</p>
1.10.35.	The Applicant	<p>Schedule 2 – Requirement 9(6) Is “will” the right word? Should it be “in accordance with” or similar?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.10.36.	The Applicant Natural England SSDC	Schedule 2 – Requirement 10(2) Should a <i>cordon sanitaire</i> be created for protected species in the same way as for nesting birds?
1.10.37.	The Applicant SSDC	Schedule 2 – Requirement 11(1) Should the consultation exercise also involve the relevant planning authority on the basis of the effect on local communities?
1.10.38.	The Applicant	Schedule 2 – Requirement 13 The Environment Agency [RR-043] indicates that Requirement 13 does not appear to make any provision for the future management/maintenance of the approved drainage details. How does the Applicant wish to respond to this comment?
1.10.39.	SCC SSDC Other relevant Risk Management Authorities	Schedule 2 – Requirement 13(5) The Environment Agency [RR-043] notes that points a) and b) suggest no surcharge at 1 in 1 yr (100% AEP) events, and no flooding at 1 in 5 yr (20% AEP) events. It comments that this would appear to be a low standard of service for a new road drainage network. Typically, no surcharge would be expected up to and including 5% AEP (1 in 20 yr) in the drainage network, with no surface flooding at 1% AEP (1 in 100 yr) events. Normally, exceedance design should cover the climate change scenario at 1% AEP. Could the relevant parties comment on whether the proposal would meet expected performance standards for the road drainage network?
1.10.40.	The Applicant SCC	Schedule 2 – Requirement 13(3) a) Is there a date by when the mitigation needs to be completed? b) Should this be included within the Requirement?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.10.41.	The Applicant	Schedule 2 – Requirement 13(5) "... brought in by reference." Can it be clarified to what reference is being made?
1.10.42.	The Applicant	Schedule 2 – Requirement 14(3) a) Is there a date by when the mitigation needs to be completed? b) Should this be included within the Requirement?
1.10.43.	The Applicant	Schedule 2 – Requirement 15(3) a) Is there a date by when the mitigation needs to be completed? b) Should this be included within the Requirement?
1.10.44.	The Applicant SCC	Schedule 3 – Part 11, column (2) a) Some of the rights of way are noted as "footway", but others are "bridleway". Should any of the footways be designated as a "footpath" since it is proposed that they are to be public rights of way? b) The South Somerset Bridleways Association indicates [RR-026] that the new public rights of way should be restricted byways. What is the Applicant's response to on this?
1.10.45.	The Applicant	Schedule 4 – Part 3, column (3) Could this be clarified as this does not appear to make sense?
1.10.46.	The Applicant Relevant landowner	Schedule 5 – Plot reference 2/2e If temporary possession only, what is there to ensure landscaping as mitigation is maintained appropriately in the longer term?
1.10.47.	The Applicant Natural England	Schedule 5 – Plot reference 3/1a and 3/1b Is five years appropriate to ensure ecological mitigation?
1.11.	Explanatory Memorandum [APP-018]	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.11.1.	The Applicant	General While the Statement of Reasons deals with whether Section 127 and/or Section 138 of the PA2008 are likely to be engaged, should this matter also be included within the Explanatory Memorandum document?
1.11.2.	The Applicant	Paragraph 2.10 This paragraph refers to associated development. Should Work 10 also be included in this list?
1.11.3.	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.74 This refers to Article 46. Is this correct since Article 46 relates to Appeals under the Control of Pollution Act 1974?
1.11.4.	The Applicant	Paragraphs 4.124 a) Article 38(1) refers to "tree or shrub ... within or overhanging land within the Order limits", but the explanatory memorandum refers to "any tree or shrub that is near the project" which would be a wider power. What is proposed and can this be resolved?
1.11.5.	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.152 This deals with protective provisions. Could the Applicant please confirm whether those who would benefit from the protective provisions have agreed to their terms?
1.11.6.	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.164 The text indicates that Article 48 prevents the Applicant from acquiring Crown Land without the agreement of the Crown. This is not the case as the Section 135 of the 2008 Act does this, not the Article. Could the text please be redrafted?
1.12.	Statement of Reasons [APP-021, AS-009/AS-010]	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.12.1.	The Applicant	Paragraph 1.7.1 There is reference here to "special category land", however, the Book of Reference [APP-022, AS-011] indicates (page 233) that there is no "special category land". Could this please be clarified?
1.12.2.	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.1.2 While appreciating that there are third party rights in Applicant owned land, could the Applicant give the latest position as to land it owns as freehold.
1.12.3.	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.4.2 a) How much, if any, land did the inquiries fail to identify any owner or occupier? b) If any, what areas does this relate to?
1.12.4.	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.6.1 a) Could this paragraph please be redrafted in plain English to allow for greater understanding?
1.12.5.	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.8.3 a) Identifiers 108 to 143 in Annex B are "Unknown" and 144 is "Unoccupied". How can negotiations be "ongoing"? b) Can we be advised of the latest position?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.12.6.	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 5.3.2 This refers to "Registered Park or Garden", which would be affected by the proposal. However, Section 131 of the PA2008, refers to "common, open space or fuel or field garden allotment" and Section 132 to "common, open space or fuel or field garden allotment", neither of which include by definition a Registered Park or Garden.</p> <p>It may be that a land which is a Registered Park or Garden could also be common, open space or fuel or field garden allotment.</p> <p>Could this paragraph please be clarified?</p>
1.13.	Acquisition and/or Temporary Possession and/or Rights over Land	
1.13.1.	The Applicant	<p>Book of Reference – paragraph 1.1.3 It is stated that "The BoR lists ... together with any "rights" which may be created, interfered with, suspended or extinguished".</p> <p>Could the Applicant please explain how this is reconciled with the guidance published by the former Department for Communities and Local Government in "Planning Act 2008: procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land" where, in Annex D, paragraph 10 where is states "Where it is proposed to create and acquire new rights compulsorily they should be clearly identified. The Book for reference should also cross-refer to the relevant articles contained in the development consent order."?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.13.2.	The Applicant	Book of Reference – paragraph 2.1.4 The reasoning for including land already within the Applicant’s control is understood. However, in Part 1, should column 3 expressly exclude the appellant’s existing own interests, since it is not proposed that they will be compulsorily acquired?
1.13.3.	The Applicant	Book of Reference – Parts 1, 3 and 4 – All plots In the third column it is stated “rights of land”? Is this the correct terminology? Should it be “rights over land”?
1.13.4.	The Applicant	Book of Reference – Part 1 – Plots 7/5a & 7/6a Given that Section 135 only allows interference with rights in Crown Land where there is the consent of the relevant Crown authority, should these exclude the rights of the Crown?
1.13.5.	The Applicant	Book of Reference – Part 2 – All entries Is the phrase “In respect of freehold proprietor of” appropriate, since it doesn’t refer to land?
1.13.6.	The Applicant	Book of Reference – Part 3 Could the Applicant please confirm that all those in Part 1 are cited in Part 3?
1.13.7.	The Applicant	Book of Reference – Part 5 Is the heading correct give that this relates to special parliamentary procedure, special category or replacement land rather than land with a Crown Interest?
1.13.8.	Ian Aird	Book of Reference Please provide details of perceived inaccuracies in the Book of Reference.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.13.9.	The Applicant	<p>Lands Plan The Key for each of the Lands Plan has four options for land within the boundary of the dDCO: "Land to be permanently acquired", "Lands to be used temporarily and rights to be acquired permanently", "Land to be used temporarily" and "Land not subject to compulsory acquisition". Is it correct that the last of these would be more correctly entitled "Land not subject to compulsory acquisition or temporary possession"?</p>
1.13.10.	The Applicant SCC	<p>Acquisition of Rights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There are a number of plots such as 1/2b, where it is intended to permanently acquire rights over the land, and that the land be used for the construction of the A303 or a turning head. However, the BoR does not indicate which rights are intended to be acquired. The description does not limit the rights to the surface. Could the Applicant please confirm how deep the works will go? b) In some instances it would seem that the intention is to transfer the land to SCC? c) What mechanism will be used for this purpose? d) Has this been agreed with SCC? e) Have the owners of the land agreed to its designation as public highway and the transfer to SCC? f) Where the land is to be used for the construction of the A303 is the acquisition of rights the correct procedure for land not owned by the Applicant?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.13.11.	The Applicant	<p>Acquisition of Rights</p> <p>a) There are a number of plots, such as plot 1/5a, where it is proposed to permanently acquire rights over the land, and it is intended that the land would be used to construct a turning head. Schedule 5 of the dDCO indicates that the land would be designated as public highway and maintained by SCC.</p> <p>b) It would seem that the land over which it is intended to acquire rights is privately owned. Has there been an agreement with the owners to dedicate the land as such?</p> <p>c) Has there been agreement with SCC to dedicate it as public highway?</p> <p>d) If not, how will the right to use this land as public highway be secured?</p> <p>e) If the land is to be used permanently as public highway is the acquisition of rights the correct procedure?</p>
1.13.12.	The Applicant	<p>Acquisition of Rights</p> <p>Overall the BoR is vague in terms of the rights sought. These should be linked to the purpose for which the land is required.</p>

ANNEX A

**A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling project:
 Potential typographic and cartographic errors in dDCO [APP-017, AS-007/AS-008], Explanatory Memorandum [APP-018] and Statement of Reasons [APP-021, AS-009/AS-010]**

Ref: EXQ1 AxB	Item	Query
	<u>Draft Development Consent Order</u>	
1.	Article 6	Does an agreement referred to in Article 4(1) represent an agreement <u>under</u> the Order?
2.	Article 13(1)	Second line – after “local highway” insert “authority”..
3.	Article 15(4)	Third Line - Is a comma “,” missing between “consent” and “but”?
4.	Article 46(11)	Needs to refer to the Department for Housing, Communities and Local Government.
5.	Schedule 1 – Work 7	Should “The construction of associated outfall works” be prefaced by an “(a)” like others in schedule?
6.	Schedule 1 – Work 89	These works are only shown on Sheet 4, reference to Sheet 3 is superfluous.
7.	Schedule 2 – Requirement 3(2)(e) and (f)	Is (f) a continuation of (e) and then (i) to (v) (so should it be (e) (i) to (vi))?

Ref: EXQ1 AxB	Item	Query
8.	Schedule 3 – Part 1, column (2)	The title of the column is “Length of road” but a number of these do not have a distance - between G and H, H and I, J and K, and K and L.
9.	Schedule 3 – Part 6, column (2) and Part 7 column (2)	The title of the columns in each case is “Road name, number and length” but a number of these do not have a length.
10.	Schedule 3 – Part 9, column (3)	See comment on Article 18(3) at ExQ 1.10.14.
11.	Schedule 3 – Part 11	Is there are reason the “of” is capitalised in the title row?
12.	Schedule 5, Plot references 4/1f and 4/2a	Are the colourations on the plans correct?
13.	Schedule 5, Plot reference 5/3j	The third and fourth sentences appear to be the same.
14.	Schedule 6, paragraph 2(2)	There appears a typographic error “5A(5A)”. Also, the substitution appears to be to subsection (5). (In Section 5A in the 1961 Act, there are subsections (5), (5A) and (5B)).

Ref: EXQ1 AxB	Item	Query
	<u>Explanatory Memorandum</u>	
15.	4.120 & 4.121	The last sentence of paragraph 4.120 is the same as paragraph 4.121.
16.	4.132	This paragraph refers to Article 35 when it should refer to Article 36.
17.	4.196	The “/596” at the end of the reference to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 is superfluous.
	<u>Statement of Reasons</u>	
18.	1.6.1	The Convention is “The European Convention on Human Rights” rather than “for”.
19.	4.4.1	States “was submitted to the Land on 10 August 2017”. The assumption is that this is a reference to the Land Registry. Is this correct?
20.	4.6.3	Does the “Scheme” mean the “Scheme area”?
21.	5.2.2	This paragraph could be considered to be misleading in that, in the final bullet point, it indicates the test applies to all land subject to proposed compulsory acquisition, not just that subject to Section 131 and 132 of the 2008 Act. Could it please be redrafted?
22.	5.3.9	A “series of ponds consisting of existing and new will be created”. This doesn’t make complete sense. Could it please be clarified?
23.	6.1.3	Could the quote please be laid out correctly?

Ref: EXQ1 AxB	Item	Query
24.	6.2.1	Refers to Article 1. Is this Article 1 of the First Protocol?
25.	7.1.2	This refers to plots 7/7c. However, the Crown Land Plan [APP-013] refers to two different plot numbers. Can this be clarified?
26.	7.4.1 and 7.4.3	A representation does not have to be made by a statutory undertaker for section 127 to be engaged, although normally it will be. Could these paragraphs please be redrafted to clarify this?
27.	7.5.1	First bullet: Please conclude the first bracket. The requirement for conservation area consent no longer exists; instead a "relevant demolition" needs planning permission. Could this paragraph please be redrafted?