

From: [REDACTED]  
To: [A303 Sparkford to Ilchester](#)  
Cc: [NI Programme Officers](#)  
Subject: A303 Sparkford to Ilchester - Deadline 2 Submission  
Date: 23 January 2019 18:41:11

---

Dear Michele

Please see the below list of documents that form the Deadline 2 submission from Highways England. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Responses to Written Questions**

9.1 Responses to the Examining Authority's Written Questions

**Additional Documents (to support our Written Questions)**

2.3 Works Plans (required updates only as detailed in responses to Written Questions)

2.10 Traffic Regulation Measures Plans (required updates only as detailed in responses to Written Questions)

2.17 Engineering Section Drawings (required updates only as detailed in responses to Written Questions)

9.2 Environmental Statement Table of Errata

9.3 Equality Impact Assessment

9.4 Geophysical Survey Report

9.5 Full Archaeological Evaluation Report

9.6 Private Water Supplies Technical Note

9.7 Layout of Hazlegrove Junction Topic Paper

9.8 Noise Levels at all Modelled Receptors and Modelling Assumptions

9.9 Review of the updated NNNPS 2018 against the Environmental Statement

**Draft DCO**

3.1 Draft DCO (tracked changes and clean version)

**Explanatory Memorandum**

3.2 Explanatory Memorandum

## **Table of Amendments to the draft DCO**

### 9.10 Table of Amendments to the Draft DCO

-

#### **Draft Statements of Common Ground:**

- 8.1 Environment Agency
- 8.2 Natural England
- 8.3 Historic England
- 8.4 Somerset County Council and South Somerset County Council
- 8.6 Somerset Drainage Board Consortium
- 8.8 Defence Infrastructure Organisation
- 8.9 Parish Councils (West Camel, Queen Camel and Sparkford)
- 8.11 Church Commissioners for England
- 8.18 Mr and Mrs Walton

If you have any queries, please don't hesitate to get in touch.

Kind regards

Elliot

#### **Elliot Hayes | Project Manager | Regional Investment Programme South West**

Highways England | Temple Quay House | 2 The Square, Temple Quay | Bristol | BS1 6HA

Web: <http://www.highways.gov.uk>

*This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.*

**Highways England Company Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000  
|National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park,  
Birmingham B32 1AF | <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/highways-england> | [info@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:info@highwaysengland.co.uk)**

*Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Bridge House,  
1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, Surrey GU1 4LZ*

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

## A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Scheme TR010036

### 9.1 Responses to the Examining Authority's Written Questions

APFP Regulation 5(2)(g)  
Planning Act 2008  
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed  
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009  
January 2019



Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning  
(Applications: Prescribed Forms and  
Procedure) Regulations 2009**

**A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling  
Scheme**

Development Consent Order 201[X]

---

**Responses to the Examining Authority's Written Questions**

---

<b>Regulation Number:</b>	Regulation 5(2)(q)
<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b>	TR010036
<b>Application Document Reference</b>	9.1
<b>Author:</b>	A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Scheme Project Team, Highways England

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
Rev A	January 2019	Submission for Deadline 2

## CONTENTS

<b>1. Responses to the Examining Authority's Written Questions.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Annex A .....</b>	<b>44</b>

## **1. Responses to the Examining Authority's Written Questions**

- 1.1.1 The purpose of this document is to set out the Applicant's responses to the Examining Authority's Written Questions.
- 1.1.2 These can be found in Table 1.1 below.

Table 1.1: Responses to the Examining Authority's Written Question

Ref	Question:	Question Response
1.0	<b>General and Cross-topic Questions</b>	
	<b>National Planning Policy Framework</b>	
1.0.1	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?	An evaluation has been presented in tabular format and has been submitted as part of Deadline 2 (document reference 9.9, Volume 9, Revision A). The evaluation confirms that no changes to the assessment presented within the Environmental Statement are required as a result of the 2018 updates to the National Planning Policy Framework.
	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.	The evaluation has been presented in tabular format and has been submitted as part of Deadline 2 (document reference 9.9, Volume 9, Revision A).
	Any further revisions to documents should refer to the 2018 version where relevant.	Noted.
	<b>Drawings</b>	
1.0.7.	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?	The drawings have been checked. Three corrected engineering sections have been re-issued as part of the Deadline 2 submission (document reference 2.17, Volume 2.0). These are drawings HE551507-MMSJV-LSI-000-DR-UU-2175, 2178 and 2181, and the latest version is Revision C02. No other engineering sections have been updated.
	<b>Drawings</b>	
1.0.8.	Various potential discrepancies are noted in reference to the dDCO section below (Annex A) Please ensure that these are resolved.	Each issue raised within these written questions has been addressed as described in the response. A revised draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) (document reference 3.1, Volume 3, Revision C) is submitted along with these responses for Deadline 2.
	<b>Public Sector Equality Duty</b>	
1.0.9.	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?	Highways England use the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) process to consider and evidence compliance with the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under the Equality Act 2010. Equality Impact Screening and Assessment tools are used by Highways England at each stage of the design process to ensure it meets the PSED. An Equality Impact Screening was carried out during the options phase for the scheme, whereupon it was determined that a full EqIA was required at the preliminary design stage. The full EqIA was undertaken in 2017-18 and was based on the scheme design submitted for the Development Consent Order (DCO) application. The EqIA sets out the potential positive and negative impacts on the scheme, and how processes associated with its development (such as stakeholder engagement) have complied with the PSED. The EqIA has been submitted to support this response for Deadline 2 (document reference 9.3, Volume 9, Revision A).
	<b>Environmental Statement</b>	
1.0.10	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.	Noted.
	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?	The Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) (APP-148) submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application sets out what potential remedial action may be needed. The Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) (Table 3.1) in Chapter 3 of the OEMP (APP-148) sets out potential remedial action that may be needed for the scheme to reduce effects on geology and soils (references GS6 and GS7). The REAC also details what the Remediation Strategy will include, once it has been produced, following analysis of the Ground Investigation (GI) results. Section 15.6 and Table 15.2 of ES Chapter 15 Summary (APP-052) provides a synopsis of the monitoring requirements for the scheme. Table 15.2 of Chapter 15 Summary (APP-052) provides a column stating the monitoring delivery mechanism for each significant effect anticipated.
	<b>Clarification</b>	
1.0.11	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?	The Environmental Statement (ES) does not provide a description of the 6 multi-purpose tracks associated with works numbers 3 (Track 1), 4 (Track 3), 11 (Track 2), 12 (Track 4), 57 (Track 6) and 58 (Track 7). However, the ES Figure 2.9 - Temporary Works Plans (APP-108) does show all of the works areas considered as part of each ES assessment chapter, which do include the aforementioned tracks, as well as all the works shown in the Works Plans [document reference: APP-006]. The Environmental Masterplan (APP-107) also shows these elements. Environmental receptors including heritage assets and visual receptors for example, have been identified in relation to these design elements since they are included on the Temporary Works Plans and within the Red Line Boundary. These specific scheme elements are not directly referenced within any of the ES chapters

Ref	Question:	Question Response
		because no direct or indirect effects are anticipated from these specific works alone.
1.0.12	<b>Clarification</b> 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.	Noted.
	Please clarify whether there is a difference between long term and permanent. If so, please explain the difference?	Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) of the Environmental Statement (ES) does refer to permanent effects within Section 12.10, rather than long term effects for the most part. The People and Communities assessment refers to permanent effects as these effects are likely to last or remain unchanged indefinitely, rather than long term effects which would occur over, or relate to a long period of time. As described in paragraph 12.4.33 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049), in assessing an impact on a receptor or resource, consideration has been given to duration: whether the impacts would be short or long-term, and reversibility: whether the impact is permanent or temporary. All permanent effects would be irreversible and therefore long-term. However long-term effects still have the potential to be reversible in some cases, so could be temporary or permanent.
	b) Could the Applicant provide a description of effects that are deemed, respectively long term and permanent? This may be easiest in tabular form.	A technical memo will be produced to provide a table of effects that are deemed respectively long term and permanent. This technical memo will be submitted as part of Deadline 3.
1.1.	<b>Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b>	
1.1.1.	<b>Clarification</b>	
	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?	This description refers to an element of the scheme that was deleted prior to the application. It is also acknowledged that the Eyewell House structures are approximately 5 metres from the scheme boundary rather than 30-40 metres as stated in paragraph 4.6.7 of the Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment (DBA) (APP-067). However given the nature of the nearby works which would be to install a new Public Right of Way (PRoW), no additional or different effects to those considered in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (APP-043) of the Environmental Statement (ES) are predicted. A table of errata for the Environmental Statement has been compiled to confirm the correct references and has been submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9., Revision A).
1.1.2.	<b>Clarification</b> 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?	This is an error. The Significance of Effect assessment should read "Neutral". A table of errata for the Environmental Statement has been compiled to confirm the correct references and has been submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9., Revision A).
1.1.3.	<b>Clarification</b> 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?	The name of MM49 on page 98 of Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment (DBA) (APP-067) should read "Robinson's Antiques, High Street, Queen Camel". The description is correct. A table of errata for the Environmental Statement has been compiled to confirm the correct references and has been submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9., Revision A).
1.1.4.	<b>Clarification</b> 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.	The cross referencing errors have been noted within a table of errata for the Environmental Statement, submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A).
1.1.5.	<b>Clarification</b> 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?	The results of the arboricultural survey have been submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) Application in Appendix 7.1 Arboricultural Constraints Report (APP-069) and Appendix 7.3 Arboricultural Impact Assessment (APP-071) of the Environmental Statement.
1.1.6.	<b>Clarification</b> 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.	To clarify, the Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment (DBA) is Appendix 6.1 of Volume 6.3 of the ES (APP-067). Appendix 6.2 is the Hazlegrove House Registered Park and Garden Statement of Significance (APP-068). A table of errata has been compiled to confirm the correct references and has been submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A).
1.1.7.	<b>Clarification</b>	



Ref	Question:	Question Response
	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.	Noted.
	Could this reference be checked and any other such similar matters be addressed in a table of errata?	A table of errata for the Environmental Statement has been compiled to confirm the correct references and has been submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A).
	<b>Heritage assets (generally)</b>	
1.1.8.	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?	During the earlier assessment process alternative study areas were considered. These were 1 kilometre for Scheduled Monuments, Grade I and II* listed buildings, and 200 metres for Grade II listed buildings, Conservation Areas and non-designated heritage assets.
	b) Why were these rejected?	As the scheme progressed it became clear that due to the prominence of the ridge which carries the A303 and the interconnectivity of the landscape and its associated heritage assets, along with the potential geographical influence of the scheme, the study areas used previously would not reflect a proportionate assessment of impacts on heritage assets. As such the study area was extended to 1 kilometre for all assets. Again to ensure the assessment was proportionate within this 1 kilometre study area an initial scoping exercise was done to scope out assets which would clearly not be impacted by the scheme. The principle of this scoping exercise was agreed with the following stakeholders: Historic England, South Somerset District Council (SSDC), and South West Heritage Trust (SWHT). The results of this scoping exercise were also agreed with the stakeholders. This methodology is set out in Section 6.4 paragraphs 6.4.2, 6.4.4 and 6.4.5 of 6.1 Environmental Statement Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (App-043) and section 2.2 and paragraph 2.7.4 in 6.3 Environmental Statement Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment (APP-067).
	c) Do IPs consider that the assessment area is appropriate?	The study area and scoping of assets as part of a proportionate assessment have been agreed in the draft Statement of Common Grounds with Historic England submitted as part of Deadline 2 (document reference 8.3, Volume 8, Revision A). South Somerset District Council have made no specific comments on the study area and have not raised it as an issue within our joint draft Statement of Common Ground, also submitted as part of Deadline 2 (document reference 8.4, Volume 8, Revision A).
	<b>Heritage Assets (generally)</b>	
1.1.9.	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.	This has been noted and a report will be prepared detailing in combination effects of construction and operation on heritage assets. This will be submitted for as part of the Applicant's submission package for Deadline 3.
	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.	
	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.	
	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?	
	<b>Heritage Assets (generally)</b>	
1.1.10.	The ES utilises the HA208/07 definition of direct impacts which includes the following effects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Degradation/destruction of unknown archaeological remains</li> <li>- Physical alternations to heritage assets</li> <li>- The effect of increased noise, light and air pollution on heritage assets, and</li> <li>- The impact on views and historic setting caused by the Proposed Development.</li> </ul>	Noted.
	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].	Indirect effects are not explicitly detailed within the cultural heritage methodology (Section 6.4) in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (ES) (APP-043). However, the methodology for the cultural heritage assessment is based on the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) assessment methodology, and indirect effects as detailed in HA208/07 have therefore been assessed as part of the overall assessment within Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (APP-043) of the ES. To avoid confusion, clarification has been included within the table of errata for the ES that has been submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A).

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	<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>	<p>An indirect effect has been highlighted for MM273 (Bakery of West Camel and adjacent Methodist Church) in Table 7.2, page 67 of the Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment, Appendix 6.1 of the Environmental Statement (APP-067). The indirect affect identified is an issue of viability, and loss of historic use from the removal of its roadside setting. No further indirect effects were identified.</p> <p>With regards to the hydrological and hydrogeological setting of the study area and its impact on buried archaeological remains, it has been concluded that there would be no likely significant effects to Road Drainage and the Water Environment (RDWE) as a result of the scheme. This topic was therefore scoped out of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process, which means that detailed impact assessment has not been undertaken and presented within the ES for this topic. This approach was agreed with the Environment Agency in advance of the DCO Application being made. A technical appendix has been prepared and submitted as part of the DCO Application to provide a summary of the consultation and scoping level of assessment undertaken to date to reach the conclusion of no likely significant effects (APP-056).</p> <p>Additionally the geology of the area is limestone and there is no peat or alluvium which could contain well preserved organic remains. As such there are no significant geoarchaeological or paleoenvironmental remains within the vicinity of the proposed scheme. Consequently, there would be no effects on buried archaeological remains.</p>
1.1.11.	<p><b>Heritage Assets (generally)</b></p> <p>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>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The use of temporary and permanent construction effects and operational effects follows current best practice in environmental assessment. This has been used successfully on major infrastructure projects over the last 5 years. It has been used for Development Consent Orders (DCOs) on major infrastructure projects including M20 Junction 10a and Norwich Northern Distributor Road. This temporal scope allows for a clearer understanding of the type and duration of effects of the scheme.</p>
1.1.12.	<p><b>Heritage Assets (generally)</b></p> <p>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. 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>	<p>All significant effects are assessed with the described mitigation measures included. This is outlined in Section 6.11 Paragraph 6.11.1 of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (APP-043), and Section 2, Paragraph 2.7.9 of Appendix 6.1, Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment (APP-067).</p> <p>Mitigation measures are included within the Significance of Effect column. An updated significance of effect column is therefore not required.</p>
1.1.13.	<p><b>Heritage Assets (generally)(vibration)</b></p> <p>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>	<p>British Standard (BS) 7385-2 'Evaluation and measurement for vibration in buildings, guide to damage levels from groundborne vibration' sets out guidance for the vibration levels associated with a minimal risk of vibration-induced damage for all building types including buildings of historical value. The entity that is associated with risk of damage is the peak particle velocity (PPV) as measured in mm/s. The PPV, is a function of each vehicle pass-by and not a cumulative measure: increasing the number of vehicles would increase the number of measured events, but not the magnitude of any individual event and so the PPV would not change. Seen graphically as a function of time, increasing the number of vehicles would increase the number of peaks in the particle velocity profile, but not increase the value of any particular peak. The PPV would therefore remain the same with increased traffic during operation and therefore no impacts are anticipated for an increase in Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs).Vibration effects in terms of peak particle velocity (ppv) (which is the parameter used to assess the impact of vibration on vulnerable buildings) would remain the same with increased traffic during operation and therefore no impacts are anticipated. This is because the ppv, as measured in mm/s, is a function of each vehicle pass-by and not a cumulative measure. Increasing the number of vehicles would increase the number of measured events, but not the magnitude of any individual event. Seen graphically as a function of time, increasing the number of vehicles would increase the number of peaks in the particle velocity profile, but not increase the value of any particular peak.</p>
1.1.14.	<p><b>Heritage Assets (generally)(lighting)</b></p> <p>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</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	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.	
	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?	The methodology to determine impacts of constructional and operational lighting uses Conservation Principles, Practice and Guidance (Historic England) and Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England). Guidance used is noted in section 6.4, paragraph 6.4.3 in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement, Cultural Heritage, and Section 3.4, Paragraph 3.4.1 of Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment (APP-067) of the Environmental Statement.
	b) Could the Applicant please indicate how long "the first few years" referred to above would be?	The operational lighting at Hazlegrove Junction will be screened from the Hazlegrove House Registered Park and Garden (RPG) by year 15.
	<b>Heritage Assets (generally) (landscape and visual effects)</b>	
1.1.15.	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?	Heavy Good Vehicles (HGV) heights and their contribution to traffic movements have been taken into the account as part of the operational impact assessment included within Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (APP-043).
	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?	HGV heights have been taken into account as part of the operational impact assessment included within Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (APP-043).
	<b>Hazlegrove House and Hazelgrove House RPG</b>	
1.1.16.	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?  The question should be answered in terms of: - Land take - Landscape effects - Visual effects - Noise effects.	A photomontage is currently being produced from the front of Hazlegrove House Registered Park and Garden, as requested by Historic England and South Somerset District Council. This photomontage and will be used to inform this assessment and will be submitted as part of Deadline 4.
	<b>Hazlegrove House RPG</b>	
1.1.17.	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?	During consultation with stakeholders, including South Somerset District Council and Historic England, an area towards the south western corner of Hazlegrove House Registered Park and Garden was identified as being potentially less sensitive than most other parts. This is due to the fact that this area appears to be intensively farmed. This area is also relatively low lying and situated behind an area of established woodland that will screen the works from one of the identified key views (Key View 38 – see the Visual Receptor Plan (APP-121)). As much of the proposed works as possible has been confined to this area.  A topic paper on the evolution of the Hazlegrove Junction design has been submitted as part of Deadline 2 alongside this submission (document reference 9.7, Volume 9, Revision A).
	b) What alternatives were considered for the extent of the physically unaffected land of the RPG, and why were they rejected?	Figure 3.1 of Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives of the Environmental Assessment (APP-040) contains details of route options that would have occupied parts of Hazlegrove House Registered Park and Garden (RPG) that are physically unaffected by the Applicant's proposed scheme. The impact that these options would have had on the RPG was a principal reason why they were rejected. A topic paper on the evolution of the Hazlegrove Junction design has been submitted as part of Deadline 2 to provide further clarity on this question (document reference 9.7, Volume 9, Revision A).
	c) Is the loss of cultural heritage the minimum necessary to deliver the benefits of the proposal?	The Applicant believes that the proposals represent the best balance of all objectives that have been used to assess the scheme throughout its development.
	d) Are there alternatives, perhaps involving different land-takes, which would better ensure the significance of the heritage asset was maintained?	Yes. However, alternatives that involve less land-take from Hazlegrove House Registered Park and Garden (RPG) are likely to have significant impacts from other perspectives. For example, a southern route option which is likely to have avoided land-take from the RPG almost entirely was considered early in scheme development. This is shown in Figure 3.1 of Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives of the Environmental Assessment (APP-040). However this was rejected, largely due to the environmental impact it would have had by passing closer to the villages of Queen Camel and West Camel and also closer to the River Cam.
	e) When considering the level of harm to the heritage asset, what level of harm would be caused? Such an assessment should be justified.	The harm to the Hazlegrove House Registered Park and Garden (RPG) has been assessed as less than substantial. The justification for this assessment can be found in Appendix 1, Table 1(section 5.131) of The Case for the Scheme (APP-149).
1.1.18.	<b>Hazlegrove House RPG</b>	

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	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?	The statement reflects that the area to be used for the construction compound is arable land. No land of pastoral character will be used for the location of the construction compound.
	b) If not, does this affect the conclusions?	There is no effect on the conclusions of the cultural heritage assessment included within Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (APP-043) of the Environmental Statement.
	<b>Hazlegrove House RPG</b>	
1.1.20.	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])?	The Outline Environmental Management plan (OEMP) (APP-148) will be updated to include an additional item within Table 3.1 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments and submitted as part of Deadline 3. This will require the planting scheme to reflect the character of Hazlegrove House Registered Park and Garden (RPG) and be consulted with South Somerset District Council and Historic England prior to undertaking the planting.
	<b>Archaeology</b>	
	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?	The Geophysical Survey Report (document reference 9.4, Volume 9, Revision A) and Full Archaeological Evaluation Report (document reference 9.5, Volume 9, Revision A) have been submitted as part of this submission for Deadline 2.
1.1.21.	b) What arrangements are in place to disseminate these results and take the results into account, if necessary, within the ES and dDCO?	The Geophysical Survey Report (document reference 9.4, Volume 9, Revision A) and Full Archaeological Evaluation Report (document reference 9.5, Volume 9, Revision A) were finalised in January 2018 and have subsequently been submitted as part of this submission for Deadline 2 and have been shared with Historic England and South West Heritage Trust (advisors to Somerset County Council).
	c) If the results are already available, has the field work revealed any previously unknown archaeological remains?	A lower level of archaeological remains than those predicted using geophysical survey work, aerial survey and Lidar analysis have been found. As such the assessment included within Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (APP-043) of the Environmental Statement (ES) identifies more potential archaeological remains than those discovered. No identifiable new heritage assets were found within the red line boundary.
	d) If so, what is the significance of these remains and what effects would the proposal have upon them?	No additional effects to heritage assets have been identified through trial trenching.
	e) Does this affect the conclusions and if so, in what way?	There are no changes to the overall conclusions of the cultural heritage assessment, included within Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (APP-043) of the Environmental Statement.
	<b>Camel Hill Romano-British Settlement Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)</b>	
1.1.22.	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?	The draft Statement of Common Ground submitted as part of Deadline 2 with Historic England (8.3) (document reference 8.3, Volume 8, Revision A) and draft Statement of Common Ground with Somerset County Council and South Somerset District Council document reference 8.4, Volume 8, Revision A) note that there is an agreement with regards to the scheme not encroaching on the Camel Hill Scheduled Monument (SM) during construction and operation. There will be no physical impacts on the monument itself. There is potential for removal or compaction of archaeological remains associated with the monument however this risk is minimal given the proposed method of construction of the haul road using geotextile and temporary granular fill, inspection of the route which is secured within the Outline Environmental Management Plan (APP-148) as CH1 and CH2 of Table 3.1 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, and the results of the trial trenching. Trenches excavated in the field adjacent to the haul route to the north of the SM, revealed no archaeological remains. It would seem that the Romano-British settlement was either focused within the area to the south, adjacent to the A303, or that remains extending north had been quarried or ploughed out, this is evidenced by the presence of large limestone bedrock blocks within the plough soil.
	b) If not, how could they be improved?	The mitigation measures are considered sufficient to keep any negative effects to a minimum.
	c) What degree of harm, if any, would be caused to the SAM?	There will be no physical harm to the Scheduled Monument (SM). There will be limited temporary harm, which is less than substantial, to the setting of the monument during construction with the movement of traffic along the temporary haul route.
1.1.23.	<b>Downhead Medieval Settlement Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)</b> 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?	A reptile receptor site has been identified for captured individuals from the area of works. It is located north east of Downhead Manor Farm and 15 metres east, at its closest point, of Downhead Medieval Settlement Scheduled Monument (SM). It comprises tussocky calcareous grassland, scrub, hedgerows and grazed grassland, forming a mosaic of habitats. The receptor site would be enhanced through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The installation of 2 hibernacula, one to the north and one to the south.</li> <li>• Fencing off the northern area from sheep using electric stock fencing.</li> </ul> No compaction, disturbance to soils or excavation works would be required to facilitate this ecological mitigation. As such no permanent or operational effects have been identified to the monument. Temporary slight adverse effects have been identified due to setting impacts from the appearance of and movement of traffic along a temporary haul route to the north of the monument, which will affect the rural character. This assessment can be found in Table 7.2 and Table 7.3 of Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Desk Based

Ref	Question:	Question Response
		Assessment of the Environmental Statement (APP-067).
	<b>Downhead Medieval Settlement Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)</b>	
1.1.24.	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?	There are no permanent or operational effects on the Scheduled Monument (SM) identified. The setting effects identified during construction are not significant and have been assessed as slight adverse. As such it has not been considered necessary to develop specific mitigation for effects on the SM.  No permanent harm will be caused to the Scheduled Monument (SM) or its setting.
	b) If not, how could they be improved?	
	c) What degree of harm, if any, would be caused to the SAM?	
	<b>Queen Camel and West Camel Conservation Areas and Heritage Assets to the south</b>	
1.1.26.	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?	No response required.
	b) What measures would be in place to ensure that any effects on these heritage assets were mitigated?	The level of harm to the conservation areas from additional traffic movements is not considered significant and therefore no mitigation is proposed.
	c) How would these measures be secured?	No mitigation measures are proposed.
	<b>Listed buildings in Sparkford</b>	
1.1.27.	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?	Heritage Assets along Sparkford High Street are not considered to be affected by the scheme, including additional traffic movements. Vibration effects in terms of peak particle velocity (which is the parameter used to assess the impact of vibration on vulnerable buildings) would remain the same with increased traffic during operation.  The detailed assessment of Heritage Assets within the 1 kilometre study area which fall in Sparkford were scoped out for detailed Environmental Statement (ES) assessment in the initial assessment. This was agreed with South Somerset District Council and Historic England.
	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?	As noted in response to 1.1.27(a) the scheme is not expected to result in harm to the heritage assets along Sparkford High Street.
	c) How would these measures be secured?	No mitigation measures are proposed
	<b>Listed milestone</b>	
1.1.28.	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?	The milestone is likely to have been originally associated with the turnpike administered by the Ilchester Turnpike Trust. Its original setting would have been alongside a probably metalled road with limited traffic of carriages, horses, pedestrians and livestock. This historic setting has been replaced by a modern road with significant motorised traffic, especially during the summer months. It is no longer used as a road sign and is a remnant indicating the historic development of the road. As such, other than its roadside setting the original setting has been substantially lost.  It has been assumed that the milestone is in its original location, its presence is marked on historic mapping in this approximate location and the distances are approximately correct. However given the age and size of the milestone it potentially could have been moved within the immediate area over its lifetime as the road was altered.
	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.	The milestone is to be relocated not replaced therefore all historic fabric will be retained. Prior to removal the milestone will be recorded both as part of the historic record and to ensure that any damage can be repaired in an appropriate manner. The milestone will still sit road edge on the southern carriageway as close as possible to its existing location. The distances shown will still be approximately correct. The setting will still be a modern road with busy motorised traffic. Therefore the setting and the ability to understand the heritage value of the milestone will not be substantially changed.
	c) Where in the dDCO Requirements it is provided that the milestone is to be relocated?	In Section 3, Table 3.1, CH5 of the Outline Environmental Master Plan (OEMP) (APP-148) there is an undertaking that the milestone will be recorded, removed, safely stored, restored and reinstated. A methodology for the removal and relocation, including the new position of the milestone, will be prepared. It will then be agreed with the South West Heritage Trust and South Somerset District Council (SSDC). Historic England will also be consulted as the work is considered demolition and reinstatement.
	d) What arrangements are in place to see whether, if the milestone was replaced, it was re-considered for listing?	Listings are not automatically updated following alterations or changes to the listed structure. As such the milestone will remain listed in its new position.
1.1.29.	<b>Non-designated heritage assets</b>	

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	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?	The following policy and guidance was used to identify non-designated heritage assets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National Planning Statement for National Networks paragraph 5.125.</li> <li>- National Planning Policy Framework Annex 2: Glossary, Heritage Assets.</li> <li>- Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Part 2 HA 208/07 section 2. Defining Cultural Heritage.</li> <li>- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 2, Managing significance in decision taking in the historic environment (Historic England).</li> <li>- Local Heritage Listing, Historic England Advice Note 7.</li> <li>- Secretary of States Principles of Selection Criteria for Listed Buildings.</li> </ul> Please see Sections 2 and 3 of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (APP-043) of the Environmental Statement.
	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)?	The above policy and guidance was used along with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Site walkovers.</li> <li>- Remote sensing analysis (including aerial photographs and Lidar data).</li> <li>- Historic Environment Record data from Somerset Historic Environment Record</li> <li>- Map regression.</li> <li>- Archive and online research.</li> <li>- Consultation with SSDC, SWHT and Historic England.</li> </ul> Please see Section 2.3, Paragraph 2.3.1 of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (APP-043) of the Environmental Statement.
	<b>Non-designated heritage assets</b>	
1.1.30.	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?	All other non-designated heritage assets are assessed within Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment of the Environmental Statement (APP-067), as noted in Section 6.11, paragraph 6.11.1 of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (APP-048) of the Environmental Statement.
	<b>Non-designated heritage assets</b>	
1.1.31.	a) Does the Council does have a list of non-designated heritage assets?	The Applicant considers that the response to question 1.1.30 above addresses this point for its interest.
	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?	
	<b>Pepper Hill Cottage</b>	
1.1.32.	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?	The planting proposed will replicate the existing road frontage of Pepper Hill Cottage, albeit closer to the property itself. Any additional barriers, such as fencing, will have an additional impact on setting as they will not reflect the rural character of the property. Therefore the current proposals are considered to be sufficient. The mitigation measures have not been raised as an issue during consultation with stakeholders.
	b) If not, how could they be improved?	Not applicable. Please see the response give to question 1.1.32a).
	<b>Queen Camel Bridge</b>	
1.1.33.	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?	The bridge across the river Cam in Queen Camel is Grade II listed (National Heritage List for England (NHLE) ref 1277552) and has been assessed as part of the Queen Camel conservation area group (GR07) as agreed with South Somerset District Council and Historic England. The assessment covering this asset can be found in Table 7.2, page 62 and 63 and Table 7.3 page 77 of Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment (APP-067).
	b) Should it be considered as a non-designated heritage asset?	It is a Grade II listed structure and has been assessed as part of the conservation area group as agreed with South Somerset District Council and Historic England.
	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?	Surveys of the structure have not been undertaken specifically for the purposes of this project. However, the bridge is subject to Somerset County Council's (SCC) inspection and maintenance regime which includes General Inspections which are scheduled to take place every 24 months. An inspection was last undertaken in December 2016, and SCC have advised that the next inspection is due in the first half of 2019. Based on the findings of the 2016 and previous inspections the bridge has been assessed by SCC to have a loading capacity of 40 tonnes. This assessment means that the bridge is considered capable of carrying all road legal traffic in accordance with the Road Vehicles (Authorised Weight) Regulations 1998, and as such a structural weight limit is not required.  SCC have confirmed that the weight limit that is applied to the A359 is on environmental grounds, in order to prevent the use of the A359 and surrounding local roads by heavy goods vehicles seeking an alternative route between Yeovil and the A303 to the A37.

Ref	Question:	Question Response
		It is noted that the A359 is an existing agreed diversion route for closure of the existing A303.
	d) If so, what are the results?	As a result of the response to question 1.1.33(c) above, no response is necessary to this question.
	<b>Celtic Way</b>	
1.1.34.	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>The Celtic Way is not an official designation by any statutory body. However, the Long Distance Walkers Association website (<a href="https://www.ldwa.org.uk/ldp/members/show_path.php?path_name=Celtic+Way">https://www.ldwa.org.uk/ldp/members/show_path.php?path_name=Celtic+Way</a>), provides the following details with regard for the Celtic Way, "visits more than 100 pre-historic sites through South Wales and the South West peninsula and includes 111 miles of the Land's End Trail. Alternative routes across Exmoor or through Wessex are incorporated. This pioneering 725-mile route through western Britain, including 400 miles of new walking, will challenge and inspire. The illuminating journey takes in Pembroke, Stonehenge, Glastonbury, Exmoor and St Michael's Mount. Tread in the footsteps of early travellers and settlers and visit 100 prehistoric sites including Caerleon, Avebury and Tintagel. Discover ancient barrows, fortifications and sacred stone circles. According to the <a href="https://thecelticway.org">https://thecelticway.org</a>, "the Celtic Way Walk was about the features left upon the land by its earliest travellers and settlers. It includes paths and sites from the prehistoric period, up to the sites of the early Celtic churches. Historically, the Celtic Way Walk extends from our earliest roots forward towards the Sixth century, the age of the Celtic Saints, and the Arthurian legends in early poetry. The Celtic Way as a walking route and a written guide to the sites was an undertaking to hold on to our remaining ancient sites and paths, to visit them, to appreciate them, and to keep them in awareness".</p> <p>Table 12.11 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) of the Environmental Statement (ES) identifies that for the 2016 non-motorised user surveys for the scheme, 1 cyclist and 2 equestrians using the section of Celtic Way within the vicinity of the scheme. Paragraph 1.1.2 of Appendix 12.1 Non-Motorised User Survey Results (APP-093) explains that video surveys were undertaken for a 10-hour period (0800 to 1800) on Wednesday 31 August and Thursday 1 September 2016 to capture summer holiday flows and on Wednesday 14 September, Thursday 15 September and Friday 16 September 2016 to capture term time flows.</p>
	b) Should this route be considered to be a non-designated heritage asset?	The footpath is a modern long-distance path and therefore should not be considered a non-designated heritage asset.
	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?	Table 12.5 in Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) of the Environmental Statement (ES) explains that the scheme would improve amenity for users of Celtic Way, with a safer crossing of the A303 provided. Table 12.11 identifies that users currently have to cross the A303 at-grade using an uncontrolled crossing which is considered to be unsafe. Whilst the diversion route for the scheme would result in users having to travel further (Table 12.23) which is considered to be a Slight Adverse effect, the new route would include a new underpass of the A303 which would not exist without the scheme. This provision of the underpass would improve safety and amenity for those using the Celtic Way, with a Moderate Beneficial and significant effect on amenity predicted. On balance, effects are likely to be beneficial for users of the Celtic Way, and therefore accessibility would improve for non-motorised users using the Celtic Way.
1.2.	<b>Air Quality and Emissions</b>	
	<b>Clarification</b>	
1.2.1.	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?	The footnote should state "Building Research Establishment (2003) The 'Control of Dust from Construction and Demolition Activities'". A table of errata for the Environmental Statement has been compiled to confirm the correct references and has been submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A).
	<b>Clarification</b>	
1.2.2.	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?	The table with the full PM10 results is included within the table of errata for the Environmental Statement and has been submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A).
	<b>Receptors</b>	
1.2.6.	a) Is it correct that receptor 18 (The Witches) is both the highest concentration of PM10 (paragraph 5.10.19 of Chapter 5 Air Quality of the ES [APP-042]), and also the greatest improvement in annual NO2 concentrations (paragraph 5.10.28 of the same document) in the Do- Something scenario?	Clarification on this point is given in response to question 1.2.6b) below.
	b) If so, can the implications of this be explained?	<p>Paragraph 5.10.24 of Chapter 5 Air Quality (APP-042) of the Environmental Statement (ES) describes the greatest changes in annual mean NO2 concentrations within the scheme extent (Sparkford to Ilchester). The greatest improvement in annual NO2 concentrations in the opening year is predicted at receptor 1 (The Hollies) and there is predicted to be a decrease in annual NO2 concentrations of 8.2µg/m3 between the Do-Minimum and Do-Something scenarios.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.10.28 of Chapter 5 Air Quality (APP-042) of the ES discusses the greatest improvements in annual mean NO2 concentrations in the wider study area (outside of the scheme extents). Outside the scheme</p>

Ref	Question:	Question Response
		extents Receptor 18 (The Witches) has the greatest improvement in annual mean NO2 concentrations where there is predicted to be a decrease of 0.8µg/m3 between the Do-Minimum and Do-Something scenarios. Receptor 18 (The Witches) is predicted to have the highest PM10 concentration in the Do-Something scenario across the whole study area. The highest concentration is predicted at this receptor because this receptor experiences the highest background concentrations of PM10 of all the receptors assessed.
1.3.	<b>Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment</b> (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))	
1.3.1.	<b>Clarification</b> 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?	One mammal underpass is proposed as part of the scheme.
1.3.2.	<b>Ground Investigation</b> 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?  b) What do you consider a 'reasonable degree' to be?  c) Can you confirm if the scheme specific ground investigation has been completed and submitted?  d) Has this found any significant effect?  e) Can the Applicant explain whether any follow up survey work is required?	Use of geological mapping and desk-based sources match findings of existing intrusive ground investigation information leading to the confidence in the use of extrapolated geological data.  A 'reasonable degree' of confidence is considered (using professional skill and care) to be sufficient for the overall site-wide assessment of baseline conditions. The Applicant is comfortable that the assessment carried out is reasonable and represents a realistic and reliable basis for carrying out the assessment. The assessment in the geology and soils chapter was completed conservatively (worst case) to allow for any localised variations in geology and contamination conditions. The mitigation measures with respect to geology and soils include the completion of a number of further stand-alone reports using intrusive site data for the assessment and management of site-specific contamination risks as the scheme progresses. This will result in a high level of confidence for the scheme going forward.  The scheme specific ground investigation fieldwork was undertaken between 16 April and 1 June 2018; with a Factual Report provided by the Ground Investigation (GI) contractor late November 2018. Groundwater and gas monitoring is still ongoing. A Ground Investigation Report in accordance in HD22 is currently being prepared by the Applicant and will be submitted as part of Deadline 4.  The Ground Investigation (GI) did not encounter significant made ground. The landfill at Sparkford identified in Appendix 9.1 Preliminary Sources Study Report (PSSR) (APP-087) appears to have been filled with construction spoil from the adjacent A303 cutting.  The Ground Investigation (GI) is appropriate for the proposed scheme and no further GI is recommended. If there were any changes to alignment or structures then this would need review.
1.3.3.	<b>Biodiversity (generally)</b> 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.  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?	Noted  This will be secured through Requirement 3 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO which requires a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) including a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of the development. The CEMP must be substantially in accordance with the Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) certified under Article 43. Table 3.1 of the OEMP (APP-148) is the Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC), identified through the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process. The REAC documents the requirement for compliance with the Environmental Masterplan (APP-107) which details all areas of habitat replacement.
1.3.4.	<b>Habitats (generally)</b> 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?  b) If not could its figures be provided, perhaps best in tabulated form?  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?	The Applicant agrees with these figures.  Not required.  We assume that the paragraph referred to in the question should be paragraph 8.10.57 in Chapter 8 Biodiversity (APP-045) of the Environmental Statement (ES) and have answered the question on this basis. Priority habitats are those identified as being the most threatened and requiring conservation action under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan which, although superseded, is still considered an important resource. The criteria for priority habitats is based on international importance, rapid decline, high risk, and habitats of importance for key species. Priority habitats are generally those that comprise a diversity of flora that can support a range of protected and notable species. Therefore, the scheme can achieve greater biodiversity gains through



Ref	Question:	Question Response
		replanting smaller areas of high value priority habitats compared with lower value habitats. Habitats that will be subject to net loss as part of the scheme comprise 'grassland' (largely improved grassland and poor semi-improved grassland), arable land and species poor / defunct hedgerow. Species density within these habitats would be lower than within the proposed priority habitats to be planted, which include wildflower and species rich grassland; wet grassland; woodland; species rich hedgerows; trees and shrubs.
1.3.5.	<p><b>Reptiles</b></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>	Reptile surveys were completed in accordance with Froglife Advice Sheet 10: Reptile Survey (Froglife 1999), which advises 5 to 10 tiles per hectare are deployed at a site, although 10 per hectare is standard practice. Tiles were placed at a density of approximately 7 per hectare in these areas, which is within the acceptable range. In accordance with the guidelines 7 survey visits are required to determine presence / likely absence and 20 visits are required for a population estimate. 21 visits were completed in total and no reptiles were recorded within C18 and C19. Therefore, the survey effort employed was far greater than necessary for determining likely absence. Given that no reptiles were recorded over 21 visits, despite the slightly lower tile density in these areas, the results of the surveys are considered robust and the population has not been underestimated. No reptiles were recorded in these areas and the survey effort employed was far greater than was required to demonstrate absence.
1.3.6.	<p><b>Veteran Trees</b></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>	The veteran tree data referenced in the arb report was recorded as part of the Somerset Veteran Tree Project.
1.3.7.	<p><b>Veteran Trees</b></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>	<p>The veteran trees referenced for felling within the arboricultural report are in direct conflict with the proposed scheme footprint. The alignment has been determined by a range of disciplines including engineering and environmental and currently does not provide any feasible alternative that would enable retention of these veteran trees.</p> <p>Proposed tree planting is shown indicatively on the Environmental Masterplan (APP-107). We will be planting a greater number than we are losing but exact figures for tree numbers will be confirmed during detailed design. The net gain in tree planting is demonstrated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.2 hectares net gain in woodland habitat.</li> <li>• 0.8 hectares loss of broadleaved parkland scattered trees.</li> <li>• 20.25 hectares linear belt of trees and shrubs to be planted.</li> <li>• Planting of 51 individual trees.</li> </ul> <p>This will be secured through Requirement 3 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO), which requires a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (including a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of the development. The CEMP is required to incorporate the measures detailed in the environmental statement.</p>
1.3.8.	<p><b>Need for Habitats Regulations Assessment/Appropriate Assessment</b> 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</i> Case C-323/17, and <i>Brian Holohan, Richard Guilfoyle, Noric Guilfoyle, Liam Donegan v An Bord Pleanála</i> C-461/17 to the consideration of this matter?</p>	<p>The cases referred to confirmed that proposed mitigation measures cannot be taken into account for the purposes of screening under the UK Habitats Regulations, which give effect to the EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC). The purpose of screening is to establish whether the project is likely to have a significant effect on a European Site.</p> <p>The conclusions of this report have been agreed with Natural England in advance of the Application.</p>
1.4.	<b>Noise and Vibration</b>	
1.4.1.	<b>WHO Noise Guidelines</b>	

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	<p>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].</p>	<p><i>The WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region (ENG) were published in October 2018, after the DCO application for this scheme was accepted by the Inspectorate.</i></p> <p><i>However, it is recognised that there may be interest in how the publication of the ENG will be taken into account when assessing environmental noise impacts. The ENG supersede aspects of the WHO Community Noise Guidelines (CNG) published in 1999 and complement the Night Noise Guidelines for Europe (NNG) published 2009. The ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration refers to the CNG and NNG in setting of 'LOAELs' and 'SOAELs' within the assessment. The LOAELs and SOAELs (defined in Table 11.9 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration, APP-043) are used inform assessment of overall scheme compliance with NN-NPS and to inform judgement significant environmental effects, as defined by the EIA Directive, would be generated by the scheme.</i></p> <p><i>As set out on P29 of ENG, the approach taken by WHO in preparing the ENG differs from the previous WHO noise guidelines as they are 'not meant to identify thresholds' such as LOAEL and SOAEL. Instead the ENG sets out 'Relevant Risk', which lies between LOAEL and SOAEL. The ENG are presented with no consideration of the benefits of development or the cost of the mitigation that would be required to reduce noise levels to meet the guidelines.</i></p> <p><i>Consequently, had the ENG been published prior to submission of the application, the LOAELs and SOAELs would have been the same as set out in the noise assessment of the scheme. Therefore, the conclusions of the noise assessment, in terms of scheme compliance with NN-NPS and judgement on whether significant environmental effects would be generated by the scheme, would be the same as set out in the application.</i></p>
1.4.2.	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>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?</p>	<p>Section 2.5.167 of Chapter 2 The Scheme (APP-039) states that a thin surface course (which would reduce noise and spray) would be applied to the new dual carriageway associated with the scheme. This is secured through Requirement 14 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) which requires written details of proposed noise mitigation, including very low noise surfacing, to be submitted to and approved by the Secretary of State prior to commencement of the development. The noise mitigation must then be constructed in accordance with the approved details.</p>
1.4.3.	<p><b>Noise</b></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>	<p>The Methodist Church does not fall within the Noise Important Area (nIA) but is located just outside of it. The nIA boundary was defined by the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) as set out in paragraphs 11.2.24 and 11.3.24 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (APP-048) - it was not defined as part of this assessment.</p> <p>Noise Important Areas (nIAs) relate to residential receptors so extending the nIA to include the church would not affect the assessment outcome.</p>
1.4.4.	<p><b>Noise</b></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 1dB LA10, 18hr 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>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Any such grouping would increase the noise over the short-term but may also reflect normal traffic patterns with higher flows in peak am and pm periods. The assessment methodology used for construction noise uses LOAEL (lowest observed adverse effect level) and significant observed adverse effect level (SOAEL) values for the whole daytime or evening/night period as set out in BS5228-1 so any grouping would not affect the assessment outcome.</p> <p>If the assessment methodology were changed to consider noise effects over a shorter period than in BS5228-1 then it is possible that the outcomes would be different but as the lowest observed adverse effect level (LOAEL) and significant observed adverse effect level (SOAEL) values are based on the British Standard for the assessment of construction noise, no such assessment has been carried out or is appropriate.</p>
1.4.5.	<p><b>Clarification</b></p> <p>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>	<p>Receptors have been classified as residential or non-residential based on an Ordnance Survey AddressBase database. While Table 11.3 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (APP-048) characterises residences that are not occupied in the daytime as 'low sensitivity' these receptors are nevertheless included as residential receptors in the summary tables and in the section on operational noise significance.</p>

Ref	Question:	Question Response
1.4.6.	<b>Clarification</b>	
	a) Have the potential noise impacts of the scheme on the residents and business at Sparkford Hall been assessed?	Noise values for each individual receptor for all scenarios have been calculated, including Sparkford Hall. A full list of noise receptors has been submitted as part of Deadline 2 (document reference 9.8, Volume 9, Revision A).
	b) If so, where do we find this information?	A full list of noise receptors has been submitted as part of Deadline 2 (document reference 9.8, Volume 9, Revision A).
1.4.7.	<b>Clarification</b>	
	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?	The assessment has adopted the conventional approach of specifying the significant observed adverse effect level (SOAEL) by relation to the Noise Insulation Regulations, in a similar way to other infrastructure schemes such as HS2, enabling SOAEL to reflect UK legislation on noise and linking levels above SOAEL to cause a material change in behaviour. This approach is set out in Table 11.1 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (APP-043). It is also possible to associate this value for SOAEL with WHO Guidelines for Community Noise for the onset of cardiovascular disease although conversions from free-field to facade values, between time bases, and from Leq to L10 are all necessary.
1.4.8.	<b>Clarification</b>	
	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?	The location of the concrete batching plant is currently being reviewed in light of a change required to the redline boundary notified to the Examining Authority prior to the Preliminary Meeting and on which the Applicant is currently preparing consultation material. The location of the concrete batching plant will be clearly shown on plans submitted for Deadline 4.
1.4.9.	<b>Clarification</b>	
	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.	Noted
	Why are the calculations limited to 600m?	The requirement for the calculation area to be limited to 600 metres is specified in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) HD 213/11. DMRB also states "Research carried out by TRL has shown that noise levels from field measurements out to 600m from a motorway, where the intervening ground cover was grass, were in good agreement with predicted noise levels using CRTN with the attenuation with distance functions, Chart 7 and 8, extrapolated to 600m ... It is, therefore, recommended that this is adopted for predicting noise levels out to 600m from the road."
1.4.10.	<b>Clarification</b>	
	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?	Figure 1.1 of Appendix 11.1 (APP-090) has been updated and submitted as part of Deadline 2.
1.4.11.	<b>Clarification</b>	
	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?	Clarification regarding the study area has been noted within a table of errata for the Environmental Statement, submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A).
1.4.12.	<b>Baseline</b>	
	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?	No assessment of noise impacts for shorter periods than an 18-hour day or 8-hour night-time has been carried out. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) HD 213/11 requirement for the assessment of noise due to diverted traffic refers to an 18-hour period as the basis for assessment for the daytime. The location and duration of temporary diversion routes would form part of the Section 61 applications.
1.4.13.	<b>Baseline</b>	
	Long Hazel Park has not been assessed as a residential receptor. What is the reason for this?	There are a number of receptors extracted from the OS AddressBase data with 'Long Hazel' in their name. 'Long Hazel Dairy' and 'Longhazel Lodge' (Caravan Park) have been classified as Residential. There are additional receptors at 'Long Hazel Park' and 'Long Hazel Farm' that have been classified as non-residential. This classification was based on the OS AddressBase classification.
1.4.15.	<b>Baseline</b>	
	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?	The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) HD 213/11 that uses Average Annual Weekday Traffic (AAWT) annual average weekday flow.

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	b) To what extent are the much high levels of traffic during these periods likely to impact on noise within the study area?	The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) acknowledges that "traffic noise can vary widely on an hourly, daily and seasonal basis" so higher noise levels both with and without the scheme may be expected seasonally but not detailed assessment of this is appropriate as the methodology and assessment criteria are based on annual averages.
1.4.16.	<b>Baseline</b> 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?	Section 2.5.159 to section 2.5.167 of Chapter 2 The Scheme (APP-039) of the Environmental Statement provides a description of the acoustic mitigation that has been assumed including noise bund sizes and dimensions and each location.
1.4.17.	<b>Baseline</b> 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.  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?	Noted  All the measured data are presented in Appendix 11.1 (APP-090) but only those data that are not affected by snow have been included in the summary data table in Table 11.10 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (APP-048). Note also that the baseline contour maps are based on noise calculations from traffic flow and not from measurements, and therefore any anomalies in the noise measurements would not have affected the assessment.
1.4.18.	<b>Baseline</b> a) Can the Applicant explain the extent to which relevant consultation bodies were engaged in agreeing the appropriate baseline data?  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?	South Somerset District Council were consulted via email and at consultation meetings, and are in agreement with the baseline data as detailed within the draft Statement of Common Ground between Highways England (document reference 8.3, Volume 8, Revision A) and South Somerset District Council and Somerset District Council (document reference 8.4, Volume 8, Revision A).  The baseline assessment is informed by the baseline noise survey but is also, more comprehensively, informed by the baseline CadnaA noise model. The noise model is preferred because it is more comprehensive than could be achieved with even a very large survey and not subject to any short-term effects such as weather dependency or local phenomena (such as sources other than road traffic noise) that could affect measurements.
1.4.19.	<b>Baseline</b> 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?	Paragraph A5.26 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) HD 11 states "Significant ground-borne vibrations may be generated by irregularities in the road surface. Such vibrations are unlikely to be important when considering disturbance from new roads and an assessment will only be necessary in exceptional circumstances." As such there is very low risk that vibration from the new road could lead to significant adverse effects so no survey was carried out. Paragraph A5.26 also states that any "irregularities causing ground-borne vibration can be rectified during maintenance work."
1.4.20.	<b>Baseline</b> 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?	The assessment uses a traffic model that includes all potential diversions as a result of the scheme. It is noted that the assessment is based on modelled noise data not on survey data. This is detailed within Section 11.4 Assessment Methodology of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (APP-048) of the Environmental Statement.  The model has investigated noise levels at each receptor both with and without the scheme in both the opening year and the design year (2038). The prediction of which receptors are likely to be subject to significant adverse effects is based primarily on the noise levels and changes in noise levels that can be obtained from the model and which were used to construct the summary tables.
1.4.22.	<b>Mitigation</b> 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?	Mitigation has been proposed along the scheme in order to protect both the Spinney and Annis Hill Farm from noise impacts. Mitigation measures are described in Section 11.9 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (APP-048).  The mitigation proposed to protect The Spinney includes a 2 metre high acoustic barrier opposite the property on top of the verge at the north of the scheme, approximately 150 metres long. Low noise road surface will also be used along the scheme alignment at this location.  The mitigation proposed to protect Annis Hill Farm includes two noise bunds, each 2 metres high, located on the north side of the scheme, opposite Hawk House. The bunds would follow the alignment of the A303 for approximately 380 metres. It would be necessary to construct an access track through these bunds which would be aligned at a skewed angle so that the effect on the bunds performance is minimised. Low noise road surface will also be used along the scheme alignment at this location
1.4.23.	<b>Mitigation</b>	

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	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?	Secondary glazing with trickle vents should reduce noise levels to the extent that they are below the indoor ambient noise levels for dwellings that are set out in Table 4 of BS8233: Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction in buildings, which are 35dB Leq,16h (daytime resting in bedrooms) and 30dB Leq,8h (sleeping in bedrooms).
	<b>Mitigation</b>	
1.4.26.	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 experienced to the 10 closest residential receptors during the construction period?	Where the additional mitigation measures and noise barriers are not sufficient to prevent an exceedance of construction noise significant observed adverse effect level (SOAEL) (Table 11.5 within the ES Chapter 11 (APP-048)), then significant effects can only be avoided by restricting works that produce noise above SOAEL to a period of 10 or more days working in a 15 consecutive days, or for a total number of days of 40 in any 6 consecutive months, and corresponding requirements will be set out within the Section 61 application.
	<b>Monitoring</b>	
1.4.27.	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?	Noise monitoring will be routinely undertaken during construction and form part of construction noise control which will be set out in the Section 61 applications. Table 4.1 of the Outline Environmental Management Plan (APP-148) that was submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application details that a Section 61 is required to deliver the CEMP. The Section 61 would be agreed with the Environmental Health Officer at South Somerset District Council. The requirement for a Section 61 agreement is further noted within Table 4.1 of the Consents and Agreements Position Statement (APP-019).  With respect to monitoring during the baseline and design years in order to compare readings with noise modelling results, the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) HD213/11 paragraph A7.15 states:  "During the assessment process, measurements should not routinely be compared with calculations for the purpose of predicting changes in noise level. There is currently no methodology available to take account of the potential errors associated with comparing measurements with calculations, especially when the receptor is some distance from the noise source...".
	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?	In order to establish significant effects, noise levels were calculated in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) using forecast annual average weekday traffic flows (AAWT) for a range of future scenarios. There are inherent difficulties in comparing calculations with measurements due to the large number of variables which lead to uncertainty and which influence noise levels at a given point (which DMRB acknowledges). For the properties identified as having significant effects, mitigation comprises a combination of thin surface course, bund, acoustic barrier and secondary insulation. Since reported significant effects resulted from the magnitude of noise change as opposed to the exceedance of a threshold level, such as significant observed adverse effect level (SOAEL), it was considered that mitigation performance could be best quantified and achieved by certified testing in accordance with relevant standards.
1.5.	<b>Landscape and Visual Effects</b>	
	<b>Clarification</b>	
1.5.1.	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?	Lighting has been addressed within Chapter 7 Landscape of the Environmental Statement (APP-044) during both construction and operation. Likely impacts of lighting are highlighted within Appendix 7.4 Visual Baseline and Impact Schedules (APP-072).
	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?	Please refer to Appendix 7.4 Visual Baseline and Impact Schedules (APP-072) for the description of changes in view including those impacted by lighting. Paragraph 2.5.126 of Chapter 2 The Scheme of the Environmental Statement (APP-039) states that proposed lighting columns will be 10 metres high at Hazlegrove Roundabout. These will be the same height as the existing lighting columns at this location. It is not proposed to increase the carriageway levels or ground levels at Hazlegrove Roundabout, and so the elevation of the proposed lanterns will not exceed the elevation of the existing ones.
1.5.2.	<b>Clarification</b> 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?	This amendment is included within the schedule of errata for the Environmental Statement submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A).
1.5.3.	<b>Clarification (Key views)</b>	

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	<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). Could this please be clarified, both how many there should be and the criteria against which they were selected?</p>	<p>There are 9 Key View Points (KVPs) presented on 5 sheets, Figures 7.6A- 7.6E (APP-122). The criteria for selection is defined in paragraph 7.4.10 of Chapter 7 Landscape of the Environmental Statement (APP-044).</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>This has been produced and was issued as part of Chapter 7 Landscape (APP-044) of the Environmental Statement. Please see Figure 7.5 (APP-121) which identifies all visual receptors, key receptors and those which were selected for photomontages.</p>
	<b>Approach</b>	
1.5.4.	<p>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?</p>	<p>The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) was calculated using ground modelling software. Specific agreement on the extents of the modelled ZTV was not discussed with the stakeholders. However, following the calculation of the ZTV, further consultation was then held with the Landscape Officer from South Somerset District Council during the Technical Working Group (TWG) to ensure the landscape officer was happy with the extent of the study area and indeed the receptor points identified for assessment. The landscape officer confirmed they were content with this approach.</p>
	<b>Approach</b>	
1.5.5.	<p>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?</p>	<p>By identifying groups of receptors, the most sensitive of receptors within any given group were assessed in order to establish the worst -case scenario. As such, lower sensitivity receptors were captured within these groupings. An update to Paragraph 7.7.30 in Chapter 7 Landscape (APP-044) has been included within the table of errata for the Environmental Statement submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A).</p>
	<p>b) If not, what alternative approach should be utilised and why?</p>	<p>It is not deemed that an alternative approach is necessary. As per the response to question 1.5.5a), an update to Paragraph 7.7.30 in Chapter 7 Landscape (APP-044) has been included within the table of errata for the Environmental Statement submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A).</p>
	<b>Approach</b>	
1.5.7.	<p>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?</p>	<p>The presence of a registered park and garden would not solely lead to high sensitivity to change for the landscape character area in which it sits. It would depend on the local context and extent of the landscape character in which it sits. Therefore, there is some leeway as to how influential the presence of such a designation is on landscape value and therefore its sensitivity to change. Therefore, depending on the circumstances, a landscape character area within which a registered park and garden is located could be considered as either of high or medium sensitivity to change, and so has been included in each category within Table 7.1 of Chapter 7 Landscape (APP-044).</p>
	<p>b) How has this approach influenced the overall assessment?</p>	<p>The landscape character baseline has been informed by the Landscape of South Somerset, produced by South Somerset District Council. However, this is at a regional level which is not a sufficient level of detail for the proposed scheme. This assessment has therefore identified and separated the study area into 7 landscape character areas. In this instance, Hazlegrove has been defined as a Landscape Character Area (LCA) in its own right due to the distinctive nature of Hazlegrove House and surrounding parkland which is distinct from the surrounding agricultural landscape. This, combined with the presence of the scheme within the extents of the Registered Park and Garden (RPG) LCA 2 Hazlegrove, has therefore been considered to have a high sensitivity change.</p>
	<b>Baseline</b>	
1.5.9.	<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>	<p>The assessment of impacts of previous developments (including the existing road and its use) does not form part of the assessment process, instead the process identifies where there may be existing features at odds with the surrounding and wider landscape context or those existing features which may form detracting elements within a view. Establishing the baseline, including any presence of detracting features, helps to establish the context of the new development within the existing landscape.</p>
	<b>St Michael's Hill</b>	
1.5.10.	<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>Noted.</p>

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	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?	This viewpoint was visited and assessed at the very beginning of the assessment phase during the simple level of assessment. It was then scoped out during detailed assessment. Due to its distance from the proposed scheme, and expansive views afforded, it was not considered that the scheme would be notable within the view and would not result in a significant impact upon this receptor.
	b) What are the landscape and visual effects from this location and are they significant?	Due to its distance from the proposed scheme and expansive views afforded, it was not considered that the scheme would be notable within the view and would not result in a significant impact upon this receptor.
	<b>St Michael's Hill</b>	
1.5.11.	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?	The Significance of Effect assessment should read "Neutral". A table of errata for the Environmental Statement has been submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A).
	<b>Bunds</b>	
1.5.12.	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). 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.	The Applicant agrees that the production of cross sections at intervals through the bunds / false cuttings will provide useful clarification. These cross sections will be added to the Engineering Section drawings which will be submitted as part of Deadline 4.
	b) What will be the gradients on the sides of the bunds?	Gradients will be 1:3 (vertical:horizontal). This will be clarified on the cross section drawings to be produced in response to question 1.5.12 above.
	c) Will the bunds be supported through their own weight, or will engineering works be required to ensure their long term retention?	It is currently anticipated that the bunds / false cuttings will be constructed from site-won material, and that this will consist of appropriate engineering properties for the gradients of all slopes to be 1:3 as indicated in the response to question 1.5.12 b) above. This will to be verified by the results of the ground investigation (GI) that were undertaken in 2018.
	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?	The Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) (APP-148) includes an objective to maintain landscaped areas for 5 years. This is secured by Requirement 3 of the Development Consent Order. Strips of land have been made available within the Development Consent Order (DCO) boundary for use as access to landscaped areas which will enable access to be gained to these strips. These strips, and associated access points, are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (APP-009) and also described in Paragraph 2.5.168 and Figure 2.21 of Chapter 2 The Scheme of the Environmental Statement (APP-039).
	e) Could we be directed to where, specifically, the height of the bunds has been assessed in both landscape and visual terms?	The bunds have been assessed as an integral part of the scheme, and in that respect have not specifically been assessed as a distinct element. Paragraphs 2.5.159 to 2.5.165 of Chapter 2 The Scheme of the Environmental Statement (ES) (APP-039) describe the bunds. The specific contribution of the bunds to landscape mitigation within landscape character areas LCA2 (Hazlegrove) and LCA6 (West Camel and Wales) is discussed in Chapter 7 Landscape of the ES (APP-044) and the specific contribution at visual receptors 19, 20 and 38 is described in Appendix 7.4 of the ES (APP-072).
	<b>Design of landscape mitigation</b>	
1.5.13.	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?	During detailed design a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) will be produced outlining the long-term maintenance of the scheme for the managing agent of this section of the network. The LEMP is secured as part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) through Requirement 3 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO). A landscaping scheme is also required to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State in accordance with Requirement 5 of the dDCO. Requirement 6 of the dDCO secures the implementation and maintenance of landscaping.
1.5.14.	<b>Construction effects</b>	

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	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.	Noted.
	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?	Lighting has been assessed during both construction and operation and the impacts of that reported through the descriptions of change in view as detailed in Appendix 7.4 Visual Baseline and Impact Schedules (APP-123). The same methodology has been used to assess all aspects of the scheme as detailed in Section 7.4 of Chapter 7 Landscape (APP-044).
1.6.	<b>Socio-economic Effects on surrounding Communities</b>	
	<b>Clarification</b>	
1.6.1.	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). 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?	Table 3.1 of Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (APP-040) of the Environmental Statement (ES) does correctly note that one derelict farm building and one dwelling would need to be demolished for Option A2. However, this will be clarified within the table of errata for the ES submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A) to note that one derelict farm building and one derelict building (The Spinney) would need to be demolished. Following the sift from 4 options (A2, E4, F1 and B4) to 2 options, the designs for Option A2 (which became Option 1) and Option F1 (which became Option 2) were developed further, considering the results of the initial environmental assessment, to reduce the scale of works in the rural area. The table of errata for the ES (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A) notes that the revised design for Option 1 ensured that the derelict building (The Spinney) would no longer need demolishing, which concurs with the assessment of the scheme as part of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) of the ES.
	<b>Alternatives</b>	
1.6.2.	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?	The reference to Option 1 in Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (APP-040) Table 3.2 under Material Assets and the column discussing Option 2 is a typographic error. The text should correctly reference Option 2 and has been corrected within the table of errata for the Environmental Statement submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A).
	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?	The reference to Option 2 in the Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (APP-040) Table 3.2 under Road Drainage and the Water Environment and the column discussing Option 1 is a typographic error. The text should correctly reference Option 1 and has been corrected within the table of errata for the Environmental Statement (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A) submitted alongside these responses.
	<b>Baseline</b>	
1.6.3.	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?	Paragraph 12.6.1 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) of the Environmental Statement (ES), explains that "no study areas for People and Communities are specified in the DMRB Volume 11 Section 2 Part 4, and the DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Parts 6, 8 and 9", and therefore the study areas used for this chapter have been defined through professional judgement, based on the type and scale of the scheme, likely pathways and the context of the surrounding area. The 250 metre study area for the non-motorised users, driver stress (extended to also include all roads directly affected by traffic management measures), amenity, demolition of private property and associated land take, community land and community facilities, severance, development land and human health is considered to be sufficient to identify and assess any likely significant effects as required by DMRB Volume 11, Section 2, Part 5.  As mentioned in paragraph 12.4.2 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) the study area was extended to include Queen Camel and also community facilities within West Camel, as requested in the Scoping Opinion for the scheme.
	b) What factors were taken into account in arriving at this boundary?	Paragraph 12.6.1 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) of the Environmental Statement (ES), explains that "no study areas for People and Communities are specified in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), Volume 11, Section 2, Part 4, and DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Parts 6, 8 and 9, and therefore the study areas used for this chapter have been defined through professional judgement, based on the type and scale of the scheme, likely pathways and the context of the surrounding area".  The 250 metre study area for the sub-topics of non-motorised users, driver stress (extended to also include all roads directly affected by traffic management measures), amenity, private property and land take, community land and community facilities, severance, development land and human health aligns with good practice, including DMRB Volume 11, Section 2, Part 5. As noted, it is based on professional judgement and knowledge of scheme.  The geographical scope also considers settlements outside the study area such as West Camel and Queen Camel. The study area has not been extended beyond 250 metre (with the exception of Queen and West Camel) as, based on knowledge of the scheme, significant effects are not predicted to occur beyond this.



Ref	Question:	Question Response
	<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>	<p>Similarly, the study area was not reduced to less than 250 metres as, again based on knowledge of the scheme, the potential for significant effects to occur within this area was identified. Therefore a 250 metre study area was considered appropriate for the assessment of people and communities effects.</p> <p>Paragraph 12.4.2 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) of the Environmental Statement (ES) notes that the study area was extended to include Queen Camel as part of the baseline, and community facilities within West Camel, as requested in the Scoping Opinion. Consideration of the baseline within West Camel is included in paragraph 12.7.12, 12.7.21 and Table 12.13 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049). Consideration of the baseline within Queen Camel is included in paragraphs: 12.7.5, 12.7.9, 12.7.12 and 12.7.30 and Table 12.13.</p> <p>Consideration for impacts on Queen Camel was also given as part of the non-motorised user assessment in the eleventh bullet in paragraph 12.10.3 and Table 12.23, the driver stress assessment in paragraph 12.10.40, the severance assessment in Table A.3 of Appendix 12.3 People and Communities Supplementary Information (APP-095) and the amenity assessment within Table 12.25 given the presence of likely pathways that could be impacted.</p>
1.6.4.	<p><b>Baseline</b></p> <p>a) Have any additional receptors been assessed since the preparation of the ES?</p>	<p>No additional receptors relevant to people and communities have been assessed or identified since the preparation of the Environmental Statement.</p>
1.6.5.	<p><b>Baseline</b></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>	<p>The Davis Hall community centre is mentioned by name within paragraph 12.7.21 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) of the Environmental Statement (ES). The other facilities mentioned here are not included by name within the baseline because no impacts on these facilities have been identified.</p>
1.6.6.	<p><b>Baseline</b></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. Please provide succinct definitions for the terms many receptors; moderate number of receptors; and small number of receptors as stated within Table 12.8 of the ES.</p>	<p>Receptors include residents, customer bases, visitors, and service users, all of which would vary in any given context. Because of this, specifying ranges of numbers of receptors is not possible or appropriate and may result in skewed results. The Environmental Statement Chapter 12 People and Communities further explains the magnitude of impact for receptors and groups of receptors in paragraphs 12.4.32 to 12.4.35. Succinct definitions for the terms many receptors; moderate number of receptors; and small number of receptors cannot be provided.</p> <p>The reasons for assigning a particular impact magnitude are set out in the assessment sections in section 12.10, providing an explanation of how each impact magnitude was arrived at.</p>
1.6.7.	<p><b>Baseline</b></p> <p>a) ES Chapter 12: People and Communities [APP-049] makes no reference to the use of a Rochdale envelope. 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>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that the Rochdale Envelope approach has been used with respect to Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) of the Environmental Statement (ES). The fifth bullet of paragraph 4.3.2 in Chapter 4 Environmental Assessment Methodology (APP-041) of the ES explains that where there are uncertainties in construction practices, the worst-case scenario has been assessed within individual topic chapters (Chapters 5 to 15, APP-038 to APP-052).</p> <p>The Rochdale envelope has been used and maximum parameters have been assessed.</p>
1.6.8.	<p><b>Economic Effects</b></p> <p>a) How will the scheme support economic growth?</p> <p>b) Where has this been assessed?</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.6.5 of the Case for the Scheme (APP-149) explains that the scheme will support economic growth by 'reducing congestion and ensuring connectivity of businesses in the local area' and by 'contributing to the future aspiration to connect London with the south west, supporting the continued economic growth of the local area and the south west more widely'. Paragraph 4.1.3 also states that the scheme aims to 'facilitate growth in jobs and housing by providing a free-flowing and reliable connection between the south east and south west'.</p> <p>Economic impacts are not included as a sub-topic in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) volumes used to assess effects on People and Communities, however effects on the local economy have been considered in paragraphs 12.10.17-12.10.19 and 12.10.57 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) of the Environmental Statement (ES).</p> <p>As the effects of the scheme are likely to be beneficial overall, these have not been assessed as significant.</p>

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	c) Where are the areas that will benefit economically located?	<p>Economic effects have been assessed for a wider study area, covering the Local Authority of South Somerset (referred to as the WIA). During construction, for example, it is noted in paragraph 12.10.17 Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) of the Environmental Statement (ES) that the construction strategy states that, where possible, labour, plant and materials would be sourced locally to support the local economy (see section 12.9, Chapter 12 People and Communities, APP-049). Paragraphs 12.10.18 to 12.10.19 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) also note that the scheme would require a construction workforce and that the workforce would be likely to make use of local services and shops whilst on site. These impacts were identified as being slight beneficial.</p> <p>During operation, paragraph 12.10.57 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) states that 'Direct operational employment is not expected to be created as a result of the scheme. However, there are likely to be increased indirect employment opportunities related to reduced congestion and improved journey times. This would be beneficial to those within the WIA. The potential increase in indirect employment would therefore result in a Slight Beneficial effect.'</p>
1.6.9.	<p><b>Economic Effects</b></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. 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>	<p>Impacts on local businesses may relate to access, an area covered under the topic of Severance. Paragraph 12.10.12 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) explains that 'construction of the scheme would also require several temporary road closures, potentially resulting in severance for those who rely on those roads to access residential properties, businesses or community resources'. However, due to alternative access arrangements made available in all instances, the sensitivity of receptors is considered low, and the overall impact is Slight Adverse and not significant (see paragraph 12.10.12 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049)).</p> <p>Paragraph 12.10.19 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) explains that there would be a slight, indirect and temporary beneficial effect on the local economy throughout construction. This would be as a result of construction workers using 'local facilities, for example hospitality and catering establishments'. Although local businesses have not been directly referenced, this slight beneficial effect is applicable.</p> <p>Construction of the scheme would also require several temporary road closures, potentially resulting in severance for those who rely on those roads to access residential properties, businesses or community resources. However, due to alternative access arrangements made available in all instances, the sensitivity of receptors is considered low, and the overall impact is slight adverse and not significant. Refer to paragraph 12.10.12 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049).</p>
1.6.12.	<p><b>Economic Effects</b></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>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Paragraph 12.10.26 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) details that the full assessment of impacts on severance of the land, husbandry, access, and drainage for individual farm businesses can be found in Table A.4 of Appendix 12.3 People and Communities Supplementary Information (APP-095). This is informed by baseline data compiled in Appendix 12.4 Agricultural Impact Assessment Baseline Report (APP-096).</p>
1.6.15.	<p><b>Amenity Effect</b></p> <p>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>Noted.</p> <p>At this point in the project programme, the details regarding precise timings and phasing of works and temporary accesses have not yet been developed. A meeting was held at Sparkford Hall on 20 November 2018 where this was explained. At this meeting the Outline Environmental Management Plan (APP-148) and Table 3.1 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) within this, which identify the environmental commitments made within the Environmental Statement (ES), were explained. It was also explained that once a main contractor is working on the scheme, the OEMP will be developed into a full Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and more precise timings in relation to works will be able to be provided. The CEMP will be secured through Requirement 3 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO). It was however agreed that the timing of one particular element of work, involving the removal of a layby very close to Sparkford Hall, would only be undertaken after a discussion with the Sparkford Hall occupants, in relation to timings. This is to reduce disruption to the occupants.</p> <p>The OEMP (APP-148) submitted as part of the DCO application sets out what potential remedial action may</p>

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	b) If not, why not?	be needed. Table 3.1 REAC in Chapter 3 of the OEMP sets out potential remedial action that may be needed. Please see response to question 1.6.15(a) above.
1.6.16.	<b>Social/Amenity Effect</b>	
	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?	Paragraph 12.8.1 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) does not draw any kind of conclusion regarding effects - it sets out a potential impact likely to arise during construction. The paragraph states "With the exception of access roads, the permanent loss of these outdoor spaces would not affect the ability of the residents to use or access their properties".  The chapter draws conclusions on the use of outside spaces at residential properties in Table 12.21, where it is identified that the loss of land would be moderate adverse and therefore significant. This is the conclusion of the chapter. Ultimately this text supersedes that in paragraph 12.8.1.
1.6.18.	<b>Social Effects</b>	
	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?	The methodology for this assessment can be found in paragraphs 12.4.31, 12.4.33, 12.4.34, 12.4.35, 12.4.37, and 12.4.38, and in Table 12.3, Table 12.8 and Table 12.9 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049).
1.6.19.	<b>NMU Effects</b>	
	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.  Which groups have you engaged with and what was the outcome of discussions?	During the course of scheme development the Applicant has engaged with the Ramblers Association, British Horse Society, South Somerset Bridleways Association, Taunton Area Cycling Campaign and Somerset County Council's Rights of Way Service Manager.  It is not possible to be specific about the outcomes of this engagement as the resulting published scheme is the combined result of a range of engagements, assessments and decisions.
1.6.20.	<b>NMU Effects</b>	
	The ES Chapter 12 People and Communities [APP-049] considers the effect of the scheme on NMUs.	Noted.
	a) You state the number of users of public footpaths was low.	
	b) How many surveyors were used?	Non-motorised user (NMU) count data was obtained by CCTV. Motion sensitive CCTV equipment was installed at all locations for the duration of the surveys as stated in Paragraph 1.1.2 of Appendix 12.1 of the Environmental Statement (APP-093). Recordings from these installations were then reviewed in the office in order to determine total counts. It is not possible to determine how many enumerators carried out this task, but it is confirmed that footage from all CCTV installations was reviewed during this process.
	c) Where were they located?	CCTV equipment was installed at the locations identified in Figure 12.2 of the Environmental Statement (APP-137).
	d) What times were each PRow surveyed?	Rights of way were surveyed using motion sensitive CCTV installations which were active on site during the times stated in Paragraph 1.1.2 of Appendix 12.2 of the Environmental Statement (APP-093).
e) Have you conducted any evening or weekend surveys since the submission of the ES?	No evening or weekend surveys have been conducted since the submission of the Environmental Statement.	
1.6.21.	<b>NMU Effects</b>	
	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 PRow cross fields and then the A303 and continue through a relatively tranquil environment.  What regard has been had to other qualities such as tranquillity, visual effects and convenience when assessing the effect on NMUs?	Noted.  Chapter 12 People and Communities of the Environmental Statement (APP-049) considers effects on non-motorised users (NMUs) relating to noise and dirt exposure and visual intrusions in paragraph 12.10.2 and ease of access in paragraphs 12.10.11 to 12.10.12 in respect of construction effects and paragraph 12.10.52 and Table 12.25 with regard to operational effects.
1.6.22.	<b>NMU Effects</b>	
	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?	Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) does conclude that the scheme has the potential to increase the physical activity of non-motorised users (NMU) during operation. The evidence for this is in the operational assessment for NMUs in paragraphs 12.10.30 to 12.10.33 and Table 12.23 and amenity in paragraphs 12.10.50 to 12.10.53 and Table 12.25 which predicted overall Slight Beneficial and Moderate Beneficial effects. These assessments considered changes in journey length and time, provision of new and improved facilities for NMU, safety and changes in journey experience for NMUs. The scheme has the potential to increase usage of the NMU network in the area which could have a beneficial effect on physical activity.
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?	Consideration of both adverse and beneficial impacts relating to increases in journey length and time during operation have been considered in Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) Table 12.23. A commentary is provided for each of the non-motorised user (NMU) journeys identified within the vicinity of the scheme, which notes whether usage would be affected for NMUs, taking into account improvements to NMU	

Ref	Question:	Question Response
		facilities and the results of the 2016 NMU surveys. Consideration of changes to tranquil setting and journey experience has been given in paragraph 12.10.51.
1.6.23.	<p><b>NMU Effects</b></p> <p>a) It is not clear how the mitigation measures and new proposed routes for NMUs have been determined. 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. 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>	A topic paper regarding Right of Way Y30-28 (Eastmead Lane) will be produced and submitted as part of Deadline 3.
1.6.24.	<p><b>NMU Effects</b></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>	<p>Convenience is taken to mean how a crossing facilitates the quick and efficient movement by non-motorised users (NMUs) across a road.</p> <p>The assessment of NMU provision is documented in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-049]. This document uses journey length as the measure of impact on convenience.</p> <p>Chapter 12 of the ES identifies 15 existing journeys within the study area, describes how these journeys will be diverted as a result of the scheme proposals, and assesses the likely impact of these diversions. The existing journeys are described in Table 12.11 of Chapter 12, and the impact on these journeys as a result of the scheme is assessed in Table 12.23.</p> <p>Five of the fifteen identified journeys would be diverted through the proposed underbridge. These are 'Camel Hill to Traits Lane', 'Celtic Way', 'Sparkford to Camel Hill', 'Hazlegrove House / Sparkford Hill to Queen Camel' and 'Sparkford to Hazlegrove House / Sparkford Hall via Sparkford Hill'. Table 12.23 states that the changes to journey length for these 5 journeys are a 1,950 metre increase, 1,620 metre increase, 170 metre decrease, 1,130 metre increase and 120 metre increase respectively. The associated impact is assessed in Table 12.23 as being 'major adverse', 'major adverse', 'minor beneficial', 'major adverse' and 'minor adverse' respectively.</p> <p>When developing this route the safety, comfort and security of users has been considered. The potential for environmental impact has also been a factor.</p> <p>The layout of local roads and junctions in the vicinity of Hazlegrove has been deliberately designed to be as simple as possible from a driver perspective in order to minimise the amount of night time lighting that may present an adverse environmental impact at the adjacent Registered Park and Garden (RPG). This includes the underbridge.</p> <p>An off-carriageway non-motorised user route will be provided in the southern verge of Camel Hill Link as it passes through the Hazlegrove Underbridge. This will be 4 metres wide, sufficient for use by all classes of non-motorised user (NMU).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that personal safety can be a significant issue for NMUs at unlit underpasses. However, the lack of night time lighting at the Hazlegrove Underbridge will be consistent with all local roads in this area, and the following factors have been taken into account in the determination that the lack of lighting should not pose an unacceptable safety risk to NMUs.</p> <p>The provision of an off-carriageway route provides relative safety and comfort of NMUs by ensuring physical separation from motor traffic, particularly during darkness or poor visibility. However, the comfort of the route will be limited by the enclosed nature of the underbridge which may amplify traffic noise, and therefore it is acknowledged that careful detail design development will be required.</p> <p>Although physical separation of motor traffic and NMUs provides safety and comfort, some degree of proximity to the carriageway will be of benefit in terms of perceived and actual security from crime. There appears to be a concentration of low level criminal activity (such as theft and anti-social behaviour) at the nearby service area at Sparkford, although the lack of similar activity on adjacent roads suggests that this activity is confined to the service area site. It is therefore considered that the risk of crime at the Hazlegrove Underbridge is negligible.</p>

Ref	Question:	Question Response
1.6.25.	<b>NMU Effects</b>	
	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?	Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) has assessed an overall Slight Beneficial effect on non-motorised users (including pedestrians and cyclists) (NMU) during operation as a result of the scheme, as stated in paragraph 12.10.33, and an overall Moderate Beneficial effect on amenity for NMUs as stated in paragraph 12.10.53, and therefore the assessment identifies a number of improvements to the NMU network and journeys along the route, addressing historic problems for NMUs in a number of places. Through scheme assessments, non-statutory and statutory consultation with the local community, rights of way user groups, Somerset County Council and also through a developing familiarity of the scheme area, likely desire lines were identified and adapted into the scheme design to ensure these were provided for in a cost-effective manner. Accessibility and safety would be improved for all NMUs, with new public rights of way and crossings of the A303 provided, as described in paragraph 12.9.5 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049).
	b) Where is the evidence to support this view?	Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) considers operational effects on non-motorised users (including disabled users) in paragraphs 12.10.30 to 12.10.33 and Table 12.23. Changes to accessibility and safety are considered as part of the operational amenity assessment in paragraphs 12.10.50 to 12.10.53 and Table 12.25.
1.6.26.	<b>NMU Effects</b>	
	a) SCC and SSDC in their representations [RR 40 and RR 41] suggests that there may be unrecorded rights of way.	Noted.
	b) What steps have been taken to identify such rights of way?	Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) identified all public rights of way (PRoW), cycle routes and footways within 250 metres of the scheme. PRoW were identified from the Somerset County Council website: <a href="http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/plans/rights-of-way/">http://www.somerset.gov.uk/policies-and-plans/plans/rights-of-way/</a> , Sustrans ( <a href="https://www.sustrans.org.uk/ncn/map">https://www.sustrans.org.uk/ncn/map</a> ) was used for identification of all national cycle routes and footways were identified using google maps. Any additional unrecorded rights of way have therefore not been identified.
	c) Have any additional rights of way been identified?	No public rights of way additional to those on the Somerset County Council website have been identified in respect of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049).
	d) If so, what effect is the scheme likely to have on these rights of way?	No public rights of way additional to those on the Somerset County Council website have been assessed with respect to Environmental Statement Chapter 12 [document reference: APP-049].
1.6.27.	<b>NMU Effects</b>	
	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.	Noted.
	Can the Applicant clarify if Figure 2.13 is an extract of a drawing contained elsewhere in the ES?	Figure 2.13 is an extract from another drawing which was not submitted as part of the DCO application, but does show all signed cycle routes as required. The drawing along with the key has been included within the table of errata for the Environmental Statement submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A).
	b) Please provide a key to accompany Figure 2.13 as it is currently not clear exactly what the Figure is showing?	Figure 2.13 has been updated with a key and has been included within the table of errata for the Environmental Statement submitted alongside these responses (document reference 9.2, Volume 9, Revision A).
1.6.29.	<b>NMU Effects</b>	
	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	The proposed non-motorised user (NMU) routes have been designed to a preliminary level of detail following the Applicant's guidance notes, namely TA91/05 "Provision for Non Motorised Users" and TA90/05 "Geometric Design of Pedestrian Equestrian and Cycle Routes". Adherence to these guides should enable further detail design ensuring accessibility for all user types.
1.6.31.	<b>Traffic Issue</b>	
	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.	The Applicant assumes that you refer to Figure 7.1 in the Transport Report (APP – 150) and have answered the question on this basis.  The conclusion within Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049) was based on information provided in the Case for the Scheme (APP-149), column 3 of paragraph 2.2 of Table 1 at Appendix 1, it is stated that "In the eastbound direction, the average savings provided by the scheme across the three weekday time periods are 2.21 minutes in 2023 and 2.98 minutes in 2038. In the summer, the savings are 5.65 minutes in 2023 and 3.33 minutes in 2038. In the westbound direction, the scheme saves an average of 1.56 minutes in 2023 and 2.30 minutes in 2038 across the three weekday time periods, while in the summer, the savings are 3.28 minutes in 2023 and 3.93 minutes in 2038". This data indicates that users of community facilities that would be accessed from both directions are likely to save time at this stage of their journey. Whilst there will be increases in traffic through West Camel and Sparkford, the relatively low forecasted traffic flows on these roads would not cause any capacity issues and would not appreciably increase journey times.
1.6.32.	<b>Traffic Issue</b>	

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	<p>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.</p>	<p>The conclusion was reached based on information provided in the Case for the Scheme (APP-149) section 4. Here, it is explained that the overarching objectives for the scheme include to 'reduce delays and queues that occur during peak hours at seasonal times of the year', to provide 'a free-flowing and reliable connection between the south east and the south west' and to 'improve journey time reliability and resilience'. Column 3 of paragraph 2.2 of Table 1 at Appendix 1 of the Case for the Scheme (APP-149) also states that 'In the eastbound direction, the average savings provided by the scheme across the three weekday time periods are 2.21 minutes in 2023 and 2.98 minutes in 2038. In the summer, the savings are 5.65 minutes in 2023 and 3.33 minutes in 2038. In the westbound direction, the scheme saves an average of 1.56 minutes in 2023 and 2.30 minutes in 2038 across the three weekday time periods, while in the summer, the savings are 3.28 minutes in 2023 and 3.93 minutes in 2038.' The objectives for the scheme and travel time forecast therefore suggest that journey times to future developments in the local area will be reduced because of the scheme, improving access for users.</p>
	<p>b) Which journeys do you anticipate will be improved?</p>	<p>This conclusion was based on evidence provided in Appendix 1: National Policy Statement for National Networks (NNNPS) Accordance Table of the Case for the Scheme (APP-149). Under Table 1, NSPNN Paragraph Number 2.2 of the Appendix, it is stated that journeys 'In the eastbound direction, the average savings provided by the scheme across the three weekday time periods are 2.21 minutes in 2023 and 2.98 minutes in 2038. In the summer, the savings are 5.65 minutes in 2023 and 3.33 minutes in 2038. In the westbound direction, the scheme saves an average of 1.56 minutes in 2023 and 2.30 minutes in 2038 across the three weekday time periods, while in the summer, the savings are 3.28 minutes in 2023 and 3.93 minutes in 2038.' This data indicates that journeys in both the eastbound and westbound directions would be improved because of the scheme. Should any future developments rely on these stretches of road, users would therefore experience improved journey times.</p>
	<p>c) Where is the evidence for this?</p>	
	<p><b>Traffic Issue</b></p>	
1.6.33.	<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>b) Where do you anticipate the increased employment opportunities would be situated?</p>	<p>Paragraph 12.10.57 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (APP-049), explains that the indirect employment opportunities would be 'beneficial to those within the WIA'. As stated in paragraph 12.6.1, the WIA (Wider Impact Area) for this scheme is the district of South Somerset. Any increase in employment opportunities would therefore be located within the WIA.</p>
	<p><b>Traffic Issue</b></p>	
1.6.34.	<p>a) When is it proposed to close Traits Lane and the Podimore Slip road?</p>	<p>No specific dates have been established for the permanent closure of these roads.</p>
	<p>b) Are there practical difficulties with closing these roads earlier in the construction process?</p>	<p>No practical difficulties are anticipated with the early closure of the Podimore Slip Road.</p> <p>It will be necessary to ensure any alternative access arrangements for properties along Traits Lane (for example Blackwell Farm) are in place prior to the closure of the A303 / Traits Lane junction. This requirement will be drafted into a Position Statement between the Applicant and Mr Hewlett of Blackwell Farm.</p>
1.7.	<p><b>Traffic and Transport</b></p>	
	<p><b>Transport Objectives</b></p>	
1.7.1.	<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted. Please see response to question 1.7.1b) for clarification.</p>
	<p>b) Which problems would a railway not resolve?</p>	<p>The problems identified in the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester location are detailed in Section 2.3 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (APP-151). These include regular congestion, poor journey time reliability and a record of collisions (accidents) that is worse than the national rate for all A class trunk roads. The objectives for the scheme that would require these problems to be addressed are set out in the Transport Report (APP-150) in section 2.4.</p> <p>The primary alternative mode for the dominant long-distance trips in the A303 corridor would be rail. The available rail routes for the corridor are described in the Transport Report (APP – 150) in section 5.1. Despite improvements to rail, and even with further improvements, the road scheme is needed for this corridor to fully achieve scheme objectives. To achieve the scheme objectives and solve the problems with a railway scheme would require a large reduction in traffic levels on the existing road so that congestion and poor journey time reliability would be eliminated. Achieving this with a rail improvement is unrealistic. Even if this were achieved, it would not address safety problems caused by the old single carriageway and existing at grade junctions.</p>

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	c) Would the proposed scheme solve all of the problems?	<p>In summary the scheme solves all of the problems of the existing single carriageway and meets the objectives for the scheme.</p> <p>Section 8 of the Transport Report (APP – 150) shows that the journey times would be quicker along the corridor with the free-flowing scheme despite the fact that the scheme attracts higher flows which would be likely to have a negative impact on journey times along the other sections of the route, particularly the other single carriageway sections.</p> <p>The economic impacts in section 8.2 of the Transport Report shows that the proposed scheme would result in benefits for collisions (accidents), economic efficiency of the users and travel time reliability, as well as wider economic benefits.</p> <p>The traffic impacts of the proposed scheme are summarised in section 7 of the Transport Report. This sets out the traffic flow changes in the local and wider areas. As well as local area reassignments there are strategic reassignments of traffic, explained in paragraphs 7.1.5 to 7.1.8. The impacts on the junctions in the local area are set out in section 7.2 which demonstrates that the junctions operate within capacity.</p>
	d) Would it create other problems?	The Transport Report (APP–150) identifies in section 7.1 the locations where traffic increases would occur with the scheme. These increases occur locally in West Camel and Sparkford which are identified in paragraph 7.1.4. The impacts on junction operational performance is assessed in section 7.2 of the Transport Report. The economic appraisal contained in section 8.2 of the Transport Report indicates that overall there are some small disbenefits for noise and air quality as well as for greenhouse gases.
	<b>Nature of proposal</b>	
	a) A number of respondents believe that the intention is to upgrade the road to an expressway in the future.	Noted.
1.7.2.	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?	The Applicant will upgrade this section of the A303 to a high-quality dual carriageway as part of this scheme. In future Road Investment Periods, Highways England has a longer-term aspiration to upgrade the busiest A-roads to provide a motorway-quality and consistent journey experience with improved safety compared to existing All Purpose Trunk Road routes. The case for these upgrades will be established on a case-by-case basis, with need and value for money taken into consideration. The term ‘Expressway’ is used only to differentiate a new design standard for new and upgraded A roads from other types of road improvement, which is awaiting publication. This section of the A303 has taken cognisance of this standard. Highways England will not be introducing the term ‘Expressway’ as a concept to road users and they will not have to learn new signs or rules.
	<b>Scheme Alignment/Arrangement</b>	
	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.	Noted. Please see response to question 1.7.3b) for clarification.
1.7.3.	Have the effects of the scheme on this junction been modelled?	<p>The traffic modelling has identified an increase in traffic on Sparkford High Street with the scheme. This is explained in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal (ComMA) report (APP-151) at paragraph 12.2.5. In summary, A303 eastbound traffic from the A359 south will continue to use the revised junction at Hazlegrove for access to the trunk road. However, traffic travelling north on the A359 would use the A359 via Sparkford High Street with the scheme rather than use the short section of A303 between Hazlegrove and Camelot junctions.</p> <p>Traffic modelling indicates that traffic joining the A303 eastbound at Camelot with the scheme would be similar to that without the scheme, but traffic leaving the A303 at this location would be reduced. The reduced daily traffic on the short link between the A303 and A359 is shown in Figure 12.8 at site 16 which shows that the forecast Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) would reduce from 3000 to 2600 vehicles per day in 2023 and from 3400 to 3000 vehicles per day (vpd) in 2038.</p>
	b) Have alternative traffic arrangements been considered?	The evolution of the junction is explained in the Topic Paper on Hazlegrove Junction, submitted alongside this submission for Deadline 2 (document reference 9.7, Volume 9, Revision A).
	<b>Scheme Alignment/Arrangement</b>	
1.7.5.	a) What alternative access arrangements have been considered for the Andrea Mattia Diner and the adjacent filling station?	Initial scheme layout proposals included the retention of the existing A303 carriageway as the westbound merging slip road. This may have provided limited access to the Camel Hill service area (including the Mattia Diner) for traffic merging with the A303 from the A359. However the Camel Hill service area (in particular its exit) would have been located in very close proximity to the merge. This was considered to be an unsafe arrangement. The provision of a dedicated exit / entry from the A303 westbound carriageway was briefly considered although this would have been less than 400 metres from the Hazlegrove junction westbound

Ref	Question:	Question Response
		merge. This would have been a departure from Highways England's geometric layout standards which require a spacing of 1 kilometre as a minimum.
1.7.8.	<p><b>Compounds</b></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>	<p>A compound is required to the north of the A303 at Hazlegrove, as indicated in the draft Traffic Management Plan. Three corrected Works Plans have been re-issued as part of Deadline 2 (document reference 2.3, Volume 2). These drawings are HE551507-MMSJV-LSI-000-DR-UU-2033, HE551507-MMSJV-LSI-000-DR-UU-2034 and HE551507-MMSJV-LSI-000-DR-UU-2035 and the latest version is Revision C04. No other Works Plans have been updated.</p> <p>As a result of the response to question 1.7.8 a) above this question does not require a response</p>
1.7.9.	<p><b>Traffic Management Plan</b></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>	<p>The weight limit is for environmental rather than structural reasons. It has been put in place in order to prevent heavy good vehicles travelling between Yeovil and the A303 along the A359 through the villages of Queen Camel and Marston Magna. A more appropriate route for these vehicles is along the A37 which runs between Yeovil and the A303, connecting with the A303 approximately 6 miles to the west of Hazlegrove Roundabout.</p> <p>The temporary suspension of the weight limit would therefore impose traffic disturbance in Queen Camel and Marston Magna.</p> <p>It should be noted that the A359 is already a designated diversion route for closure of the A303 between the A359 (Hazlegrove) and A37 (Ilchester Meads). This was agreed between Highways England, its maintaining agents and Somerset County Council in 2014.</p> <p>This question relates specifically to the effect of additional heavy goods vehicles along the A359 as a result of using this road as a diversion route when the A303 is closed. Whilst the Applicant acknowledges that heavy goods vehicles are a particular concern, the impact of increased volume of all vehicle types along the A359 during diversions will also need to be managed carefully.</p> <p>During the early stages of scheme development the focus has been on the development of design solutions that minimise the requirement to close the A303, and the agreement of arrangements for the planning of significant traffic management works well in advance of their implementation. The applicant has been in discussion with Somerset County Council regarding the management of traffic during the construction period. An outline traffic management plan has been prepared which is included as Appendix B5 of the Outline Environmental Management Plan (APP-148). In paragraph 1.2.2 "Challenges and considerations" the document acknowledges the potential for increased traffic through local communities as a result of the works. This will ensure further development of the plan as described below focusses on this potential as a priority.</p> <p>Highways England have appointed a contracting organisation to provide advice on the buildability of the scheme through its development. The minimisation of the overall construction duration and anticipated number of times the A303 will need to be closed are a direct result of this advice. Table 2.6 of Chapter 2 The Scheme of the Environmental Statement (ES) (APP-039) provides details of the current expected worst case scenarios for closure of the A303 and associated use of the A359 as a diversion route. It is intended to improve on this worst case as the construction strategy develops. It is currently expected that the majority of any closures that are necessary will take place in 2021.</p> <p>The development of the Traffic Management Plan in advance of the commencement of the works will be driven by Highways England's main contractor. The contractor will be in the best position to refine construction sequences that may minimise instances of closure of the A303 even further, and to implement the most appropriate mitigation measures. The Applicant has agreed with Somerset County Council that a Traffic Management Working Group will be established by the main contractor early in the delivery of the scheme in order to ensure these works are planned and publicised well in advance of their implementation, with the involvement of all stakeholders. This will be included within the updated Traffic Management Plan to be included within the Outline Environmental Management Plan, to be submitted as part of Deadline 3.</p>
1.7.11.	<p><b>Traffic Assessment</b></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.</p>	Noted.



Ref	Question:	Question Response
	Where do we find this detail?	This road project is supported by a local transport model which is referred to in the Transport Report (APP-50) and the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (ComMA) report (APP-151). Paragraph 3.1.1 of the ComMA report provides a high level description of the development of the local model from the South West Regional Traffic Model with the enhancement of the modelling in the local scheme area to better represent local traffic movements. More detail of the design of the local model is set out in section 7.2 of the ComMA report. The traffic impacts of the scheme are set out in section 12.2 of the ComMA report.
	b) Have you assessed the scale and distribution of the increase in traffic within Sparkford?	The traffic modelling has identified an increase in traffic on Sparkford High Street with the scheme. This is explained in the ComMA report (APP-151) at paragraph 12.2.5.
	c) If so, where is this information?	Paragraph 12.2.5 of the ComMA Report (APP-151) explains the increases on Sparkford High Street for both southbound and northbound traffic.
	<b>Traffic Assessment</b>	
1.7.12.	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?	Yes. The operational assessment of junctions is described in the Transport Report (APP-150) section 7.2. This explains the methods used and shows which junctions were assessed in Figure 7.3 for the Do Minimum (without the scheme) and Figure 7.4 for the Do Something (with the scheme). These 2 figures show that West Camel crossroads and Sparkford High Street / The Avenue were assessed. The results of the assessment are provided in Table 7.1 which shows that with the scheme none of the junctions would exceed the capacity threshold of 0.85 for the ratio of flow to capacity (RFC). The highest ratio of flow to capacity (RFCs) with forecast traffic would be 0.18 and 0.78 for the 2 junctions respectively.  The forecast traffic flows take account of the cumulative effects of all the developments and other transport schemes that were considered to be in the categories of 'near certain' or 'more than likely' which has been assessed as part of the Uncertainty Log. The Uncertainty Log is contained in the Appendix E of the ComMA Report (APP- 151) and described in paragraphs 11.2.3 to 11.2.7. The other transport schemes include A303 Stonehenge and the A358 Taunton to Southfields Dualling schemes.
	b) Do the effects of this additional traffic need to be mitigated? If so, what measures are proposed and how will they be secured?	The additional traffic in West Camel and Sparkford does not produce any forecast junction capacity problems so there is no need for mitigation measures.
	<b>Traffic Assessment</b>	
1.7.13.	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?	Only Podimore Roundabout is signal controlled so this was assessed with LINSIG which produces a DoS value. All other junctions are priority controlled so have been assessed with the RFC values.
	b) Do the different measurements give different outcomes?	Yes. The measurements are the same, the distinction is due to the separate junction modelling packages used.
	c) What does IP at Table 7.2 mean?	This is defined in the Glossary (APP-053) as: Inter-peak – the modelled weekday time period between 10:00 – 16:00.
	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?	The Do Minimum is the scenario without the proposed scheme (so would not be referred to as a Do Minimum scheme). In this scenario, with forecast traffic increases, the B3151/A303 junction exceeds capacity as drivers on the B3151 would find it more difficult to join the A303, particularly for the right turning movement. The underlying assumptions are the junction capacity which is derived from the junction geometry and priority control as well as the forecast traffic demand.
	<b>Traffic Assessment</b>	
1.7.15.	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?	The Combined Modelling and Appraisal (ComMA) report (APP-151) provides the operational assessment results for these junctions in section 12.4. Tables 12.16 to 12.24 provide the results for ratio of flow to capacity (RFC) / Degree of Saturation (DoS), queues and delays for the junctions with forecast weekday AM peak, inter peak and PM peak traffic flows. The maximum RFC for Sparkford High Street – The Avenue would be 0.78 and for Podimore Roundabout the maximum DoS would be 0.87, both in the PM peak in 2038. This means that there would be no significant queues or delays at these junctions as they will operate within desirable capacity.
	b) Is mitigation required?	These operating conditions are not considered to require mitigation measures.
	c) If not why not?	It is acknowledged that higher traffic flows occur on the A303 corridor during summer peak periods due to higher levels of strategic traffic movement. These peak levels of traffic would not usually be considered in design on the grounds of disproportionate cost and impact that catering for the very highest peak traffic levels would require. However, it is expected that the higher traffic levels would be mitigated by adjusting the traffic signal timings at Podimore Roundabout as far as is practicable to cater for the higher summer traffic flows. It should be noted that the local traffic movements are lower during the A303 summer peak periods so the performance of the Sparkford High Street – The Avenue junction would be better than the weekday peak periods.
1.7.17.	<b>Traffic Assessment</b>	

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	Do the traffic forecasts within the ES chapter 12 [APP-049] and the Transport Report [APP-150] include the cumulative effects?	The forecast traffic flows take account of the cumulative effects of all the developments and other transport schemes that were considered to be in the categories of 'near certain' or 'more than likely' which has been assessed as part of the Uncertainty Log. The Uncertainty Log is contained in the Appendix E of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal (ComMA) Report (APP-151) and described in paragraphs 11.2.3 to 11.2.7. The other transport schemes include A303 Stonehenge and the A358 Taunton to Southfields Dualling schemes.
	<b>Highway Safety</b>	
	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/B3151 junction.	Noted.
1.7.18.	How will the proposed scheme improve road safety at these locations and on this stretch of road generally?	The proposed scheme removes a number of at-grade (on the same vertical level) junctions between the A303 and local roads whereas the junctions on the proposed scheme are all grade-separated. This allows the through traffic to remain on the main carriageway without interacting with local traffic throughout the scheme. This therefore reduces the conflicting traffic movements and the number of opportunities for vehicles to collide. In addition, the two directions of A303 traffic will be separated by a central reserve and barrier which will eliminate the risk of head-on collisions due to overtaking on the single carriageway.
	b) Did any of the recorded accidents involve NMU's?	There were 34 collisions recorded between 2010 and 2014 inclusive at Hazlegrove Roundabout and on the single carriageway between here and the dual carriageway at Podimore (refer to Table 2.2 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal (ComMA) Report (APP-151) for more details). Only one of these collisions involved an NMU. This was a serious collision located close to Hazlegrove Roundabout in which a road worker operating traffic management control using a Stop / Go board was struck by a vehicle.
	<b>Highway Safety</b>	
	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?	The study area was defined by assessing the geographical area of impact of the scheme, which is where there are significant increases or decreases in traffic flows with the scheme in place. This was split into a local detailed area where local traffic re-routed onto the A303 and a wider skeletal network to capture long distance re-routing such as from the M4 / M5 and A31 / A35 routes to the A303 corridor. A diagram showing the study area can be found in Figure 13.3 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal (ComMA) report (APP-151).
1.7.19.	b) To what extent were any of these accidents due to the nature of the existing A303?	There were 34 collisions recorded at Hazlegrove Roundabout and on the single carriageway between here and the dual carriageway at Podimore (refer to Table 2.2 of the ComMA report for more details). 15 of these 34 (44%) were due to the nature of the existing A303. The criterion used to determine this was whether the collision would not have occurred had the A303 been dualled, for example collisions involving vehicles turning into or out of the junctions along the carriageway or collisions involving through traffic at the Hazlegrove Roundabout were classified as being due to the nature of the existing road.
	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?	Accident impact is calculated based on defined observed accident data or default accident rates by road / junction type (see paragraph 13.3.12 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal (ComMA) report (APP-151) for more information) and traffic flows with and without scheme scenarios using Department for Transport software tool COBALT. The scheme results in accident reductions since it eliminates the old single carriageway between Sparkford and Ilchester and the associated at grade junctions. Elsewhere over the wider road network the changes in numbers and severities of accidents is governed increases or decreases in traffic flows on road links and junctions. The COBALT software aggregates these changes and shows that there is a net benefit with the scheme. This is summarised in Table 9.2 and illustrated for the wider network in Figure 9.3 in the Transport Report (APP – 150).
	<b>Highway Safety</b>	
1.7.20.	a) The CoMMA Report [APP-151] Table 6, p541 projects the number of future fatalities. How is this figure arrived at?	Accident impact is calculated based on defined observed accident data or default accident rates by road / junction type (see paragraph 13.1.12 of the ComMA report (APP-151) for more information) and traffic flows in the with and without scheme scenarios using the Department for Transport software tool COBALT. The impacts are aggregated over the 60-year appraisal period and split into severity (fatal, serious or slight casualties) based on the severity splits defined in COBALT. This is assessed for the Do Minimum (without scheme) scenario and the Do Something (with scheme) scenario and for each case calculates the number of fatal, serious and slight casualties. The difference between the 2 scenarios will produce savings in casualties for each category.
	b) What assumptions is it based on?	The default accident rates and casualty severity splits used in COBALT are calculated based on national data for the road / junction type from 2008-2010. Accident rates are assumed to reduce over time. The forecasting of the proportion of fatal / serious / slight casualties is based on a similar methodology.
	c) What geographical area does it cover?	The geographical area covered in the collision assessment is displayed in Figure 13.3 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal (ComMA) Report (APP-151).
1.7.21.	<b>Highway Safety</b>	

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	a) Has the potential safety implications of the reduction in the number of crossing points for NMUs been assessed?	<p>Yes. In answering this question the applicant assumes that this is in relation to crossings of the A303 carriageway.</p> <p>The reduced number of crossings of the A303 has been assessed to have a positive safety implication. This is because NMUs making north-south journeys will be exposed to significantly lower risk associated with traffic volumes.</p> <p>This assessment is documented in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement (APP-049). Specifically, paragraph 12.10.31 reports that the improved safety associated with the proposals for the two bridge crossings of the A303 and associated NMU facilities in verges alongside local roads would largely mitigate for the adverse effects of increased journey lengths.</p>
	b) What, if any, measures are proposed to prevent NMUs crossing the road other than at the formal crossing points?	<p>No specific prevention measures are proposed, although the nature of the engineering within the highway boundary of the new dual carriageway will be a significant deterrent.</p> <p>The central reserve will include a continuous vertical concrete barrier (as described in Paragraph 2.5.135 of Chapter 2 The Scheme of the Environmental Statement (APP-039). A continuous boundary fence is proposed along both sides of the dual carriageway, as shown in the General Arrangement Plans (APP-009) and along much of the length of the scheme the engineered slopes and associated vegetation planting will make access to the roadside verge from adjoining land difficult.</p>
	<b>Highway Safety</b>	
1.7.23.	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?	A pegasus crossing would not significantly benefit highway safety. An explanation is provided in response to question 1.7.23 b) below.
	b) If not, why not?	A pegasus crossing is not required due to the low traffic volumes that are likely to be using the former A303 carriageway (approximately 800 vehicles per day in each direction in the design year, or 75 vehicles per hour in the peak hour). These flows are well below the thresholds quoted in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) for controlled crossings (specifically Table 6/1 of TA91/05 "Provision for Non Motorised Users".
1.8.	<b>Flooding/ Drainage Strategy</b>	
	<b>Effects on unlicensed water abstractions</b>	
1.8.2.	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?	A private water supplies technical note (document reference 9.6, Volume 9, Revision A) was produced for review by the Environment Agency, which included a review of mapped water features and agricultural survey responses from landowners to identify potential water features where deregulated abstractions may exist within the study area. Several natural springs were identified within the study area, but as the proposed scheme is not anticipated to affect groundwaters or flow pathways at any depth, it is expected that the source/ integrity of these natural springs will not be affected by the scheme. It was concluded within this technical note that no adverse impacts on deregulated abstractions / private water supplies are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed scheme during either construction or operational phases. The technical note (document reference 9.6, Volume 9, Revision A) has been submitted as part of the Deadline 2 submission.
	b) What, if any, supplies have been identified?	A single private water supply at grid reference ST 55646 24982 was identified within the proposed scheme footprint. This water feature is located between a derelict farm building and the A303. Discussions are ongoing with the landowner with regards to the land and this private water supply, but the intention is to replace any water supplies that are lost.
	c) What provision has been made for the protection of these supplies?	Discussions with the landowner are ongoing.
	<b>Ground water</b>	
1.8.3.	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>Highways England proposes to make an amendment to Article 20 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) to address this point as follows:</p> <p>20 (5) The undertaker must take such steps as are reasonably practicable to secure that any water discharged into a watercourse or public sewer or drain or to the ground under this article is as free as may be practicable from gravel, soil or other solid substance, oil or matter in suspension, or dissolved pollutants.</p> <p>The dDCO has been submitted as part of Deadline 2 (document reference 3.1, Volume 3, Revision C).</p>
1.8.6.	<b>Flood Risk</b>	

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	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?	It is accepted that this area is low lying and suffers from poor drainage, however it has been demonstrated in the response to question 1.8.6 b) below, that the proposal will not increase flood risk in this area.
	b) Can it be demonstrated that the proposal will not increase flood risk in this area?	As further described in Paragraph 4.3.1 of the Drainage Strategy Report [APP-060], to mitigate the increase in impermeable area associated with the dualling scheme, off-site discharge will be restricted. The proposed strategy reduces off-site discharge to no greater than the undeveloped rate of run-off.  As outlined in Requirement 13(2)(b) of the draft Development Consent Order (APP017), surveys are to be conducted at detailed design stage downstream of the proposed outfalls to confirm their suitability and condition, subsequently informing any rehabilitation.
	<b>Flood Risk</b>	
1.8.7.	a) The Church Commissioners for England indicate [RR-032] in respect of Land at Courtry & 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?	It is accepted that this area is particularly wet, with a known existing flooding issue (described in Paragraph 3.3.6 of the Drainage Strategy Report (APP-060)), however it has been demonstrated in the response to question 1.8.7 b) below, that the proposal will not increase flood risk in this area.
	b) Can it be demonstrated that the proposal will not increase flood risk in this area?	As further described in Paragraph 4.3.1 of the Drainage Strategy Report (APP-060), to mitigate the increase in impermeable area associated with the dualling scheme off-site discharge will be restricted. The proposed strategy reduces off-site discharge to no greater than the undeveloped rate of run-off.  As outlined in Paragraph 3.3.7 of the Drainage Strategy Report (APP-060), surveys are to be conducted at detail design stage downstream of the proposed outfalls to confirm their suitability and condition, subsequently informing any rehabilitation.
	<b>Management and Maintenance of drainage</b>	
1.8.8.	a) Has the phasing/temporary drainage during the construction period been taken into account?	Not at this stage, although recommendations of best practice have been provided within: Paragraph 1.6.4 of the Road Drainage and the Water Environment Assessment Summary (APP-056); Paragraph 6.2.11 of the Flood Risk Assessment (APP-059); and Outline Environmental Management Plan (APP-148).
	b) If so, what are the proposed arrangements and how are they secured by the dDCO?	Drainage during the construction period will be set out in and controlled by the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to be approved under Requirement 5. As set out in Requirement 5 (2)(g), the CEMP must set out management plans and working methods for all of the topics covered in the ES, which will include construction methods and construction phase drainage provision.
	<b>Management and Maintenance of drainage</b>	
1.8.9.	a) What provision has been made for the future maintenance/management of the drainage scheme?	A level strip of land 4 metres wide has been provided alongside all highway drainage ditches. These are generally part of the soft estate, although only grassed so that access will be possible by tracked vehicle, off road vehicle or other maintenance plant. Access points have been provided to these strips from the adjacent road network. The grassed strips and access points are shown on the General Arrangement Plans (APP-009).  The access strips are also described in Paragraphs 2.5.168 to 2.5.140 and Figure 2.21 of Chapter 2 The Scheme of the Environmental Statement (APP-039).  Where more regular maintenance is required, these strips of land and access points are formalised into constructed tracks. This is the case for drainage ponds and outfalls. The access tracks are also shown on the General Arrangement Plans (APP-009).
	b) Have these measures been included in the dDCO?	Yes. The features described above have been included within the overall Development Consent Order Boundary.
	c) If not, why not?	As a result of the response to question 1.8.9 b) above this question does not require a response.
	<b>Geology and soils</b>	
1.8.10.	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?	As described in Paragraph 4.2.3 of the Drainage Strategy Report (APP-060), both superficial and bedrock groundwater levels and will be monitored over 12 months (June 2018 to June 2019) to inform of seasonal fluctuations. Currently the drainage strategy considers that infiltration is not a viable discharge option considering groundwater levels and infiltration coefficients. Should the results of the ground investigation conclude that infiltration is a viable means of discharging surface water then updates to the drainage strategy could be undertaken, however this is considered unlikely.
	b) If so, in what way?	As a result of the response to question 1.8.10 a) above this question does not require a response.
1.8.11.	<b>Geology and soils</b>	

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	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?	Yes, the 250 metre buffer is considered to be appropriate given the geological and hydrogeological conditions, combined with the site history. The full justification is provided in detail within the bullet points of Paragraph 9.6.1 (APP-046).
	b) If not, what alternative distance should be used and what are the implications of this?	Not applicable.
	<b>Climate</b>	
1.8.12.	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?	The UK Climate Projections 2018 (UKCP18) projections are broadly consistent with UK Climate Projections 2009 (UKCP09) however, with the greater chance of hotter, drier summers and warmer, wetter winters. The impact on the scheme receptors assessed to UKCP09 are all not significant and this would remain when being assessed to UKCP18 due to only a small percentage change in temperatures and precipitation anticipated as well as the likelihood category and the consequence of impact ratings not increasing enough to push the receptor into the significant category. Aspects of the design such as storm water allowance have been designed allowing a 40% increase, which goes above the 20% required standard in DMRB Volume 4, Section 2, Part 3, HD 33/16 Surface and Sub-Surface Drainage Systems for Highways to cope with a more significant effect from climate change. (UKCP18 projects 3% wetter in summer rainfall change and 33% wetter for winter precipitation change for the high emissions scenario for the 2060-2079 period relative to 1981-2000.- <a href="https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/binaries/content/assets/mohippo/pdf/ukcp18/ukcp18-infographic-headline-findings-land.pdf">https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/binaries/content/assets/mohippo/pdf/ukcp18/ukcp18-infographic-headline-findings-land.pdf</a> )
1.9.	<b>Cumulative Effects</b>	
	<b>Baseline</b>	
1.9.1.	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?	As described in paragraph 14.4.7 of Chapter 14 Combined and Cumulative Effects (APP-051) the criteria is based on the screening criteria that is included in the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, which was selected as the majority of other developments that were considered as part of the assessment fall under the Town and Country Planning regime. Where a development is under 150 dwellings, development is not considered to be EIA development and therefore significant effects are not considered to arise.
	<b>Baseline</b>	
1.9.3.	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?	As described in paragraph 14.6.2 of Chapter 14 Combined and Cumulative Effects (APP-051), the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 2, Part 5, states that the study area for the assessment of cumulative effects should be defined on a case-by-case basis. This should reflect the scheme in question and the area over which significant effects can reasonably be considered to have the potential to occur from both the scheme and in combination with other developments. In this case, given the scope and scale of the proposed works, the study area used for the identification of other developments for the assessment of cumulative effects reflects a 2 kilometres Zone of Influence (ZOI) around the boundary of the scheme, based on professional judgement and to also align with the maximum ZOI identified for environmental resources included in the assessment of cumulative effects. This maximum extent is applied for biodiversity resources.
	<b>Baseline</b>	
	The ES Chapter 14 [APP-051] does not include the A303 Stonehenge and A358 Taunton to Southfields schemes in the assessment of cumulative effects?	Noted.
1.9.4.	a) What is the justification for this?	As shown in Table 14.6 of Chapter 14 Combined and Cumulative Effects (APP-051) both the A303 Stonehenge Scheme and the A588 Taunton to Southfields schemes were included as part of Long List; however, both of these schemes were scoped out as part of Stage 1 due to their distance from the proposed scheme, meaning that none of their Zones of Influence for any of the environmental disciplines overlapped.
	b) The Stonehenge Application has been accepted for examination. Should it therefore be assessed as a Tier 1 development?	Since the Stonehenge scheme has now been accepted for examination, it would qualify as a Tier 1 scheme. However, the A303 Stonehenge scheme falls outside of the study area (2 kilometres). In accordance with the methodology described in Section 14.4 of Chapter 14 Combined and Cumulative Effects of the ES (APP-051), the Stonehenge scheme has not been carried forward to Stage 2 of the cumulative effects assessment. The methodology is in accordance with guidance as set out in The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) (2015) Advice Note Seventeen: Cumulative Effects Assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects.
	<b>Baseline</b>	
1.9.6.	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?	An additional check of proposed developments has been undertaken and no new developments have been proposed that fit the criteria, after 12 April 2018. The Applicant therefore submits that it is not necessary or proportionate for further cumulative assessment to be undertaken. The Applicant notes that the Planning Inspectorate's (PINS) (2015) Advice Note Seventeen: Cumulative Effects Assessment provides that the assessment of other projects which is required is that "commensurate with the information available at the time of assessment".

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	b) Are the Councils content with the Applicant's approach to the potential need for further cumulative assessments?	Not applicable.
	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?	An additional check of proposed developments has been undertaken and no new developments have been proposed that fit the criteria, after 12 April 2018.
1.10	<b>Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-017, AS-007/AS-008]</b>	
	<b>Whole dDCO</b>	
1.10.1.	Annex A sets out a schedule setting out potential typographic and associated cartographic errors which the Applicant may wish to consider.	Annex A is included as part of this document (see Annex A) and has been completed as appropriate.
	<b>General matter</b>	
1.10.2.	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?	The Works Plans (APP-006) show the maximum extent of the footprint of each of the bunds, the centreline (coloured orange) and the Development Consent Order (DCO) boundary (coloured red).  The lengths and heights of the bunds are described in paragraphs 2.5.159 to 2.5.165 of Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement (APP-039). Widths will vary depending upon the local ground levels although an indication will be provided on the cross sections prepared in response to question 1.5.12.
1.10.2.	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?	A three-dimensional model has been prepared for the scheme. This has enabled a volumetric analysis to be undertaken. Gross volumes of embankment works (including bunds) and cuttings (including excavations for ponds) have been determined. Factors have been applied to account for 'bulking' of the excavated material and also for the possibility of some material being unacceptable. Bulking is the well-established principle that excavated material is highly unlikely to compact back down to its pre-excavation density. A bulking factor of 1.07 has been applied based on the engineering team's understanding of the in-situ material prior to intrusive ground investigation taking place in 2018. It has been assumed that 5% of all excavated material (approximately 35,000m <sup>3</sup> ) will be unacceptable either due to poor engineering properties or due to contamination.
	<b>Telecommunications duct</b>	
1.10.3.	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?	The Environmental Statement (ES) does not provide a description of the new telecommunications cable and sub duct within existing duct associated with works number 8. However, the telecommunications cable and sub duct within existing duct is included within the extents of the works shown on ES Figure 2.9 - Temporary Works Plans (APP-108) and the Environmental Masterplan (APP-107). Environmental receptors have been identified in relation to this design element since it is included within the Red Line Boundary. The new telecommunications cable and sub duct within existing duct is not directly referenced within any of the ES chapters because no direct or indirect effects are anticipated from this work.
	<b>Road Closures</b>	
1.10.4.	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?	Permanent road closures are specified in Parts 1 and 2 of Schedule 4 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) (APP-017).  For temporary road closures which are known to be required as part of construction, the detailed measures for traffic management will require to be set out in the traffic management plan to be submitted for approval under Requirement 11 following consultation with the local highway authority.  Both the known and any temporary further temporary road closures under Article 15 require the consent of the street authority (15(4)). Accordingly, the relevant local authority with street authority powers has the ability to approve, attach conditions to or refuse any application to temporarily restrict use of any street, including road closures.  No consent of the Local Planning Authority is required as such consent would not be required for any temporary restriction on the use of streets authorised under the highways legislation.
	<b>Detailed design approvals</b>	
1.10.5.	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?	The Applicant notes that this question is not addressed to it however it consider that it would be useful to reiterate the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) proposals as they have been communicated to the Councils.  The dDCO provides at Requirement 12 that the detailed design will be submitted to the Secretary of State for approval following consultation with the relevant planning authority and local highway authority. Under Requirement 4, details of that consultation, (including changes sought and whether they have been made,

Ref	Question:	Question Response
		and where changes have not been made why not), must be submitted along with the application for approval of the detailed design. The Secretary of State will therefore have the views of the Councils before him when making any decision on the detailed design.  There is no requirement or mechanism under the Planning Act for the Councils to be paid any fee for responding to consultation on DCO requirements.
	b) What safeguards are you seeking?	Not applicable.
	c) Has this matter been discussed with the Applicant?	This issue has been raised by the Councils in discussion with the Applicant. It is understood by the Applicant that the Councils would prefer the ability to refuse or approve the detailed design; however as they are not the discharging authority for the requirements this would create a double approval process requiring approval from the Councils and from the Secretary of State. There is no need for double approval and such a process would unnecessarily lengthen the time needed to discharge requirements. The detailed design will be for the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) approved by the Development Consent Order (DCO) and will be considered by the Secretary of State under the requirements. This reflects standard practice in Highways England DCOs.
	<b>De-trunking</b>	
1.10.6.	a) Has there been any progress on the arrangements with the local highway authority for those parts of the road to be de-trunked?	Somerset County Council have accepted in principle the proposal to de-trunk the elements of existing A303 carriageway identified in the De-Trunking Plans (APP-015) and for them to be incorporated into the local road network.  During subsequent discussions between the Applicant and Somerset County Council a timeline has been prepared which details the tasks required in order to identify the quantity and condition of assets within these de-trunked sections, and to agree the extent of work required in order to bring these assets up to an agreeable condition prior to handover.  This timeline has been issued to Somerset County Council for review prior to implementation.
	b) If so how is this to be secured?	A draft timeline of proposed works including advance surveys and agreements on condition at hand-over has been prepared during discussions between The Applicant and Somerset County Council.  Ultimately further design development work will be subject to Requirement 12 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO), which requires that the local highway authority are consulted on the design prior to approval by the Secretary of State. The dDCO provides at Article 14(2) that, as of a date to be specified, the classifications of roads set out in the dDCO would apply. The dDCO therefore provides that the roads to be detrunked will be reclassified as provided as if that classification had been applied under the Highways Act. At that date any highways which are no longer trunk roads will become highways maintainable by the local highway authority. No adoption or similar procedure by the Highways Authority is required.
	<b>Annis Hill Farm</b>	
1.10.7.	Does the dDCO make provision for replacement fencing and the relocation of water troughs at Annis Hill Farm?	The further works item (h) listed towards the end (Page 44) of Schedule 1 of the draft Development consent Order (dDCO) (APP-017) includes provision for the installation of new fencing.  The General Arrangement Plans (APP-009) indicate boundary fencing around the perimeter of the scheme.  Relocation of water troughs is not an operation for which planning consent is required and does not need to be specified within the DCO.
	<b>Introductory text</b>	
1.10.8.	The introductory text refers to a "single appointed person" when, of course, the ExA is a two-person panel. Could this please be amended?	This has been amended within the draft Development Consent Order (document reference 3.1, Volume 3, Revision C) and submitted as part of Deadline 2.
	<b>Article 2(1)</b>	
1.10.9.	a) Limits of deviation: Are the limits of deviation considered to be reasonable in all the circumstances?	The Applicant would highlight that there is very little ability for works other than the main A303 highway to move within the limits of deviation due to the configuration of works. Minor changes to works such as pond and bunds would be driven by the location of the linear carriageway and track works to ensure these remain properly located in relation to the highway. For example Pond 1 (work 8) lies between the main carriageway and track 1 and is therefore restricted in how much it could move given the areas needed for the works surrounding it. Bund 4 (work 56) is likewise very constrained as there is very little scope for it to move south due the route of track 6 or north as that is where the main carriageway will be situated.
	b) Watercourse - "except public sewer or drain". Is this terminology clear?	Not applicable.

Ref	Question:	Question Response
1.10.10.	<b>Article 3</b>	
	a) Disapplication of legislative provisions. Is the Environment Agency content with this? b) What is the latest position as to other consents and agreements that will be necessary?	Not applicable. The consents and agreements required as part of the scheme are outlined within the Consents and Agreements Position Statement (APP-019); following the submission of the Development Consent Order (DCO), Natural England have provided The Applicant with Letters of No Impediment for both the Badger Ghost Licence and the Great Crested Newt (GCN) Ghost Licence.
1.10.11.	<b>Article 13 (as a whole)</b>	
	Is SCC as local highway authority content with these provisions?	Noted. Please refer to Somerset County Council's response.
1.10.12.	<b>Article 13(6)</b>	
	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.	There are no proposed structures under non-trunk roads. The application does not contain any proposed badger tunnels under local roads. If there were, these would be relatively modest in size meaning that they would not constitute structures.
1.10.13.	<b>Article 14(2) &amp; (7), and Article 18(1), (2) &amp; (3)</b>	
	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?	The day to be determined or specified will be set out in a notice stating that it is the date determined under the relevant article of the Development Consent Order (DCO). Given the substance of the provisions concerned, such notices would be sent in advance of the specified date to interested parties. It is not possible to predict the date too far in advance as it this will be dependent on the completion of works on or to the roads concerned. Recent Highways England DCOs (including the M20 and Testos junction) have used the date on which roads are first opened to traffic as the determined date, however, as this scheme involves the re-classification of existing roads, that date would not apply in all cases and would not be appropriate. The draft DCO (dDCO) therefore follows the precedent of various other highways DCOs including the A14 (Article 16), and Silvertown Tunnel (Article 50) orders.
1.10.14.	<b>Article 18(3)</b>	
	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?	Schedule 3 Part 9 of the draft Development Consent Order (APP-017) is correct. It is proposed to restrict waiting time to 2 hours. Four corrected Traffic Regulatory Measures Plans have been re-issued as part of Deadline 2 (document reference 2.10, Volume 2.0). These drawings are HE551507-MMSJV-LSI-000-DR-UU-2102, HE551507-MMSJV-LSI-000-DR-UU-2103, HE551507-MMSJV-LSI-000-DR-UU-2104 and HE551507-MMSJV-LSI-000-DR-UU-2105 and the latest version is Revision C02. No other Traffic Regulatory Measures Plans have been updated.
1.10.15.	<b>Article 19(11)</b>	
	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)?	A non-response to consultation would be taken as raising no objection. Provided that the consultation requirement is complied with the dDCO does not require that a response is received to allow progression to the seeking of consent. The Applicant cannot compel the Chief Officer of Police to respond should they choose not to. The Applicant notes that Article 19 describes a 2-stage process in line with the process for the making of traffic regulation orders. The Applicant may not make an application for consent unless the notice period in subsection 5 has expired. A minimum of 28 days' notice of intention is therefore given before consent is sought under subsection 2, a further 28 days is then allowed for the traffic authority to consider and determine that application, including any amendments made in response to consultation.
1.10.16.	<b>Article 21</b> Given these protective works could be to a listed building, do any particular provisions needed to be included in such a scenario?	No protective works to listed buildings as described in Article 21, 11 (a) and (b) are anticipated either during construction or operation of the scheme.
1.10.17.	<b>Article 33(1)(d) and Article 33(4)(b) &amp; (c)</b>	
	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. 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?	Noted. This is the standard wording for this Article which allows permanent works such as ground stabilisation and retaining walls to be left in situ in land temporarily possessed.
	b) Are there any examples of these "permanent" works which form part of the mitigation requirements of the scheme?	Mitigation works being carried out on land which is temporarily possessed are either temporary in nature or will be secured through the agreement or acquisition of a necessary right.



Ref	Question:	Question Response
	<b>Article 43(1)</b>	
1.10.18.	a) How does this provision ensure that the final versions of these documents are those referred to?	The Applicant suggests that version numbers for these documents could be added into the final version of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) submitted to the examination to clarify this and will include that change in the relevant version.
	b) Is this the complete list of drawings and documents?	The Applicant considers this to be a complete list.
	<b>Article 47(12)</b>	
1.10.19.	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?	The Applicant has proposed an amendment to refer to the Secretary of State for Justice.
	<b>Schedule 1 – Works 10, 39, 40 and 99</b>	
1.10.20.	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?	The Applicant does not consider that the ecological mitigation areas represents a material change of use of land as the only meaningful changes to the land will be habitat improvement and a minor restriction on the activities which can be carried out to prevent disturbance during the period in which the species establish.  The creation of an access track to Blackwell Farm represents a minor change to part of an agricultural field to create an agricultural access for the benefit of the same agricultural holding. This accommodation work is considered to be ancillary to the existing primary use of the affected land.
	<b>Schedule 1 – Work 10</b>	
1.10.21.	a) No works are shown on the Works Plan [APP-006, AS-004] (the arrow goes to an area of “white” paper.	Work no 10 (shown on Sheet 1 of the Works Plans) is intended to take place within the entire extent of the red line boundary in the white area shown to the north of the proposed Pond 2. This is clarified in Note 5 of each of the revised Works Plans (AS-004).  Similar provision applies to Work Nos 39 and 40 (shown on sheet 2 of the Works Plans (AS-004)) and work No 99 (shown on sheet 4 of the Works Plans (AS-004)).
	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)?	This work has been moved to be Associated Development (AD).
	<b>Schedule 1 – Work 16</b>	
1.10.22.	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?	The applicant takes this to mean an access at the south-west of the property which coincides with right of way reference Y27/UN. This access is accommodated as part of access reference 12 as shown on Sheet 2 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans (APP-007) and described in Part 5 of Schedule 4 of the draft Development Consent Order (APP-017).
	<b>Schedule 1 – Work 69</b>	
1.10.23.	Is the Applicant satisfied that this work can be contained within the Order Lands?	Yes.
	<b>Schedule 1 – Work 75</b>	
1.10.24.	See comment on Schedule 1 Work 43 (perhaps should reference sheet 2 as well as sheet 3)	Work 75 is shown in its entirety on sheet 3. While part of this work is shown on sheet 2 it is beyond the cutline and not numbered on that sheet. The Applicant accordingly does not consider that adding sheet 2 to the description would assist any person trying to locate this work.
	<b>Schedule 1 – Works 100 and 101</b>	
1.10.25.	Is “retention of ... woodland” actually a “work”?	Works in this locality are described within the Arboricultural impact Assessment (AIA) (APP-071) which forms Appendix 7.3 of the Environmental Statement. The works required are to remove the sections of this woodland which are in direct conflict with proposed scheme, protect retained sections with temporary barrier in accordance with British Standard (BS) 5837.

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 3(2)(e) and (f)</b>	
	See potential typographic error as well.	
1.10.26.	a) Are all of these, particularly works associated with the diversion of existing utilities, necessary for “out of hours” working?	Yes.
	b) Could the reasoning be explained in each case?	The diversion of existing utilities, traffic management changes and tie ins with existing carriageways are all likely to require work on the live carriageway and therefore have the potential to disrupt traffic and place construction workers at greater risk of harm. In order to minimise this, it may be preferable or necessary to undertake these works at times of low traffic flows (that is, overnight or at weekends).  Deliveries of abnormally large or indivisible loads are likely to involve transportation on slow moving vehicles that may also occupy two lanes. Such deliveries have the potential to disrupt traffic on the road network and therefore it may be preferable or necessary to undertake them at times of low traffic flows. Large items that may need to be delivered to site include bridge beams, items of temporary works such as batching plant silos or construction plant such as excavators. Whilst it is considered unlikely that these items will be abnormally large on this scheme due to the relatively small scale of the works it is prudent to retain provision in the draft Development Consent Order in order not to constrain the contractor's method of working too much.
1.10.27.	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 3(4)</b> 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?	It is not anticipated that the wording of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) needs to be amended. The Handover Environmental Management Plan (HEMP) is to be prepared so that it is approved and available for use upon completion of the authorised development.
1.10.28.	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 3</b>  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.	The Applicant has written to the Environment Agency on a number of points including this. The Applicant has suggested that instead of being added to Requirement 3, the need for and scope of the Pollution Incident Control Plan are added to the Outline Environmental Management Plan which will be a certified document approved as part of any grant. Inclusion in this document would allow more detail and explanation to be provided than would be appropriate in the requirement whilst still giving the certainty that the plan is secured. In response to the comments on Requirement 3, the Applicant agrees that the Environment Agency should be consulted and has proposed a change to the dDCO as follows:  3.—(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been prepared in consultation with the Environment Agency, the relevant planning authority and the local highway authority and submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State.
	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.	In response to the comments on Requirement 3, the Applicant agrees that the Environment Agency should be consulted and has proposed a change to the dDCO as follows:  3.—(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been prepared in consultation with the Environment Agency, the relevant planning authority and the local highway authority and submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State.
	Can we please have the Applicant's response to these comments?	Please see the responses above.
1.10.29.	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 5(1)</b>  How is “landscaping” defined so as to ensure that planting, cuttings, and false cutting mitigation measures will all be secured?	The delivery of cuttings and false cuttings are engineering led construction tasks which will be part of the detailed design to be approved under Requirement 12 not Requirement 5. That detailed design must be compatible with the preliminary scheme design shown on the works plans and the engineering section drawings which include the cuttings and false cuttings.  Requirement 5(4) specifically requires the inclusion of details of planting as part of the landscaping scheme. The landscaping scheme must be based on the Environmental Statement which sets out the mitigation which is required to be delivered.
1.10.30.	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 5(2)</b>  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)?	The Applicant has proposed a change to the wording to align with the drafting used in Requirement 6 as follows:

Ref	Question:	Question Response
		...taking due regard to the guidance in British Standard 5837:2012 or other recognised codes of good practice.
	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 6(1)</b>	
1.10.31.	a) Is there a date by when the mitigation needs to be completed?	The Applicant cannot identify what mitigation is referred to in the question. Requirement 6(1) requires compliance with the approved landscaping scheme. The landscaping is an integral part of the project.
	b) Should this be included within the Requirement?	Please see the response to question 1.10.31a).
	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 6(3)</b>	
1.10.32.	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?	The landscaping and planting will be maintained by Highways England as part of its ongoing maintenance programme. Highways England as a Highway authority has a statutory duty to maintain highways in a safe condition, cuttings and false cuttings will be inspected, monitored and maintained as part of the built elements of the highway under that duty. Planting will be maintained under the regular maintenance programme which includes grass cutting, litter clearing and boundary feature maintenance. This regime will be in accordance with the Handover Environmental management Plan (HEMP), which is a requirement of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO). This document will identify the function of each planting plot within the landscape design and indicate the management and maintenance regime to be undertaken by the Highways England Area contractor.
	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 8</b>	
	The Environment Agency [RR-034] recommends the following with regard to contaminated land management:	
	1. Follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, when dealing with land affected by contamination.	Noted
	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.	Noted.
	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.	Noted.
1.10.33.	Could the Applicant set out its response to this recommendation?	<p>The Applicant has a number of Suitably Qualified Persons (SQPs) registered under the NQMS Scheme to directly check key aspects of reports, ensuring that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The work has been planned, undertaken and written up by competent people.</li> <li>• The underlying data has been collected in line with good practice.</li> <li>• The data has been processed, analysed and interpreted in line with good practice and any specific advice provided by the relevant regulatory authorities.</li> <li>• The report sets out recommendations and conclusions that are substantiated by the underlying data and are based upon reasonable interpretations.</li> <li>• Any limitations in the data or uncertainties in the analysis are clearly identified along with the possible consequences of such limitations.</li> <li>• All regulatory requirements are met (including environmental permitting).</li> <li>• Declaration form to be completed for each report and copy provided to the administrator (for each site).</li> <li>• Provide full support to third party audit of NQMS approved work.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant understands that the key aim is to ensure that all legislative requirements for the management of land contamination are met, specifically by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raising (and make more consistent) standards by ensuring that a satisfactory level of work is undertaken.</li> <li>• Providing greater confidence to regulators, developers and clients about the quality of submissions made under the planning system.</li> <li>• Ensuring quality of reports reviewed by competent individual to avoid the need for further scrutiny or auditing (ultimately reducing regulator delays &amp; inexperience risks and consequent cost implications).</li> </ul> <p>The need to involve an SQP in a scheme is considered on a case by case basis, subject to the above considerations and requirements agreed at the point of commission. The Applicant would be pleased to provide this level of quality assurance should the Examining Authority require this.</p>
	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 9</b>	
1.10.34.	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?	Requirement 9 has been amended. A revised draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) (document reference 3.1, Volume 3, Revision C) is submitted along with these responses
	b) What does “sub-written” mean?	‘Sub-written’ means sub-(written scheme of investigations) and could more clearly have been written as sub-

Ref	Question:	Question Response
		scheme. The amendments made to Requirement 9 have removed the term sub-written.
	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 9(6)</b>	
1.10.35.	Is “will” the right word? Should it be “in accordance with” or similar?	The Applicant considers that “in accordance with” would not make sense in context. The purpose of the requirement is to ensure that the long term storage of the archaeological archive is carried out in a manner acceptable to the County Archaeologist. In many cases such storage is carried out by the County Archaeologist. It is therefore necessary to agree what resource and requirements those are and what steps the Applicant has to take to assist with those. It is considered that is best undertaken and agreed once the contents of the archive and therefore the relative importance of these and the requirements for storage are known.
	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 10(2)</b>	
1.10.36.	Should a <i>cordon sanitaire</i> be created for protected species in the same way as for nesting birds?	For protected species other than nesting birds that are newly identified during construction (have not already been identified as part of the pre-construction surveys), it is not appropriate to create a <i>cordon sanitaire</i> in the same way as for nesting birds. In this situation, works in the vicinity would cease until a written scheme for the protection of such species is prepared and implemented and any necessary licences obtained.
	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 11(1)</b>	
1.10.37.	Should the consultation exercise also involve the relevant planning authority on the basis of the effect on local communities?	The traffic management plan brought forward under Requirement 11 must align with the draft considered as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) process. The planning impacts of the development will be considered as part of the consenting decision in the DCO process. The consideration of planning impacts due to traffic management should therefore be undertaken as part of the DCO determination and not in determining the details of the traffic management plan. The management of traffic is within the remit of the local highway authority and not the local planning authority.
	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 13</b>	
1.10.38.	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?	The Applicant would direct the Examining Authority and the Environment Agency to paragraph 23 of our proposed Protective Provisions which provides that all drainage works within the Order Land held by the Applicant have to be maintained by the Applicant to the reasonable satisfaction of the drainage authority. Accordingly the Applicant does not propose any amendment to Requirement 13 as this matter has already been addressed.
	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 13(3)</b>	
1.10.40.	a) Is there a date by when the mitigation needs to be completed?	The Applicant cannot identify what mitigation is referred to in the question. Requirement 13(3) requires compliance with the approved drainage details. Drainage provision is an integral part of the scheme which would not operate safely without it and drainage will be in place prior to the scheme opening.
	b) Should this be included within the Requirement?	As compliance with the approved drainage details are already secured the Applicant does not consider that any amendment is required.
	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 13(5)</b>	
1.10.41.	“... brought in by reference.” Can it be clarified to what reference is being made?	The Applicant has proposed a change to the Development Consent Order (DCO) so that this now reads: Highway drainage will be designed in accordance with HD 33/16 Design of Highway Drainage Systems and any subsequent design manuals amending or replacing that.
	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 14(3)</b>	
1.10.42.	a) Is there a date by when the mitigation needs to be completed?	Yes, the mitigation needs to be in place by the time of scheme opening.
	b) Should this be included within the Requirement?	The mitigation referred to in this requirement is noise mitigation which will be included within the detailed design and constructed as part of the scheme. Elements such as bunds, barriers and road surfacing are integral parts of the scheme. Accordingly this is already covered by the requirement to undertake the development in accordance with the detailed design,
	<b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 15(3)</b>	
1.10.43.	a) Is there a date by when the mitigation needs to be completed?	The Applicant cannot identify what mitigation is referred to in the question. Requirement 15(3) requires compliance with the approved lighting scheme; this is not provision of mitigation.
	b) Should this be included within the Requirement?	
	<b>Schedule 3 – Part 11, column (2)</b>	
1.10.44.	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?	Where a non-motorised user (NMU) facility is described as a ‘footway’ this is intended to distinguish this as a facility within the verge of a highway per the statutory definition of a footway set out in s329 of the Highways Act 1980. Under this definition a footway is part of the highway (along with the carriageway) and public rights of passage accordingly exist over it; however use of that part classed as footway is restricted to pedestrians. The description ‘footpath’ has been used to describe separate rights of way for pedestrians only. The terms used therefore reflect the statutory definitions and the Applicant has not proposed any amendments to these.

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	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?	The dedication of proposed rights of way as Restricted Byways was considered during preparation of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application. However, it was felt that the status of Restricted Byway might encourage inappropriate use by motorised vehicles, and so the status of Bridleway has been used instead.
1.10.45.	<b>Schedule 4 – Part 3, column (3)</b> Could this be clarified as this does not appear to make sense?	The Applicant has proposed a change to the DCO.
1.10.46.	<b>Schedule 5 – Plot reference 2/2e</b> If temporary possession only, what is there to ensure landscaping as mitigation is maintained appropriately in the longer term?	Possession of plot 2/2e is required temporarily during construction so that works can be carried out to create track 2 (work 11) and pond 7 (work 2). Following this boundary features such as fencing and hedgerows will be installed, maintenance of these and any other landscaping on this plot is secured by the acquisition of rights to construct and maintain a boundary fence, plant and maintain hedgerows and undertake and maintain landscaping, including planting" as set out schedule 5 of the dDCO.
1.10.47.	<b>Schedule 5 – Plot reference 3/1a and 3/1b</b> Is five years appropriate to ensure ecological mitigation?	Habitat management for Great Crested Newts (GCN), as stated within the licence application, is required until 2027. Monitoring is required for 3 years (2021 – 2023). Reptile monitoring of the receptor site is required for 5 years (2021 – 2025). In terms of habitat management, the responsibility for this will return to landowner in 2026 on the assumption that the Highways England verge has established and provides suitable habitat for reptiles to colonise.
1.11.	<b>Explanatory Memorandum [APP-018]</b>	
1.11.1.	<b>General</b> 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?	No. The Explanatory Memorandum is designed to explain what the Development Consent Order (DCO) itself does, not explain the underlying law.
1.11.2.	<b>Paragraph 2.10</b> This paragraph refers to associated development. Should Work 10 also be included in this list?	This work has been moved to be Associated Development (AD).
1.11.3.	<b>Paragraph 4.74</b> This refers to Article 46. Is this correct since Article 46 relates to Appeals under the Control of Pollution Act 1974?	The reference to Article 46 is an error and has been corrected. As noted in the title of this section the correct article is Article 19.
1.11.4.	<b>Paragraphs 4.124</b> 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?	The Applicant assumes that this question refers to paragraph 1.142 not 1.124. The power is correctly stated in Article 38. The cutting back of trees overhanging or roots within the order land could affect trees which are outside the order land in the immediate vicinity of the boundary and the Explanatory Memorandum attempted to explain that. The Explanatory Memorandum has been revised to be clearer and submitted as part of Deadline 2 (document reference 3.2, Volume 3, Revision B).
1.11.5.	<b>Paragraph 4.152</b> This deals with protective provisions. Could the Applicant please confirm whether those who would benefit from the protective provisions have agreed to their terms?	The local drainage boards have agreed the terms of the draft protective provisions. The statutory undertakers have been consulted and have not responded requesting any changes to the draft protective provisions. Agreement has not yet been reached with the Environment Agency and discussion is ongoing,
1.11.6.	<b>Paragraph 4.164</b> 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?	The Explanatory Memorandum has been updated and submitted as part of Deadline 2 (document reference 3.2, Volume 3, Revision B).
1.12	<b>Statement of Reasons [APP-021, AS-009/AS-010]</b>	
1.12.1.	<b>Paragraph 1.7.1</b> 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?	There is no special category land. The Statement of Reasons will be updated to reflect that there is no Special Category Land.
1.12.2.	<b>Paragraph 4.1.2</b> 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.	The following plots are owned by Highways England as Freehold registered title:  1/1a, 1/1b, 1/1c 2/3a, 2/3b, 2/3c, 2/3d 4/3a, 4/3b, 4/3c, 4/3d 4/3e, 4/3f, 4/3g, 4/3h 4/3i, 4/3j, 4/3k 5/2a, 5/2b, 5/2c, 5/2d 5/2e, 5/2f, 5/2g, 5/2h 6/2a 7/3a, 7/4a, 7/4b, 7/4c, 7/4d, 7/4e, 7/4f, 7/4g, 7/4h, 7/4i, 7/4j, 7/4k, 7/4l

Ref	Question:	Question Response
		<p>8/1a, 8/1b, 8/1c, 8/1d, 8/1e, 8/1f, 8/1g, 8/1h, 8/1i, 8/1k 9/2a, 9/2b, 9/2c, 9/2d</p> <p>8/1j Reputed freeholder. This parcel forms part of the road leading to Hazlegrove Roundabout but is not covered by registered title however the adjoining title is Highways England.</p> <p>There are currently ongoing negotiations between the district valuer and interests for the acquisition of land.</p> <p>To date there has been no completed acquisition of interest land by agreement and negotiations are currently ongoing.</p>
1.12.3.	<p><b>Paragraph 4.4.2</b></p> <p>a) How much, if any, land did the inquiries fail to identify any owner or occupier?</p> <p>b) If any, what areas does this relate to?</p>	<p>Even though there are large pieces of land that are unregistered with the Land Registry, enquiries with land owners identified ownership of parcels of land. This information was confirmed through Land Interest Questionnaires in November 2017, where various interests confirmed on plans the land that they owned.</p> <p>The areas of unknown ownership are located within the existing A303 highway. Part of the highway are covered by Highways England land titles and the other sections of unknown unregistered parts of the highway are classified as Highways England A303 trunk road. Minor and C roads are classed as adopted highway by Somerset County Council, however this does not clarify underlying ownership.</p> <p>Where there are unknown parcels of highway land the land owner either side of the road have been placed within the Book of Reference plots citing interests as having ownership of the subsoil of the road to the centreline of the road. This reflects the legal presumption of ownership to the centreline.</p> <p>The areas of unknown ownership are located within the existing A303 highway. Part of the highway is covered by Highways England land titles. Minor and C roads are classed as adopted highway by Somerset County Council, however this does not mean that they own the land.</p> <p>The following plots are cited as having an unknown ownership of the land:</p> <p>1/2c, 1/3f (Road land plot) 2/4a, 2/4b, 2/4c, 2/4d (Road land plot) 4/1a, 4/1b, 4/1c, 4/1d, 4/1e, 4/1f, 4/1g, 4/1h, 4/1i, 4/1j, 4/1k (Road land plot) 4/4a, 4/4b, 4/4c, 4/4d, 4/4e, 4/4f, 4/4g (Plested as reputed freeholder) 4/5a (James Andrew Lindsay-Clark as reputed freeholder) 4/8a, 4/8b, 4/8c, 4/8d, 4/8e (Ann Marsh as reputed freeholder) 5/3a, 5/3b, 5/3c, 5/3d, 5/3e, 5/3f, 5/3g, 5/3h, 5/3i, 5/3j, 5/3k (Road land plot) 5/4a, 5/4b, 5/8c, 5/4d (Ann Marsh as reputed freeholder) 5/8a, 5/8b (Dawn Monica Fowler as reputed freeholder) 5/10a (Peter Spence as reputed freeholder) 6/3a (Road land plot) 7/5a, 7/5b (Road land plot) 8/1j (Highways England as reputed freeholder).</p>
1.12.4.	<p><b>Paragraph 4.6.1</b></p> <p>a) Could this paragraph please be redrafted in plain English to allow for greater understanding?</p>	<p>This paragraph has been updated and the Book of Reference will be re-issued as part of Deadline 4 submission.</p>
1.12.5.	<p><b>Paragraph 4.8.3</b></p> <p>a) Identifiers 108 to 143 in Annex B are "Unknown" and 144 is "Unoccupied". How can negotiations be "ongoing"?</p> <p>b) Can we be advised of the latest position?</p>	<p>The Book of Reference will be updated to 'N/A' to reflect that negotiations are not ongoing in this case, and will be re-issued as part of the Deadline 4 submission.</p> <p>Where land acquisition is proposed, negotiations are underway. A schedule has been provided and will be submitted as part of the Applicant's submission for Deadline 3.</p>
1.12.6.	<p><b>Paragraph 5.3.2</b></p> <p>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. 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. 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. Could this paragraph be clarified?</p>	<p>There is no special category land. The Statement of Reasons has been updated to reflect that there is no Special Category Land and submitted as part of Deadline 4.</p>

Ref	Question:	Question Response
1.13.	<b>Book of Reference – paragraph 1.1.3</b>	
	It is stated that “The BoR lists ... together with any “rights” which may be created, interfered with, suspended or extinguished”. 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 it 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.”?	The Book of Reference (APP-022) will be updated and re-submitted as part of Deadline 4.
1.13.2	<b>Book of Reference – paragraph 2.1.4</b>	
	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?	The Book of Reference requires to show the Applicant’s interest as they qualify within the relevant part. To omit these would render the Book of Reference non-compliant with the regulations.
1.13.3.	<b>Book of Reference – Parts 1, 3 and 4 – All plots</b>	
	In the third column it is stated “rights of land”? Is this the correct terminology? Should it be “rights over land”?	Wording to be amended to cite 'rights in land'. Book of Reference will be amended to display this where necessary and submitted as part of the Deadline 4 submission.
1.13.4.	<b>Book of Reference – Part 1 – Plots 7/5a &amp; 7/6a</b>	
	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?	No. The Book of Reference requires to show these interests. To omit these would render the Book of Reference non-compliant with the regulations.
1.13.5.	<b>Book of Reference – Part 2 – All entries</b>	
	Is the phrase “In respect of freehold proprietor of” appropriate, since it doesn’t refer to land?	The section does refer to land and property therefore no amendments are required.
1.13.6.	<b>Book of Reference – Part 3</b>	
	Could the Applicant please confirm that all those in Part 1 are cited in Part 3?	This has been amended in the latest version of the Book of Reference submitted to the Examining Authority (AS-001), however not all of the interests in Part 1 need to be cited in Part 3, for example a mortgagee of a proprietor should not be cited within Part 3.  The plot numbers listed below are where amendments were made so that Part 1 interests are also cited in Part 3 and vice versa: 4/7a, 5/2d, 5/2e, 7/4a, 7/4c, 7/4j, 9/2a.
1.13.7.	<b>Book of Reference – Part 5</b>	
	Is the heading correct give that this relates to special parliamentary procedure, special category or replacement land rather than land with a Crown Interest?	The heading is incorrect and should read:  Land Which The Acquisition Is Subject To Special Parliamentary Procedure, Is Special Category Land Or Is Replacement Land. The Book of Reference will be updated and resubmitted in line with Deadline 4.
1.13.9.	<b>Lands Plan</b>	
	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”?	The key to the land plans is correct and no changes will be made.
1.13.10.	<b>Acquisition of Rights</b>	
	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?	a) Schedule 5 of the DCO set out the areas of land of which temporary possession may be taken and only new rights etc. may be permanently acquired, including specifying the rights which may be acquired in those plots. The precise depth of the highway works required will depend on the ground conditions at each location. The law of public highways states that the public highway status goes as deep as is necessary to ensure the protection and support of the highway (Tunbridge Wells Corporation v Baird (1896) AC 434 – also supported in the recent Supreme Court case of Southwark LBC v TfL [2018] UKSC 63, which described the “zone of ordinary use” as being the road surface, airspace and subsoil required for the operation, maintenance and repair of the highway), and includes such depth as may be used as a highway is used (Coverdale v Charlton (1878) 4 QBD 104). The depth of a highway is therefore fact and location specific, and dependent on amongst other factors the ground conditions (Schweder v Worthing Gas Light and Coke Company (no2) (1913) 1 Ch 118). There is no requirement in law to specify a depth.
	b) In some instances it would seem that the intention is to transfer the land to SCC?	b) No, the land itself is not transferred. It is not necessary for a highway authority to own all of the land under a highway and there are innumerable instances where the underlying ownership of land under public highways vests in others, most often the adjoining landowner. The rights to use and maintain the land as highway are sought to be able to be transferred to cover any period between opening the highway and it being entered onto the SCC list of highways maintainable at public expense. The specification of rights also ensures that the owner is entitled to the proper compensation by making it clear what level of interference is caused to

Ref	Question:	Question Response
	<p>c) What mechanism will be used for this purpose?</p> <p>d) Has this been agreed with SCC?</p> <p>e) Have the owners of the land agreed to its designation as public highway and the transfer to SCC?</p> <p>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?</p>	<p>their interest. It is not necessary to transfer any right in land once it is designated as public highway as the highway authority has all the rights they need to maintain and control it without requiring the underlying ownership to be interfered with. That means should these sections ever be stopped up for any reason the ownership still vests in the adjoining landowner and there are not isolated sections of ownership which would require to be offered back to the successor of the current owner.</p> <p>c) As set out in b the land itself is not being transferred so no mechanism is required.</p> <p>d) Discussion with SCC is ongoing.</p> <p>e) The land itself will not be transferred to SCC; the ownership of the underlying solum will not be changed. The interest of a highway authority in a public highway only covers part of the interest in that land, it does not transfer ownership. The power sought is included within the scope of compulsory acquisition in order to change the status of the surface layer should the owners not agree.</p> <p>f) Use of land which is only needed for construction is sought through temporary possession. Only where rights are needed permanently, or for longer than the taking of temporary possession is appropriate, are permanent rights being sought. The acquisition of rights is a lesser interference than acquisition of full ownership. The acquisition of rights has therefore been preferred where possible in accordance with the guidance that compulsory powers should seek to cause the minimum level of interference with others' rights. The acquisition of rights creates a right to compensation for the affected landowner.</p>
1.13.11.	<p><b>Acquisition of Rights</b></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>	<p>a) No response required.</p> <p>b) and c) It is not proposed to 'dedicate' the land as public highway – that is an unnecessary step. The DCO allows land to be designated as highway and the classification of that highway to be specified in the DCO. As with other areas of highway being created or re-classified the status of these areas as public highway is created directly by the DCO and a further step (such as dedication or adoption) is not required.</p> <p>d) The power sought is included within the scope of compulsory acquisition of rights at Schedule 5 of the DCO in order to change the status of the surface layer should the owners not agree. The Planning Act 2008 specifically allows for the acquisition of <u>any</u> interest (s159) as it is clear that the highway interest and the underlying ownership of the solum are different interests, there is no justification to acquire the underlying solum when all that is required is the necessary interest to permit the change in status.</p> <p>e) It is not necessary for a highway authority to own all of the land under a highway and there are innumerable instances where the underlying ownership of land under highways vests in others, most often the adjoining landowner. Interference is only required with interests in the surface layers of the land. The acquisition of rights is a lesser interference than acquisition of full ownership. The acquisition of rights only has therefore been preferred where it is possible in accordance with the guidance that compulsory powers should seek to cause the minimum level of interference which is necessary to deliver the scheme. The acquisition of rights creates a right to compensation for the affected landowner commensurate with the level of interference without acquiring all of their interest</p>
1.13.12	<p><b>Acquisition of Rights</b></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>	<p>The Book of Reference will be amended to reflect the rights sought. An updated Book of Reference will be submitted as part of the Deadline 4 submission.</p>



## Annex A

Ref: EXQ1 AxB	Item	Query	Response
<b>Draft Development Consent Order</b>			
1	Article 6	Does and agreement referred to in Article 4(1) represent an agreement under the Order?	Yes, an agreement made under Article 4 would be an agreement made under the Order and so would fall within the scope of Article 6.
2	Article 13(1)	Second line - after "local highway" insert "authority"..	The draft DCO has been updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 2.
3	Article 15(4)	Third Line - Is a comma ",", missing between "consent" and "but"?	The draft DCO has been updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 2.
4	Article 46(11)	Needs to refer to the Department for Housing, Communities and Local Government.	The requested change has been made to the dDCO under amendment. The Department for Communities and Local Government was replaced by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, not 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?	The draft DCO has been updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 2.
6	Schedule 1 - Work 89	These works are only shown on Sheet 4, reference to Sheet 3 is superfluous	The draft DCO has been updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 2.
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))?	The draft DCO has been updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 2.
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.	The draft DCO has been updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 2.
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"	The draft DCO has been updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 2.
10	Schedule 3 - Part 9, column (3)	See comment on Article 18(3) at ExQ 1.10.14	Schedule 3 Part 9 of the draft Development Consent Order [APP-017] is correct. It is proposed to restrict waiting time to 2 hours. Four corrected Traffic Regulatory Measures Plans have been re-issued as part of Deadline 2 (document reference 2.10, Volume 2.0). These drawings are HE551507-MMSJV-LSI-000-DR-UU-2102, HE551507-MMSJV-LSI-000-DR-UU-2103, HE551507-MMSJV-LSI-000-DR-UU-2104 and HE551507-MMSJV-LSI-000-DR-UU-2105 and the latest version is Revision C02. No other Traffic Regulatory Measures Plans have been updated.
11	Schedule 3 - Part 11	Is there a reason the "of" is capitalised in the title row?	No, this is an error. A change has been made to the dDCO to address this point.
12	Schedule 5, Plot references 4/1f and 4/2a	Are the colourations on the plans correct?	The Applicant can confirm that the colourations on the plans are correct. No amendments have been made.
13	Schedule 5, Plot reference 5/3j	The third and fourth sentences appear to be the same.	The third sentence concerns electricity cables, the fourth telecommunications cables. Both services are required in the plot but the rights will accrue to separate undertakers so have been listed separately.
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)).	The reference 5A(5A) is correct. The amendment is to subsection 5A of section 5A of the Act. A change has been made to sub-paragraph 2 of paragraph 2 of schedule 6 to show the numbering correctly.
<b>Explanatory Memorandum</b>			
15	4.120 & 4.121	The last sentence of paragraph 4.120 is the same as paragraph 4.121.	The Explanatory Memorandum has been updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 2 (document reference 3.2, Volume 3, Revision B).
16	4.132	This paragraph refers to Article 35 when it should refer to Article 36.	The Explanatory Memorandum has been updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 2 (document reference 3.2, Volume 3, Revision B).
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.	The Explanatory Memorandum has been updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 2 (document reference 3.2, Volume 3, Revision B).
<b>Statement of Reasons</b>			
18	1.6.1	The Convention is "The European Convention on Human Rights" rather than "for".	The Statement of Reasons will be updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 4.
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?	The Statement of Reasons will be updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 4.
20	4.6.3	Does the "Scheme" mean the "Scheme area"?	The Statement of Reasons will be updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 4.
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	The Statement of Reasons will be updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 4.

Ref: EXQ1 AxB	Item	Query	Response
		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?	The Statement of Reasons will be updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 4.
23	6.1.3	Could the quote please be laid out correctly?	The Statement of Reasons will be updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 4.
24	6.2.1	Refers to Article 1. Is this Article 1 of the First Protocol?	The Statement of Reasons will be updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 4.
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?	The Statement of Reasons will be updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 4.
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 would be. Could these paragraphs please be redrafted to clarify this?	The Statement of Reasons will be updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 4.
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?	The Statement of Reasons will be updated accordingly and submitted as part of Deadline 4.