

A47 Wansford to Sutton Dualling

Scheme Number: TR010039

Volume 5

5.2 Annex O: Table Evidencing Regard had to Targeted Consultation Responses

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

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

July 2021

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

A47 Wansford to Sutton
Development Consent Order 202[x]

**5.2 CONSULTATION REPORT ANNEX O
TABLE EVIDENCING REGARD HAD TO TARGETED CONSULTATION
RESPONSES (IN ACCORDANCE WITH S49 OF THE PLANNING ACT
2008)**

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010039
Application Document Reference	TR010039/APP/5.2
Author:	A47 Wansford to Sutton Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	July 2021	Application Issue

CONTENTS

1	OVERVIEW.....	1
2	TABLES EVIDENCING REGARD HAD TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES.....	2
2.1	Targeted statutory consultation under section 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008, October and November 2020, and Project Update October 2020.....	2
2.2	Targeted statutory consultation under section 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008, May and June 2021	45

1 OVERVIEW

- 1.1.1 The tables provided below evidence the regard had to responses received to the Applicant's statutory consultation held between 19 October 2020 to 19 November 2020 in accordance with section 49 of Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008). Additionally, the tables respond to responses provided as part of a wider engagement with the local community undertaken at the same time.
- 1.1.2 The tables also provide evidence of the regard had to responses received to the Applicant's statutory consultation held between 10 May 2021 and 9 June 2021 in accordance with section 49 of PA 2008.
- 1.1.3 Each table summarises responses received, sets out whether a change has been made in response to it, and details the Applicant's response, including the regard had to the consultation response. Where multiple responses containing the same comment have been received, these are addressed at the same time in tables below.

2 TABLES EVIDENCING REGARD HAD TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES

2.1 Targeted statutory consultation under section 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008, October and November 2020, and Project Update October 2020

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Consultation – further engagement	Request that a meeting is set up so that residents of Upton can address all of their concerns of your updated plans and so you can allow for their voices to be heard and not ignored.	Upton Community Council	N	Meetings have subsequently been held with the Upton representatives, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23/07/20 • 02/02/21 • 19/05/21
Consultation - materials	Wansford Village Road Classifications now wrong <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old North Road/Bridge End was de-classified from an A road some time ago. The A6118 neither exists as shown in your cover photograph nor as shown on your detailed plans. 	2020009	N	This comment is noted.
Consultation - materials	Putting a photograph on the front cover which showed the incorrect designation for the ex A6118, now the C340, did not help the credibility of the document.	2020035	N	This comment is noted. Highways England will bear this in mind for future consultations for other Schemes.
Consultation - materials	It is considered that protective provisions specifically for the benefit of Anglian Water should be included as part of the wording of the Draft DCO.	Anglian Water	N	Protective provisions for the benefit of Anglian Water are included in the draft DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1).
Design – access	The improvements that your proposing to the drift Rd. are not adequate as the road isn't wide enough to carry HGVs or farm vehicles, and the junction with Church Walk is too sharp of a turn for HGVs and verges always get damaged!	Upton Community Council	Y	Since the 2020 consultation and engagement further work has been undertaken including swept path analysis. The design has been developed with further works now included in the Scheme, including

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	Access into Upton must remain open as it is an essential route used by everyone in the village of Upton. If that road closes, you are effectively cutting us off from our neighbouring villages.			<p>amending the geometry of the Upton Drift and increasing the size of the passing places to make them capable of accommodating large vehicles. These works have been discussed with Peterborough City Council and the emergency services.</p> <p>Transport Modelling analysis shows that the closure of Upton Road without the Scheme diverts traffic on to Upton Drift. However, the overall level of traffic between Upton Drift and Upton Road remains approximately the same with and without the Scheme. The relatively small increase in peak hour traffic (approximately 30 to 100 passenger car units) on Upton Drift has no adverse impacts on the operation of the Upton Drift/ Langley Bush Road junction. See the Transport Assessment (TR010039/APP/7.3).</p>
Design – access	<p>Ambulance response times are already an average of 10 minutes, which with some medical emergencies ambulances would need to reach someone in less than half of that, and by closing off our access, your adding to the journey time of all the emergency services, potentially killing someone.</p> <p>If you can pay for an underpass to be installed for access to just 1 business (Sacrewell Farm), why is it not feasible to</p>	2020006	N	<p>Upton Drift will be improved as part of the Scheme and these works have been discussed with the emergency services. No concerns were raised.</p> <p>The existing access to Sacrewell Farm is to be closed for safety reasons and a new safe access provided. The only way to provide a safe access to Sacrewell Farm is to via a new underpass beneath the new A47.</p> <p>Traffic counts were carried were undertaken in</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>install one for 7 businesses and 25 homes, so our road can remain open.</p> <p>You need to seriously rethink your plans regarding our access as if this goes ahead people will not be happy.</p> <p>There hasn't even been a traffic survey or vehicle count to see how many vehicles do use this road, so that you'll see what an essential method of access your closing off.</p>			2019 in order to validate the traffic modelling.
Design – access	<p>I would also venture that the exit from the A1 at the point is also unsatisfactory. The slip road is incredibly short and when traffic volumes are high it's necessary to be very aware when using it. The detritus from the A1 gathers in the middle of the junction and motorists that have misjudged how quickly they need to decelerate often end up on the marbles and sliding. A couple have ended up running into the grass bank opposite.</p> <p>I would ask, is this junction actually needed at all? many drivers only come off there in the mistaken belief that it is the A47 junction which is just a few yards further North. We have a perfectly good exit onto London Road Wansford for the South of the village and the A47/A6118. Old North Road for the North.</p> <p>As an additional observation, traffic leaving</p>	2020045	N	<p>The Scheme will generate road safety benefits from the new A1 eastbound off-bound slip, which reduces the interactions between the A47 and the A1 at the eastern roundabout. In total, traffic modelling indicates that, over a 60-year timeframe the Scheme improvements will save a total of over 250 accidents. (TR010039/APP/7.3).</p> <p>No changes to the access to the A47 from the A1 northbound are proposed as part of the Scheme.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	the A1 North is coming from 70 MPH dual carriageway into a 20 MPH zone. Similarly to joining the A1 North traffic dithering when leaving at this junction causes other vehicles to brake hard and take avoiding action.			
Design – access	<p>We note that Side Road Strategy is largely unchanged from that which was proposed in 2018 design. Reference is made to access for both Sacrewell Farm and BP Filling Station but not Wansford Pumping Station in Anglian Water's ownership (as shown on the attached plan).</p> <p>This operational site is managed by Anglian Water on behalf of our customers to provide water services and is accessed on a continuous basis for operational and maintenance purposes. We would welcome confirmation of how access to this site will be maintained both during and after construction.</p> <p>Similarly, the revised design refers to a bridleway route which crosses the existing access to Wansford Pumping Station. As such it is essential that the issue of bridleway user safety is considered as part of the design of the route given that there will be regular traffic movements entering and leaving the site.</p>	Anglian Water	N	<p>Discussions are ongoing with Anglian Water.</p> <p>The site access to the Anglian Water pumping station from the highway will be realigned slightly as part of the proposals but this will be constructed in a manner that ensures access is maintained to the site throughout. The intention is that the gated site entrance will remain in the same location.</p> <p>Highways England have confirmed with Anglian Water that 24 hour access to the site will be taken into consideration when developing the construction programme.</p> <p>User safety is considered throughout the design process visibility splays at the realigned access will meet the appropriate standards to ensure adequate visibility for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders crossing the access point.</p>
Design – access	Wansford Pumping Station is located to the south of the existing A47 and it appears that	Anglian Water	N	Land with Anglian Water's ownership has been included within the DCO boundary to facilitate

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	part of this operational site is shown as forming part of the site boundary in the scheme plan provided. It is unclear from the boundary plan why it is considered necessary to take permanent or temporary possession of part of this operational land or whether existing access arrangements would be affected. We would request confirmation about what is intended in relation to land in our ownership so that we can offer comment about whether the principle is acceptable.			<p>the diversion of Anglian Waters assets, required for the construction of the A47 mainline.</p> <p>Highways England and Galliford Try have been in discussions with Anglian Water to develop the areas for the diversions included within the DCO boundary.</p>
Design – access	<p>None of your maps show a turning point on the new access road for my property. This needs to be shown so that the dust men and oil deliveries can continue to be made safely at my address.</p> <p>I understand there should be a kilometre between one slip road ending and another starting. There is no mention of this requirement being met with regards to the new access suggested for my property.</p> <p>Please ensure you have the correct postcode.</p>	2020015	N	<p>A turning head is provided to allow vehicles that to turn back and avoid any disruption to the properties.</p> <p>A new access to the properties on Great North Road is proposed through the existing junction with the A1 southbound. The existing direct access from the properties to the A1 southbound will be closed for safety reasons. The standard mentions 1km between full grade separated junctions, which is not this case here. The proposal is an improvement to the existing situation as it eliminates direct access from the properties to the A1 southbound, which is very close to the existing junction and is not considered safe.</p> <p>This feedback has been recorded and Highways England have updated their records to correctly show the correct postcode</p>
Design –	Please don't close the access to Upton from	2020026	N	The access to Upton Road from the A47 will

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
access	the A47, it's an important road used by a lot of people from farmers to access for seasonal events, it will have multiple problems once complete if an underpass or flyover is not installed to maintain access levels.			<p>be closed to traffic as part of the Scheme due to safety reasons.</p> <p>The Upton Drift will remain open, will be improved and will continue to provide access to Upton.</p> <p>Access to the A47 from Upton will be via Upton Drift, Langley Bush Road and the new link road which connects with the Sutton Heath roundabout.</p> <p>Since the 2020 statutory consultation and engagement the design has been developed with further works now included in the Scheme, including amending the geometry of the Upton Drift and increasing the size of the passing places to make them capable of accommodating large vehicles.</p>
Design – access	<p>There are rarely more than two vehicles waiting to join the A47 from the northbound A1 sliproad so to have a second lane makes no sense at all, either logistically or costwise. Vehicles rarely have to wait more than a few seconds to pullout onto the A47 as there is a constant flow of vehicles turning right onto the slip road to join the A1 northbound, this holding up the traffic eastbound on the A47.</p> <p>A limited number of vehicles use the dangerous Peterborough Road exit from the village onto the A1 northbound, which HE is</p>	2020039	N	<p>The Scheme no longer includes works to the northbound A1 slip road.</p> <p>Access from Peterborough Road to the A1 will remain open. This is not part of the Scheme.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	potentially planning to close, although considerably more use it to enter the village, so there would only be a marginal increase in traffic coming off the A1 northbound a few hundred metres further north onto the roundabout which the existing slip road could easily cope with.			
Design – access	<p>1. Please confirm, in metres, how close the proposal will bring the new dual-carriageway to (<i>name redacted</i>) boundary at its closest point.</p> <p>2. Please confirm, in metres, how close the works on the proposed new dual-carriageway will come to (<i>name redacted</i>) boundary at their closest point.</p> <p>3. What measures are proposed to reduce-noise and sight of the proposed new dual-carriageway, specifically in the proximity of the current junction between Sutton Heath Road and the A47?</p> <p>4. Please confirm whether any new lay-bys are proposed in the proposals, and if so where.</p> <p>The following questions pertain to the proposed closed-off section of Sutton Heath Road leading to (<i>name redacted</i>):</p> <p>5. We are concerned about the things that</p>	2020028	N	<p>Access to (<i>name redacted</i>) will be maintained throughout.</p> <p>Highways England responded by email addressing these points:</p> <p>1. The new dual carriageway earthworks will be 103m from (<i>name redacted</i>) at its closest point.</p> <p>2. The works on the new dual carriageway will be 97m from (<i>name redacted</i>) at the closest point and this will be when the earthworks are being carried out. The earthworks for the new cycle path will begin approximately 40m from (<i>name redacted</i>).</p> <p>3. The assessment of operational noise found that with embedded mitigation comprising a low-noise surface no significant operational noise effects, adverse or beneficial, are predicted at any noise sensitive receptor (including dwellings) within the operational Study Area. However, there will be an acoustic</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>can blight a closed off road e.g. overnight travellers, fly-tipping and dogging. Can you explain please how it is proposed that access will be closed to vehicles, leaving access for residents/visitors/services to (name redacted)?</p> <p>6. Please can you confirm whether the proposed closing-off of the road will have any effect on the provision of services to (name redacted), including Peterborough City Council's refuse collection, and postal services.</p> <p>The answers to the above questions will help us determine the extent to which the current proposals will cause a reduction in the value of (name redacted), both during the works and thereafter, and we will take further advice accordingly. NB (name redacted) is rented to tenants and so we also take into account any increased difficulty in renting the property due to the proposals.</p>			<p>fence located at the A47 eastbound carriageway adjacent to (name redacted). (Post email note: <i>The potential impacts, design, mitigation and enhancement measures are set out in 11.8 and 11.9 of Environmental Statement Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (TR010039/APP/6.1).</i></p> <p><i>The potential landscape and the visual effects of the Scheme have been assessed and proposed mitigation is set out detailed in Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.1) and Environmental Masterplan (TR010039/APP/6.8)).</i></p> <p>4. There is currently no provision for new lay-bys in the scheme. There will be hard-standing to access the ponds for maintenance, however this will not be located in the vicinity of (name redacted).</p> <p>5. Highways England are considering mitigations regarding this concern. Signage will be considered in the detailed design stage. Discussions have been ongoing with the property owner since the consultation.</p> <p>6.. The proposals will have no effect the provision of services.</p>
Design – access	Upton Drift is too narrow for two way traffic and the closure of Nene Way roundabout will	2020023	Y	Improvements will be made to Upton Drift and new passing places and limited widening are

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	mean that as well as domestic traffic, there will be a conflict with the very large farm machinery and plant using the single access. The potential for a conflict between farm traffic, domestic traffic, future bus traffic and emergency vehicles on this road does not seem to have been considered.			included as part of the Scheme. Since the 2020 statutory consultation and engagement the design has been developed with further works now included in the Scheme, including amending the geometry of the Upton Drift and increasing the size of the passing places to make them capable of accommodating large vehicles. These works have been discussed with Peterborough City Council and the emergency services.
Design – access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any shared access used by (<i>name redacted</i>) to farm the remainder of his land and machinery used within the DCO must be made good on completion. During the construction period, no access shall be impeded to the remainder of the farmland. 	2020042	N	Any temporary land or existing farm accesses used for the construction of the Scheme will be returned to their former state (or better) following completion of the works. Access to the remainder of the farmland will be maintained during the construction period.
Design – access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any shared access used by (<i>name redacted</i>) and their tenant, (<i>name redacted</i>), to farm the remainder of their land and machinery used within the DCO must be made good on completion. During construction it is vital that HE retained excellent signage and unencumbered access to (<i>name redacted</i>). (<i>name redacted</i>) is an attraction that is open to the public. It is also a charity. Failure to maintain good access at all times will threaten its existence. (<i>name redacted</i>) 	2020043	N	Any temporary land or existing farm accesses used for the construction of the Scheme will be returned to their former state (or better) following completion of the works. Access to the remainder of the farmland will be maintained during the construction period. Highways England and Galliford Try will continue to liaise with those affected and keep them updated as to the construction programme. Appropriate signage to the venue will be provided during the construction phase. During construction any adverse effects will be

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>require early consultation on access and signage, and the undertaking of major works, so that (<i>name redacted</i>) and HE can work together to minimise the impact. 18 months prior notification of the proposed programme of works is necessary to ensure events staged at (<i>name redacted</i>) can be managed alongside the HE works to the A47.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the construction period, no access shall be impeded to the remainder of the farmland. 			mitigated, and access will be maintained at all times.
Design – alternative	Your "improvements" to the Western Wansford Roundabout take no account of the problems of traffic flow which can only be resolved by removing the roundabout and installing intelligent traffic lights.	2020032	N	The Wansford western roundabout is not within the scope of the Scheme. The pre-existing issue at the Wansford western roundabout will be raised with the Highways England Operations team for consideration as a future improvement project during the identification and prioritisation process for future roads periods.
Design – alternative	Choke points on the existing A47 Wansford West Roundabout which are poorly designed – traffic at heavy periods builds up badly at these points and Eastbound traffic in morning periods regularly cut through Wansford to avoid this roundabout delay. There is plenty of wasted space around the two indicated roundabout approaches which could quite easily be utilised to provide extra lanes: Eastbound approach – a separated direct left hand slip road lane for access to A1	2020001	N	<p>The Wansford western roundabout is not within the scope of the Scheme.</p> <p>The traffic modelling assessment has identified ongoing issues with the operational performance of the Wansford western roundabout. In summary the modelling shows that delays are expected at the Wansford western roundabout both with and without the Scheme.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>Northbound slip road; a straight ahead lane for Eastbound A47 traffic; and a straight ahead & right lane for Eastbound A47 and Wansford village access.</p> <p>Westbound approach – a right hand lane for A1 Northbound access; a straight ahead lane for Westbound A47 traffic; and a straight ahead and left lane for Westbound A47 and Wansford village access – the two straight ahead lanes merging West of the roundabout to filter traffic into existing narrower road.</p> <p>The above simple alterations are not mentioned in your proposals and as a Wansford resident and local business operators it is very frustrating that simple alterations go unseen, where such alterations could significantly improve traffic flow, reduce unnecessary through-village traffic and complement your excellent proposed scheme.</p>			<p>However, the transport modelling journey time results along the A47 between the Wansford western roundabout and Ailsworth show a travel time saving of approximately 1.5 minutes in 2025 and 2 minutes in 2040 for the eastbound direction during the AM peak, when compared without the Scheme. Transport Assessment (TR010039/APP/7.3).</p> <p>The provision of two-lane exit at the Wansford western roundabout will improve the operation of the A47 eastbound traffic.</p> <p>The pre-existing issue at the Wansford western roundabout will be raised with the Highways England Operations team for consideration as a future improvement project during the identification and prioritisation process for future roads periods.</p>
Design – alternative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As long term residents of Wansford we do not recognize the significant issues you suggest exist with traffic exiting from Peterborough Road to the A1 North, to then immediately exit the A1 to join the A47. Peterborough Road provides clear visibility of A1 traffic coming from the south, and provides a much safe entry point for Wansford traffic wishing to go North on the A1. The Northbound slip from the A47 West roundabout is an extremely dangerous way of joining the A1 North, and much more 	2020009	N	<p>Access from the Peterborough Road to the A1 will remain as existing and is not part of the Scheme.</p> <p>With regards to the signage on the A1 north road, this comment has been passed on to the Highways England operations team.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>hazardous than using Peterborough Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peterborough Road provides a very useful exit from the A1 North carriageway into Wansford avoiding the historic single carriageway Wansford Bridge. Currently both Peterborough Road and the A47 Exit are ignored as a preferred entry points to Wansford Village by Satnavs. • A substantial issue not addressed at all in your proposal and which is linked to your alleged Peterborough Road traffic analysis, is that as things stand, all satnavs encourage A1 North traffic wishing to enter Wansford to do so by leaving the A1 at London Road (see below as road is supposed to have been re-classified I understand to a C class road), taking a right into Elton Road and crossing the single carriageway bridge. You should revisit your traffic flow proposals as any problem on the Northbound A1 carriageway means instant log jam on the single carriageway bridge, and especially Bridge End/Old North Road and Old Leicester Road. Your A1 North road signing is also incorrect as that too suggests traffic wishing to enter Wansford should do so by leaving at this junction too. 			
Design – alternative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your proposals make no reference to village rat running despite much feedback to your team. The rat running was exacerbated by 	2020009	N	Traffic modelling analysis shows that, in terms of daily traffic there is a slight decrease in traffic through the Wansford village in the

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>the last set of changes to the A47 East and West roundabout interactions, and the provision of traffic lights. Your latest proposal does nothing to address the eastbound A47 traffic which turns right into Old Leicester Road, speeds through the village and then re-joins the A47 West Roundabout via Old North Road. As pointed out clearly to your team, if it were not for the traffic lights on the East roundabout causing a temporary break in the westbound traffic flow, Wansford will become even more log-jammed with rat-running traffic present in the Old North Road because it is unable to enter the traffic flow at the East Roundabout.</p>			<p>future year scenarios when compared to the existing situation.</p> <p>Overall a large proportion of the traffic growth will come from the wider area rather than Wansford village, this will create an increase in traffic on the strategic A1 and A47 roads and therefore reduce the available capacity for through traffic side road movements at intersecting junctions.</p> <p>Since the introduction of the 20mph speed limit zone the analysis of the observed traffic data shows that there is a slight reduction in traffic during the peak hours although the Inter Peak (13:00 to 14:00) remains the same.</p> <p>The combination of these factors reduces the attractiveness of Old North Road, as well as other roads in Wansford village, for daily through traffic movements.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the scheme will not cause an overall increase in daily rat-running through Wansford village compared with the existing situation, although there will be an increase in through traffic during the AM peak hour. See the Transport Assessment (TR010039/APP/7.3).</p>
Design – alternative	My real objection is the lack of improvement to the Wansford western A1 roundabout junction and design which seems	2020027	N	The Wansford western roundabout is not within the scope of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	unworkable, and The Northern section of the Old North Road , will not have safe access. The Slip road onto the A1 going north needs redesigning by taking some of the embankment to the west of the slip road to reduce the curve onto the A1.			<p>The slip road from the A1 northbound will remain as existing and is no longer part of the Scheme. Access from the Old North Road will therefore remain the same.</p> <p>The transport modelling journey time results along the A47 between the Wansford western roundabout and Ailsworth show a travel time saving of approximately 1.5 minutes in 2025 and 2 minutes in 2040 for the eastbound direction during the AM peak, when compared to without the Scheme. Transport Assessment (TR010039/APP/7.3).</p> <p>With respect to road safety in total, modelling analysis indicates that, over a 60-year timeframe the Scheme improvements will save a total of over 250 accidents.</p> <p>However, the traffic modelling assessment has identified ongoing issues with the operational performance of the Wansford western roundabout. In summary the modelling shows that delays are expected at the Wansford west roundabout both with and without the Scheme.</p> <p>The pre-existing issue at the Wansford western roundabout will be raised with the Highways England Operations team for consideration as a future improvement project during the identification and prioritisation process for future roads periods.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Design – alternative	<p>You have not taken the opportunity to alter the turn off into Thornhaugh from the A1 as per the attached, although you have improved the access to the A1 for the houses opposite the Thornhaugh junction.</p> <p>This junction must be the most dangerous anywhere on the length of the A1 and by not including this in your plans means you have missed an opportunity to improve the safety of this junction.</p>	2020025	N	The turn off into Thornhaugh from the A1 is beyond the scope of the Scheme.
Design – alternative	<p>Why on earth are you not considering replacing this bottleneck with a traffic light junction, the extra lane you are proposing for the A1 north slip will do nothing to alleviate the log jam of traffic travelling west and a near impossibility to exit from the village at times.</p>	2020033	N	<p>The slip road from the A1 northbound will remain as existing and is no longer part of the Scheme. Access from the Old North Road will therefore remain the same.</p> <p>Junction signalisation modelling analysis has been undertaken. It was concluded that a signalised junction option was not an appropriate solution to resolve the traffic congestion issues at the Wansford western roundabout and would further cause an overall decrease in network performance.</p>
Design - alternative	<p>“The existing single carriageway for westbound traffic across the A1 bridge at Wansford will be kept the same”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At peak times this very wide single carriageway causes aggressive driving behaviour by drivers wishing to turn right at the roundabout ahead & causes unnecessary queues/reduces 	2020049	N	Works to the A1 are beyond the scope of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	flow of traffic at this point. The road narrows just prior to the r-a-b- then opens up into 2 lanes. If there were 2 <u>directional</u> , straight/left & right, lanes over the bridge this would be avoided.			
Design – boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boundaries must be effectively reinstated between the temporary and permanent land take once completed. It is desirable to erect permanent fencing wherever possible early in the scheme. 	2020042	N	<p>Any temporary land used for the construction of the Scheme will be returned to its former state (or better) following completion.</p> <p>Permanent fencing will be erected as soon as possible once construction of the Scheme commences; however it is dependent on the actual works in a particular location. For example, permanent fencing will be dependent on earthworks being completed.</p>
Design – boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boundaries must be effectively reinstated between the temporary and permanent land take once completed. It is desirable to erect permanent fencing wherever possible early in the scheme. If HE insist on temporary fencing being used then a programme of annual maintenance is required. Too many incidents of temporary fencing wire causing damage to machinery on the A14 have been seen. This results in cost of repairs but also reduced productivity due to downtime for machinery resulting in yield loss. 	2020043	N	<p>Any temporary land used for the construction of the Scheme will be returned to its former state (or better) following completion of the works.</p> <p>Permanent fencing will be erected as soon as possible once construction of the Scheme commences; however it is dependent on the actual works in a particular location. For example, permanent fencing will be dependent on earthworks being completed.</p> <p>All temporary fencing will be maintained to ensure it is in good condition and will be removed as soon as possible when it is no longer required.</p>
Design –	This solution also fails to address wither the	2020023	N	Works to the A1 is beyond the scope of the

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
future proofing	<p>immediate problem of northbound traffic or the potential for the entire junction to become redundant with the government announcement of a review of the A1 (although there is no budget or timetable). The real answer is to improve the A1 between Peterborough and Stamford as was planned in 1994 in which the northbound carriageway would become the local service road and a new bridge would be built to the east. Having the local service road would also solve the problem of the extremely dangerous access to Wittering.</p> <p>If the Government review of the A1 brings forward the 1994 scheme or a variant of it, then all the current proposals for the western junction become redundant and we will be tied into a disfunctional system for decades. The current design layout needs to be "future-proofed" and adapted in such a way as to allow future modification and enable A1 proposals to be brought forward.</p>			<p>Scheme.</p> <p>With regards to future proofing, the Scheme has been designed to the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards, using the Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) data provided by the Department for Transport which forecasts traffic movements up to the year 2040.</p>
Design – land take	<p>Permanent Land Take</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have seen on the A14 the considerable difficulties caused, and continue to be caused, by an inaccurate and sloppy reconciliation of boundary features to the General Vesting Declaration boundary. Highways England failed on the A14 to ensure that boundaries were reconciled to avoid random strips of land being left in "no 	<p>2020043</p> <p>2020042</p>	N	<p>Any temporary land used for the construction of the Scheme will be returned to its former state (or better) following completion.</p> <p>Highways England will work with landowners to ensure that no areas of "no man's land" are created by the Scheme.</p> <p>In order to deliver the Scheme, works are</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>mans' land" between the freehold ownership and the scheme boundary. This is a vital issue that requires serious consideration at the outset to learn the lessons from the A14. I can provide further guidance on this issue. The GVD boundary must be got right first time round.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please explain why the access to (<i>name redacted</i>) is shown as being subject to permanent land take. This is not necessary. The improved access arrangements should be dealt with as an Accommodation Work. Neither permanent nor temporary land take is necessary. There is no justification for land take adjoining (<i>name redacted</i>) operational property. Please explain who will retain ownership of the land immediately south of the current A47 just off the A1/A47 junction. As we have reiterated before careful landscaping of this land is vital to mitigate the damage caused by the A47 to the approach to (<i>name redacted</i>). (<i>name redacted</i>) require reassurance that the landscaping proposals will ensure that this land does not become a magnet for the traveller community nor for anti-social behaviour including drug and alcohol abuse as experienced in HE's retained ownership adjoining for many years. We refer you to our previous representations 			<p>required to the Sacrewell Farm access. These areas are therefore shown as permanent land take and Highways England are seeking powers through the DCO. The intention is, subject to agreement with the landowner, not to permanently take ownership of the land.</p> <p>Proposals for the land to the south of the current A47 just off the A1/A47 junction are shown on the Environmental Masterplan (TR010039/APP/6.8).</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	in this regard and attached for reference.			
Design – land take	<p>Temporary Land Take</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent of temporary land take is excessive and you need to justify the necessity of this land being used. What is this land being used for? As the temporary land take is to be reinstated to farmland, the impact of heavy machinery on the soil structure, drainage and quality of land returned will be considerable. For this reason the extent of land take must be reduced. The impact of land taken temporarily is a considerable issue on the A14 and so this is a live issue. Please identify the risk of contamination to the temporarily taken land. Access must be maintained to retained land at all times. 	2020043 2020042	N	<p>Temporary land take is required to allow the construction of the Scheme. The areas of land needed have been given careful consideration and kept to a minimum.</p> <p>Any temporary land used for the construction of the Scheme will be returned to its former state (or better) following completion.</p> <p>Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement Geology and Soils (TR010039/APP/6.1) sets out the assessment of likely contamination along the route and mitigation measures proposed.</p> <p>Requirement 6 to the draft DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1) identifies measures that will be required should contamination be found.</p> <p>The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (TR010039/APP/7.5) includes measures to prevent and control potential pollution during the construction phase. The EMP is secured by Requirement 4 to the Draft DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1).</p> <p>A Soil Management Plan (SMP) will be developed to help preserve land quality of the temporary land take areas.</p>
Design – land	Permanent Land Take	2020042	N	Temporary land take is required to allow the

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
take	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have seen on the A14 the considerable difficulties caused, and continue to be caused, by an inaccurate and sloppy reconciliation of boundary features to the General Vesting Declaration boundary. Highways England failed on the A14 to ensure that boundaries were reconciled to avoid random strips of land being left in "no mans' land" between the freehold ownership and the scheme boundary. This is a vital issue that requires serious consideration at the outset to learn the lessons from the A14. I can provide further guidance on this issue. The GVD boundary must be got right first time round. 			<p>construction of the Scheme. The areas of land needed have been given careful consideration and kept to a minimum.</p> <p>Any temporary land used for the construction of the Scheme will be returned to its former state (or better) following completion.</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan (TR010039/APP/) includes planting and boundary treatments.</p>
Design – The Drift	Adding passing places to The Drift is insufficient and would in itself attract further fly tipping. At a minimum we would want this making up to a two lane road.	2020047	Y	<p>Since the 2020 consultation and engagement further work has been undertaken including swept path analysis.</p> <p>The design has been developed with further works now included in the Scheme, including amending the geometry of the Upton Drift and increasing the size of the passing places to make them capable of accommodating large vehicles. These works have been discussed with Peterborough City Council and the emergency services.</p> <p>With regards to fly tipping, discussions will continue with Peterborough Council.</p>
Design -	The only significant change proposed for the	2020035	N	The submitted Scheme design no longer

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
traffic modelling	<p>Wansford western roundabout is the addition of an extra lane on the A1 northbound off slip and a filter lane that bypasses the roundabout for traffic heading east on the A47. A recent freedom of information release has shown that this is still based on modelling that shows a very large increase in traffic exiting the A1 northbound and then heading east on the A47. Neither Peterborough City Council or Wansford Parish Council can see any logic behind this increase. It appears that there is an error in the traffic modelling leading to the provision of this extra lane. Highways England was told about this apparent error nearly two years ago but nothing has been done. Similarly the traffic modelling shows a large reduction in traffic on Old North Road with no substantiation. Clearly there is a problem with the traffic modelling.</p>			<p>includes an extra lane on the A1 northbound off slip and a filter lane that bypasses the roundabout. However, the design does include a two-lane exit for A47 eastbound traffic at the Wansford western roundabout.</p> <p>The Wansford model has been calibrated and validated according to Department for Transport (DfT) Web Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) guidance and wider area traffic growth forecasts are derived from DfT National Trip End Model (NTEM 7.2). The model replicates the flows on the Old North Road well in the 2015 base year.</p> <p>Traffic modelling analysis shows that, in terms of daily traffic there is a slight decrease in traffic through the Wansford Village in the future year scenarios when compared to the existing situation.</p> <p>Overall a large proportion of the traffic growth will come from the wider area rather than Wansford village, this will create an increase in traffic on the strategic A1 and A47 roads and therefore reduce the available capacity for through traffic side road movements at intersecting junctions.</p> <p>Since the introduction of the 20mph speed limit zone the analysis of the observed traffic data shows that there is a slight reduction in traffic</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>during the peak hours although the Inter-Peak remains the same.</p> <p>The combination of these factors reduces the attractiveness of Old North Road, as well as other roads in Wansford village, for daily through traffic movements.</p>
Design	A: New link road running in parallel with the A47 to reconnect Upton road with the new roundabout. A fence or hedge would block headlights from oncoming traffic on the A47.	Upton Community Council	N	<p>This option was considered. The link road could not link directly to the new roundabout due to design standards relating to separation of roundabout arms. The link would therefore need to join to the Sutton Heath Road, at a safe distance north of the roundabout. This would result in significant land take and the associated environmental impact. An area of land would also be created between the new link and the new A47 that could not be utilised for future use.</p> <p>With the associated costs involved, this option would also not provide value for money.</p>
Design	B: A slip road so that you can access the A47 Eastbound from Upton.	Upton Community Council	N	<p>This option was considered. However, for safety reasons, the approach being taken is to provide one compliant junction with the new dual carriageway at the eastern end of the Scheme and to remove direct accesses from side roads. Direct accesses are proven not to be safe, and accident statistics in this area confirm this.</p> <p>An eastbound slip road would require a 30m merge radius, a 40m nose and a 130m merge</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>taper lane. This would provide access only to the eastbound A47, where the next junction is 5.9km away. The Upton Drift would therefore still be used for any access to the A47 Westbound and any access to the villages south of the A47 such as Sutton and Ailsworth. The Upton Drift would also be the preferred route for any journeys to Upton from the A47.</p> <p>With the associated costs involved, this option would also not provide value for money.</p>
Design	C - Move the proposed roundabout and link road so that it is sited half way between the current roundabout and the proposed roundabout. Connect Upton road to the new roundabout.	Upton Community Council	N	<p>This option was considered. For the roundabout to be constructed offline of the existing A47 and further to the east, the Scheme extents would extend further to the east in order to ensure a compliant tie-in to the existing A47 and would require significant land take.</p> <p>Locating the new roundabout further to the east and online of the existing A47 would result in a significant increase to construction duration. It would also prevent the existing A47 being utilised as a link road from Sutton and Ailsworth to the new roundabout, and therefore require a new link road to be built south of the A47.</p> <p>An existing twin set of 800mm diameter potable water pipelines cross the existing A47 at a skew approximately halfway between the</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>current roundabout and the proposed roundabout. The protection measures or possible diversions that would be required would be greater for a roundabout crossing compared to the crossing of a dual carriageway.</p> <p>With the associated costs involved, these options would not provide value for money.</p>
Design	Grateful if you could confirm whether any borrow pits are proposed?	NFU	N	No borrow pits are proposed.
Ecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please note that Highways England MUST ensure that in respect of temporary and permanent fencing top wire ecology markers are added to all fencing along the scheme to ensure that wildlife and specifically barn owls can see where the top wires are. Top wires kill barn owls. This needs to be embedded in HE design standards. HE must not use the small metal marker flags on the A47 to help mark out the scheme. These are dangerous to wildlife. 	2020042 2020043	N	<p>The impact of the Scheme on wildlife including barn owls along with mitigation proposed is summarised in the Environmental Statement Chapter 8 Biodiversity (TR010039/APP/6.1) and mitigation is included to reduce adverse impacts on wildlife.</p> <p>With regards to wire fencing and marker flags, these issues will be considered during the construction phase.</p>
Environment general	<p>At peak times joining settlement pond in this location creates a number of issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does it have to be there? Is there not any other location as we lose proportionally more land than any other land owner in this scheme? 	2020016	N	<p>In response to these comments:</p> <p>1 and 2: A flood risk assessment has been undertaken Appendix 13.1 to the Environmental Statement and a Drainage Strategy produced Appendix 13.2 to the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.3). These have determined the location and size of the drainage features.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>3. No archaeology investigation (possibility of Iron Age bank in the middle) Upex report</p> <p>4. Mitigation to CWS site?</p> <p>5. Designated funds - will they be focused near the scheme and if so how?</p> <p>6. Noise and light mitigation</p> <p>7. Any available land swaps?</p>			<p>3. Archaeology has been considered in the development of the Scheme and is summarised in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p> <p>4. Biodiversity is considered in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement including any impacts on any County Wildlife Site (CWS). To mitigate the partial loss of the Sutton Meadows North CWS, through the construction of the new westbound carriageway, new areas of restored species rich grassland/wildflower meadow would be established between the existing A47 and new access road to Sacrewell Farm. This is shown on the Environmental Masterplan (TR010039/APP/6.8).</p> <p>To compensate the loss of two oak trees in the CWS, additional oaks would be planted in the woodland planting south of the A47 aimed at reducing visual impacts near wittering brook and within the CWS mitigation area. This is shown on the Environmental Masterplan (TR010039/APP/6.8).</p> <p>5. From 2020 to 2025, Highways England will be investing £936 million from our standalone – or designated – funding. This money is allocated to four funding streams focused on making improvements that will make the</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>biggest difference and deliver lasting benefits. More details are provided on the Highways England website: https://highwaysengland.co.uk/designated-funds/</p> <p>6. The assessment of potential noise effects is set out in the Environmental Statement Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (TR010039/APP/6.1). The assessment of operational noise found that with embedded mitigation comprising a low-noise surface no significant operational noise effects, adverse or beneficial, are predicted at any noise sensitive receptor (including dwellings) within the operational Study Area. As such, permanent noise barriers (i.e. acoustic fencing) are not required. The potential impacts, design, mitigation and enhancement measures are set out in 11.8 and 11.9 of Environmental Statement Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p> <p>A Lighting Assessment has been undertaken and is presented in Appendix 7.7 to the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.3). Mitigation measures to reduce the impacts are embedded in the design and included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) which forms part of the Environmental Management Plan</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>(TR010039/APP/7.5). The EMP is secured by Requirement 4 to the Draft DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1).</p> <p>7. Highways England is a public body and therefore this is not possible.</p>
Geology	The NFU and NFU standards on soil and drainage management are to be adhered to on the A47, to ensure best practice.	2020042 2020043	N	<p>The effect on soils and geology has been considered as part of the Scheme as summarised in Environmental Statement Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p> <p>The Environmental Management Plan (TR010039/APP/7.5) includes for a Soil Management Plan (SMP) to be developed to help preserve land quality on the temporary land take areas. The Environmental Management Plan is secured by Requirement 4 to the Draft DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1).</p>
Heritage	Whilst I am pleased you have realigned the eastern section to protect the ancient woodland, the western section proposal beggars belief. On the scant, or even non existent, information available on the Scheduled Monument site, you are proposing to destroy the protected environment of the River Nene Valley, which, unlike the SM, is there for all to see	2020033	N	<p>The scheduled monument is a protected site.</p> <p>Following recent discussions with Historic England the proposed alignment now passes through the south east corner of the scheduled monument.</p> <p>Biodiversity is considered in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.1) including impacts on the River Nene Valley.</p> <p>To mitigate the partial loss of the Sutton Meadows North CWS, through the construction of the new carriageway, mitigation</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>measures are proposed including new areas of restored species rich grassland/wildflower meadow will be established between the existing A47 and new access road to Sacrewell Farm.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are set out in Chapter 8 Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement TR010039/APP/6.1) and illustrated in the Environmental Masterplan (TR010039/APP/6.8).</p>
Heritage	<p>I am concerned that there has been no significant attempt to challenge Historic England about a route through the Scheduled Monument. Historic England have admitted publicly that they did no research into the features of the Scheduled Monument and relied on the research done by Wansford Parish Council. That research clearly showed that there is a route for the road through the Scheduled Monument which does not damage any of the identified features. Using a route through the Scheduled Monument significantly reduces the traffic management issues during construction and gets away from the geotechnical risks of building on the slope down to the river Nene. There is therefore a significant cost saving, previously identified by Highways England as £6m.</p>	2020035	Y	<p>The decision to schedule land as a scheduled monument lies with the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport as advised by Historic England under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Highways England has no role in this process.</p> <p>Highways England understands that the scheduling has previously been challenged but was upheld.</p> <p>Discussions have been held with Historic England throughout the development of the Scheme design. Following recent discussions with Historic England, the proposed alignment now passes through the south east corner of the scheduled monument.</p>
Hydrogeology	<p>Drainage Mitigation Ponds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed DCO boundary indicates a large expanse of land being 	2020042	N	<p>A flood risk assessment has been undertaken Appendix 13.1 and a Drainage Strategy Developed Appendix 13.2 to the</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	taken, both permanently and temporarily, including accommodating drainage mitigation. Please confirm the necessity of these structures in this location and can they be consolidated to reduce the extent of land take?			<p>Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.3).</p> <p>Following discussions with Historic England the proposed alignment now passes through the south east corner of the scheduled monument. This has allowed a reduction in the area required for flood compensation.</p> <p>The Scheme's effect on the water environment is assessed in the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 (TR010039/APP/6.1). Permanent land take is limited to the land that is necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Scheme.</p> <p>Temporary land take is required to allow the construction of the Scheme. The areas of land needed have been given careful consideration and kept to a minimum.</p>
Hydrogeology	The environmental impact and flood risk needs to be clarified and the environmental mitigation steps to be taken to negate this.	2020042 2020043	N	<p>The environmental impact of the Scheme has been assessed and the outcome, together with the mitigation measures proposed, is reported in the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.1)</p> <p>A flood risk assessment has been undertaken Appendix 13.1 (TR010039/APP/6.3). The Scheme's effect on the water environment is assessed in the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				The Scheme is not expected to give rise to significant adverse (moderate or greater) residual effects during the construction or operational phases with the adoption of mitigation measures discussed in section 13.9 of the chapter. Mitigation measures for flood risk, such as flood compensation areas, have been embedded in the design.
Noise	<p>I couldn't find any details of the specifics of tree/hedge planting or fence erection around the new road, or planned elevation levels of the new road compared to surrounding land. Am I looking in the wrong place, or is this simply a level of detail that hasn't yet been planned?</p> <p>If this has yet to be decided, is there any way to input into this aspect of the plan?</p> <p>I am coming at it more from a noise management level from traffic when the work is complete. I know that often for this type of project, trees or fences are put either side of the dual carriageway or the new road is set between embankments to reduce the traffic noise reaching surrounding areas. I'm sure this will also be considered for this project, but want to find out or provide an opinion at the appropriate time on what is planned in this area.</p>	2020007	N	<p>The detail has now been developed and is provided in the Environmental Masterplan (TR010039/APP/6.8). The landscape and planting design has been developed to be in keeping with the current character of the immediate setting of the existing A47 and surrounding area as summarised in Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p> <p>The assessment of operational noise found that with embedded mitigation comprising a low-noise surface no significant operational noise effects, adverse or beneficial, are predicted at any noise sensitive receptor (including dwellings) within the operational Study Area. As such, permanent noise barriers (i.e. acoustic fencing) are not required. The potential impacts, design, mitigation and enhancement measures are set out in 11.8 and 11.9 of Environmental Statement Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				Mitigation is set out within Record of environmental actions and commitments (REAC) which forms part of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (TR010039/APP/7.5). The EMP is secured by Requirement 4 to the Draft DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1).
Noise	Our concern is that the new slip road off the A1 will result in extra road noise and removal of any existing trees will add to the problem. Currently we experience noise levels in the garden of up to 75 decibels. Could some thought be given to retaining as much as possible of the existing tree shelter belt and adding extra sound proofing.	2020031	N	The assessment of operational noise found that with embedded mitigation comprising a low-noise surface no significant operational noise effects, adverse or beneficial, are predicted at any noise sensitive receptor (including dwellings) within the operational Study Area. As such, permanent noise barriers (i.e. acoustic fencing) are not required. The potential impacts, design, mitigation and enhancement measures are set out in 11.8 and 11.9 of Environmental Statement Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (TR010039/APP/6.1). The vegetation at this location is being retained as shown on the Environmental Masterplan (TR010039/APP/6.8).
Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)	The Detailed Design Report provides a qualitative comparison of environmental impacts between the 2018 and 2020 scheme and the report concludes that "the 2018 design and the 2020 northern alignment perform similarly in terms of the environmental topics assessed". However, there are no quantitative assessments provided to support this conclusion. Therefore, we will consider these changes	PHE	N	The environmental impacts of the Scheme which is submitted for a DCO have been assessed in the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.1). An air quality assessment has been undertaken as summarised in Chapter 5 Air Quality of Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.1) and impacts of the Scheme on human health are summarised in

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>and assessments further as part of the future DCO application and provide further comments at this stage.</p> <p>It is also noted that there is no quantitative assessment for air quality included in the 2018 PEIR report consultation. Therefore, we look forward to considering this further as part of the future DCO application. We would like to see such an assessment consider a baseline and future evaluation of the public health impacts and benefits of development options which seek to reduce air pollution – even below limit values – as pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter show no threshold below which health effects do not occur.¹² We would anticipate that an assessment would also consider appropriate estimates of background concentrations; identify and consider impacts on residential areas and sensitive receptors (such as schools, nursing homes and healthcare facilities) in the area(s) which may be affected by emissions; and account for construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p>			<p>Chapter 12.</p> <p>A baseline study of air quality has been undertaken with local monitoring. The air quality assessment has concluded there will be no significant effects on air quality at human and ecological receptors as a result of the Scheme.</p>
Safety	<p>At peak times joining the A1 northbound from the A47 is very dangerous. The traffic at rush hour can be fast moving but with very few gaps. This along with the short slip road, the limited visibility and the carriageway crossing further north near Wittering mean the area is already a serious hazard.</p>	2020010	N	<p>The dual exit lanes are no longer part of the Scheme. No modifications are proposed to the A1 Northbound exit.</p> <p>Improvements west of the A1 are not part of the project scope.</p> <p>The Scheme will generate road safety benefits</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	Your new plans conveniently do not include this area which I find extremely worrying, I am absolutely certain if you continue with your plans without resolving the A1 northbound issue you will cause more serious accidents on the A1.			from the A1 new southbound slip, which reduces the interactions between the A47 and the A1 at the eastern roundabout. In total, modelling analysis indicates that, over a 60-year timeframe the Scheme improvements will save a total of over 250 accidents. See Transport Assessment (TR010039/APP/7.3).
Safety	It appears you have made no consideration for the safety of the residents of Wansford. At peak times it is already very difficult to join the A47 western roundabout from the village. I have children at school in Castor so do this journey at least twice a day and have to wait for the traffic lights to stop the traffic on the Eastern roundabout for me to safely exit the village. If you remove the traffic lights and increase the amount of traffic using the A47 as you propose, it will exacerbate this issue and peak times make it almost impossible to leave the village.	2020010	N	The Wansford western roundabout is outside of the project scope. The pre-existing issue at the Wansford western roundabout will be raised with the Highways England Operations team for consideration as a future improvement project during the identification and prioritisation process for future roads periods
Safety	It was consequently clearly accepted by representatives of Highways England attending the consultation that an effective method of slowing traffic joining the A47/A1 north bound slip road would be essential. No immediate answer to this conundrum was available in October 2018, but clearly over the past two years the problem has been resolved, else you would not now be seeking to proceed. I should therefore be grateful for: details as to	2020014	N	Improvements to the Wansford western roundabout are outside of the scope of this project. The pre-existing issue at the Wansford western roundabout will be raised with the Highways England Operations team for consideration as a future improvement project during the identification and prioritisation process for future roads periods

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	the planned measure(s) for avoiding this potentially dangerous situation, a copy of the evidence demonstrating that this or these measures will prove to be effective, and, explicit confirmation that Highways England is fully satisfied that their current plans will ensure the safe passage of residents living on the northern part of the Old North Road and Thackers Close from their homes onto the A47.			
Safety	<p>Please don't close our road, we need to keep that road open, an underpass and eastbound slip road would ensure that village access is maintained. If our road is closed,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Farm vehicles which need to cross the A47, will need to make a longer journey and cross a larger round-a-bout, which will be carrying more traffic than what it is now. - Longer emergency service response times, if our locals need emergency assistance they will face longer wait times and could put their lives at risk. - During wet weather, farm vehicles drop mud off wheels and machines on the round-a-bout and roads, by putting in an underpass, there will be no risk of clumps of mud dropping on the road, therefore making it safer for all road users. 	2020017	N	<p>The access from Upton Road (past Lower Lodge Farm) to the A47 is also being closed due to safety reasons.</p> <p>Access to Upton via Upton Drift will remain open and passing places and limited widening is proposed. Access to the A47 from Upton Road will be via the Langley Bush Road and the new link road.</p> <p>These works have been discussed with the emergency services. No concerns were raised.</p> <p>With regards to fly tipping, discussions will continue with Peterborough Council.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>- If someone has a horse accident at the lower lodge farm, an ambulance will have to go all the way around, when they will have literally just drove past the farm. The drift was blocked last year due to a car skidding on ice and crashing into the ditch, it was blocked for the entire morning causing delays, and drivers had to take diversions.</p> <p>- School buses will not be able to safely take children in the village to school, there is not enough space for a bus to safely turn around and on some occasions has got stuck.</p> <p>- Even more Flytipping, this year we've seen extremely high amounts of Flytipping in the village, by making that road a dead end, you'll be creating a Flytipping magnet. If you don't decide to listen to Upton's concerns, I do sincerely hope that you will make a reasonable donation to help pay for our community defibrillator, before you cut us off, and propose some improvements to the drift that will actually do some good, not just passing points, your only proposing to do the bare minimum, for the cheapest price.</p>			
Safety	I wonder whether a solution could include traffic lights that react to traffic from Old North Road which will allow them to pull out safely.	2020019	N	<p>Traffic lights are not required as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>Junction signalisation modelling analysis has been undertaken. It was concluded that a signalised junction was not an appropriate</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>solution to resolve the traffic congestion issues at the Wansford western roundabout.</p> <p>Analysis of the modelling assessment shows a signalised junction does not resolve the congestion issues and will further cause an overall decrease in network performance.</p>
Safety	The access road from Upton on to the A47 must not be closed. It will have negative effects on the village and will lead to farm vehicles travelling on the A47, this will pose a safety risk as they move slowly, drop clumps of mud everywhere and a serious accident could occur.	2020024	N	<p>The access from Upton Road (past Lower Lodge Farm) to the A47 is also being closed due to safety reasons.</p> <p>Upton Drift will remain open, will be improved and will continue to provide access to Upton. Discussions have been held with Peterborough and the emergency services. No concerns were raised.</p> <p>Access to the A47 from Upton will be via Upton Drift, Langleigh Bush Road and the new link road which connects with the Sutton Heath roundabout.</p> <p>Since the 2020 statutory consultation and engagement further work has been undertaken including swept path analysis.</p> <p>The design has been developed with further works now included in the Scheme, including amending the geometry of Upton Drift and increasing the size of the passing places to make them capable of accommodating large vehicles. These works have been discussed</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				with Peterborough City Council and the emergency services.
Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding	We think we should have a pedestrian and cycle bridge connecting Upton to the proposed cycle path as it's not fair that your not including us with the plans for a new footpath/cycle way.	Upton Community Council	N	<p>A Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment has been undertaken and design, mitigation and enhancement measures are summarised in Chapter 12 Population and human health of the Environmental Statement (Section 12.9) (TR010039/APP/6.1) and Section 5 of the Transport Assessment (TR010039/APP/7.3).</p> <p>The Scheme will include a new walking and cycling route connecting Wansford to Sutton. This includes a new underpass at the disused railway to connect to Sutton Heath Road. The shared cycle track will be extended eastwards as part of the Scheme to enable it to connect to the proposed new shared footway/cycleway that will run east to west parallel to and to the south of the A47.</p>
Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding	The Forum does not agree with the assertion that the existing route via the A1 underpass is 'an all-user route' (WCHR Review). This route fails to meet essential design standards and is not accessible to all. The Forum remains resolute in its view that an alternative route must be provided over the A1.	Peterborough Cycle Forum	N	<p>No improvements are proposed on the existing non-motorised user routes at the western end of the all-user path where it passes beneath the A1 as this is beyond the scope of the Scheme.</p> <p>With regards to an alternative route over the A1 this does not form part of the Scheme.</p>
Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding	Any footpath, bridleway or other public byway which is to be diverted as a result of the works must be declared.	2020042 2020043	N	All diversions of roads or footpaths required by the Scheme are set out in the Draft DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1) and the Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010039/APP/2.4),

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding	I wish to query an omission on your proposed design of the Wansford to Sutton Scheme. On your original 2018 brochure, page 13, you show the existing bridleway from Sacrewell Farm running east, linking to the Sutton Heath road which is also part of the Hereward Way long distance route. On your Autumn 2020 update this bridleway is not shown. Therefore, could you please confirm that this bridleway will still exist, with access to it from the South via the underpass and link road to Sacrewell Farm? This is important because this bridleway will form part of a circular route including the shared cycle / footpath parallel to the A47, using the new underpasses.	2020020	N	<p>The Project Update (2020) shows our proposed routes for walking, cycling and horse riding, however, it does not show any pre-existing routes.</p> <p>This bridleway is not affected by the Scheme and access will be via the existing access, with access to it from the south via the new underpass and link road to Sacrewell Farm which will be open to equestrians.</p>
Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding	<p>The content of the Assessment has limited its examination of WCH access to a small area close to the Scheme, neglecting the networks over the remaining majority of the study area, yet offers no explanation of this crucial shortcoming. It identifies trip generators and amenities only in the reduced area, thereby omitting communities bigger than Wansford, and amenities which attract many residents of and visitors to Peterborough.</p> <p>The Assessment and Review documents have therefore not met the requirements of DMRB GG 142. Their inadequacy has led to many opportunities for improvement or betterment of the WCH networks being omitted.</p>	2020037	N	<p>A Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment has been undertaken and design, mitigation and enhancement measures are summarised in Chapter 12 Population and human health of the Environmental Statement (Section 12.9) (TR010039/APP/6.1) and Section 5 of the Transport Assessment (TR010039/APP/7.3). These take into account public rights of way over the study area of the Scheme.</p> <p>The following standards and guidance have been used to inform the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DMRB LA 112 Population and human health (Revision 1) • IEMA Health in EIA: A Primer for a Proportionate Approach

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>Trip generators and amenities within the study area but omitted from the Assessment: Settlements omitted: Wittering, Nassington, Yarwell (with its Country Park), Water Newton, Ailsworth, Castor, Ufford, Southorpe. Amenities omitted: Bedford Purlieus National Nature Reserve, Old Sulehay Nature Reserve, Sibson Skydiving Centre, Nene Valley Railway Station and Depot, Castor Hanglands National Nature Reserve, Southey Wood Nature Reserve, Southorpe Paddock Nature Reserve.</p> <p>GG 142 4.12 requires the identification of likely desire lines based on these trip generators and amenities, but no attempt in the Assessment has been made to identify desire lines.</p> <p>Network gaps omitted from the Assessment: Within the 5km radius study area the outstanding network deficiency is the severance caused by the A1. Urban Peterborough and its villages east of the A1 have no safe and convenient crossing points to the attractive cycling country to the west. The overbridge at Stibbington (the only safe cycle crossing) has no link for cycling from the east, eg via Sutton. A thoughtful study of likely desire lines based on the complete study area is likely to reveal other network gaps. See GG 142 4.17 for the work required.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health Impact Assessment Tools (Department of Health, 2010)
Walking, Cycling and	I feel that as a minimum, and beyond the recommendations of Peterborough Cycling	2020037	N	Work on the A1 paths is beyond the scope of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Horse-Riding	<p>Forum the following should form part of the Scheme:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Surface and width improvements to improve the A1 westside shared use path, including the elimination of obstruction by parked motor vehicles at the Thornhaugh layby. 2. Surface and width improvements to the A1 northeast-side shared use path between Wansford (south) and Stibbington, and between Manor House (near NVR Station) and Water Newton. 3. Provide gaps in the A1 central fencing, to restore surface crossings for walking and cycling, at Wittering (Baldwin Close footpath - Wittering Ford Road, accommodating crossfall); Sibson (Manor House - Manor Farm) and Water Newton (either at the footpath crossing or the former road crossing). 4. A47 west of Wansford at Old Oundle Road - Toll Bar Cottage: provide centre refuge for walking and cycling. 			
Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding	The shared cycle/footway route is excellent but I wonder whether it should also be made into an equestrian route?	2020030	N	A permissible equestrian route is provided where possible as shown on the Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010039/APP/2.4).
Walking, Cycling and	There is still no evidence as to how the new cycle routes will be surfaced leaving doubt as to their suitability for ALL cyclists, i.e.	2020049	N	The proposed footway/cycleway on the southern side of the A47 will be surfaced and appropriately drained

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Horse-Riding	including road cyclists.			
Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding	<p>"New cycle crossing on the A47 west of the Wansford roundabouts, removing cycles from the A1 bridge."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cyclists should not be prevented from using the A47 at this point. Cyclists wishing to access the service station or Sacrewell Farm <u>by road</u> will have to use the A47 in order to get there. This is forcing cyclists to use a proposed cycle path via Wansford which is currently not fit for purpose, i.e. not gritted in winter months, suitable for road cycle tyres, gradient too steep for most cyclists. (Also mentioned in WCH Assessment). 	2020049	N	Works to the west of the Wansford roundabouts are not within the project scope.
Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding	<p>"Pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians will be able to connect to the proposed routes to the east of the A1 via Peterborough Road, the A1 underpass, and the recently improved route to the Wansford picnic area."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The section that has been improved along this route has a surface appropriate for ALL types of cyclists. However it's design for this environment needs to be reviewed & modified in order to remain suitable as a cycle, pedestrian, equestrian route. The useable width has already been compromised by more than 2 feet due to rabbits digging adjacent the path & 	2020049	N	This is an existing route. No improvements are proposed on the existing non-motorised user routes at the western end of the all-user path where it passes beneath the A1 as this is beyond the scope of the Scheme.

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>clearing mud onto it along with undergrowth already spilling on to it. There is a raised curb at the start of the new route at the Wansford picnic area. (See attached photographs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to this new section from P'boro' Road is extremely steep, very broken up & strewn with vegetation making it highly unsuitable for most cyclists to ride. This section needs significant improvements. Planners come & have a go at riding up & down it. As the current British Cycling National Master's road race champion I had to produce XXXX watts to get up it on my lightweight racing bike at a leisurely pace! 			
Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding	New cycleway must be without risk of flooding otherwise it will not get used. Post flooding it will be littered with debris making it unusable for many users & unpleasant for those who can use it.	2020049	N	The proposed footway/cycleway on the southern side of the A47 will be surfaced and appropriately drained
Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding	<p>The A1 underpass was not conducive to cycling due to the gradients and there appeared to be an issue with the surfacing on the ramp to the west of the A1, which was cracking."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative provision needs to be made for road cyclists to travel east- 	2020049	N	<p>The section of this permissive footpath between the A1 underpass and the picnic site access road has recently been upgraded following a successful designated funds application to improve the quality of the route.</p> <p>No improvements are proposed on the existing non-motorised user routes at the western end</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>west from Wansford to Sutton Heath/Sutton/Castor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing has been done to rectify defective surface. 			<p>of the existing path where it passes beneath the A1 as this is beyond scope of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Scheme will include a new walking and cycling route connecting Wansford to Sutton. This includes a new underpass at the disused railway to connect to Sutton Heath Road. The shared cycle track will be extended eastwards as part of the Scheme to enable it to connect to the proposed new shared footway/cycleway that will run east to west parallel to and to the south of the A47. The new section of shared cycleway/footway will be segregated from the carriageway of the new link road serving Sacrewell Farm.</p> <p>A Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment has been undertaken and design, mitigation and enhancement measures are summarised in Chapter 12 Population and human health of the Environmental Statement (Section 12.9) (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p>

2.2 Targeted statutory consultation under section 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008, May and June 2021

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Biodiversity	<p>Previously, it was noted by HDC that an ecological impact study needed to be provided with details on protected species and habitats and mitigation proposals. We look forward to this detail.</p> <p>In addition, whilst we are pleased to note that the responses since the last consultation include reference to 'inclusion of areas for compensatory flood storage' and 'inclusion of areas for environmental mitigation' there is no detail provided on what these will involve. We urge Highways England to consider the implications for the wetlands and meadows alongside the River Nene and to ensure that the proposals support and enhance the aspirations of the Nene Park Trust and Natural Cambridgeshire's 'Doubling Nature' Vision in terms of enhancing the meadows of the Nene river valley.</p>	Huntingdonshire District Council	N	<p>With regards to biodiversity, the Scheme incorporates mitigation measures, and the design has evolved with the aim of avoiding trees where possible and keeping habitat loss to the minimum, see Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p> <p>Planting of trees and species rich grassland will be incorporated into the Scheme. See the Environmental Statement Chapter 8 Biodiversity (TR010039/APP/6.1) Table 8-11. New areas of restored species rich grassland/wildflower meadow would be established between the existing A47 and new access road to Sacrewell Farm as stated in Chapter 8 Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p> <p>A landscaping scheme is included in the Environmental Masterplan (TR010039/APP/6.8). The landscape and planting design has been developed to be in keeping with the current character of the immediate setting of the existing A47 and surrounding area as summarised in Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				(TR010039/APP/6.1). All mitigation will be detailed and implemented as part of the record of environmental actions and commitments (REAC) and in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (TR010039/APP/7.5). Newly created or enhanced habitats will be managed and monitored for five years after planting.
Consultation	<p>As the application stands, we are minded that if the DCO is successful we would appeal the DCO decision pursuant to section 118 of the 2008 act, due to incorrect interpretation of policy and procedural fairness. We believe the process is flawed as the public consultation in 2017 was on a scheme that started west of the Nene roundabout, whereas the DCO application is based on a completely different scheme which now starts east of that roundabout.</p> <p>Furthermore, during and after the statutory process we were not given the opportunity to agree a statement of common ground. I enclose our consideration to the 2017 consultation which would have been included in the 766 responses on which we are told the 2020 revision is based. I also enclose the 2017 publication announcing the preferred route following analysis of those responses. The proposed scheme, as presented in 2017 clearly detailed that the scheme started west of the Nene roundabout (Upton - Castor & Ailsworth). This 2017 proposal showed the retention of this roundabout along with a safe local access to Upton. Accordingly, the</p>	2020046	N	<p>The Scheme design has evolved following several consultations and continued assessments, see the Scheme Design Report (TR010039/APP/7.4).</p> <p>After reviewing the feedback from the non-statutory options consultation in 2017 and completing a number of environmental and other surveys and assessments, an amended version of option 2 presented at the options consultation was chosen and announced as the preferred option in August 2017. A number of factors were considered in deciding between the options, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • safety • economic benefits • consultation feedback • cost • environmental effects • construction <p>The Scheme has since been amended further following feedback from the</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>businesses and residents of Upton made no significant representations on this proposal as there was no need to make an objection.</p> <p>The 2020 proposal has removed this access, and safe, suitable appropriate connection to A47 and the scheme starts east of this roundabout. It is our assertion that there has been no relevant consultation on the east of the scheme, and we strongly request that you delay DCO submission, to allow Highways England to consult appropriately on this new outline scheme design.</p> <p>If Highways England gave additional time to consult and this results in an amendment to the current SGAR 3 Prelim. Design, to retain this roundabout and retain the connection to the west of this roundabout to the existing LAR (Local Access Road), then this would;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfy the primary concerns of the businesses and residents of Upton, with regards safe access and connectivity. • Ease congestion, and Operational Safety issues on your current new, eastern roundabout. • Provide scheme budget savings through; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o design development savings o Scheme programme delays caused by Judicial Review o Construction cost savings § Reducing the scheme length § Avoiding the need to demolish and remove the existing, functional roundabout, which provides safe and appropriate local connectivity. <p>Upton village is very much an Estate village with</p>			statutory consultation in 2018 and Scheme Update in 2020.

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>operating agricultural units and many residential tenants also.</p> <p>Policy -during the past year we have tried to establish the justification of the design of the new proposed roundabout versus the retention of the existing Nene Roundabout. We have been told this is an off line construction and down to cost and design standards, however the dualling of the A47 is on the line of the current Nene Roundabout which was built in 1990. Whilst consideration must be given to the Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB) and consideration that some standards have been updated since, we would still need to be convinced this dramatic alteration is justified. It makes no sense to remove a roundabout that exists and replace with a new roundabout that removes a perfectly acceptable access. This is also a cost saving which should be considered in the context of the expense to date. We note that the 2017 proposal was designed by Mott Macdonald who have been replaced by Sweco is this a case of necessity to redesign and at what cost to the overall budget.</p>			
Design	<p>Environmentally it is a difficult route between a Tripple SSI and alongside the River Nene and geography and geology is far from ideal. As a very small landowner the scheme has a big effect on our land, however with the route now mainly north of the present A47 this is a great improvement on the original scheme, which nobody wanted. We are delighted that Historic</p>	2020016	N	<p>The Scheme alignment has been altered following the 2018 statutory consultation based on feedback and there is a new northern alignment in the eastern part of the Scheme.</p> <p>The route of the submitted Scheme design crosses to the southern end of the</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	England has now done the right thing for the environment and acknowledged it is unlikely to be a burial barrow but a ring ditch round house that are quite numerous in this area due to the Neolithic activity in this area, I do hope they continue to work with you to ensure as little as possible of the project is built on the River Nene floodplain. It does mean everyone along the route has had to share some of the pain of this scheme.			scheduled monument at its perimeter, by following approximately the current A47 route at this point and passing to the north of the current route beyond the monument in either direction.
Design	Your new route offers great improvements for cyclists and walkers with much better connectivity not only east and west but also south and north. We are still a little concerned that any dead areas do not offer camp areas for travellers who can inflict anti-social activities on surrounding residents but we know you are looking at this.	2020016	N	Highways England are considering mitigations regarding this concern.
Environment general	If lighting is to be installed it will be necessary to consider the impact on residential amenity at Stibbington and on wildlife such as bats. We look forward to confirmation as to whether lighting is required.	Huntingdonshire District Council	N	Lighting proposals in the Scheme are minimised and only used in the approach of the roundabouts to respect the rural nature of the environment. A Lighting Assessment has been undertaken and is presented in Appendix 7.7 to the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.3).
Environment general	We wish to continue any discussion or sharing of ideas for mitigation from light air and noise pollution to both the villages and Nene valley with its abundance of wildlife, and were possible enhance and develop new habitat.	2020016	N	The assessment of operational noise found that with embedded mitigation comprising a low-noise surface no significant operational noise effects, adverse or beneficial, are predicted at any noise sensitive receptor (including dwellings) within the operational Study Area. As such, permanent noise barriers

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>(i.e. acoustic fencing) are not required. The potential impacts, design, mitigation and enhancement measures are set out in 11.8 and 11.9 of Environmental Statement Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p> <p>Lighting proposals in the Scheme are minimised and only used in the approach of the roundabouts to respect the rural nature of the environment. A Lighting Assessment has been undertaken and is presented in Appendix 7.7 to the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.3).</p>
Heritage	The works likely to impact on heritage within Huntingdonshire are any proposed to the blue and green areas (see excerpt below), which have the potential to impact on the grade II* listed motorway bridge or its setting. Due to the topography of the land, higher development further away from the bridge may also bring an impact. See also comments under PEIR, below.	Huntingdonshire District Council	N	A heritage assessment has been undertaken and the Scheme provides mitigation to protect heritage assets where appropriate. Please see Environmental Statement Chapter 6 (TR010039/APP/6.1).
Hydrogeology	We were not keen to have the waste water pond on our land but accept the compromise.	2020016	N	A flood risk assessment has been undertaken Appendix 13.1 to the Environmental Statement and a Drainage Strategy produced Appendix 13.2 to the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.3). These have determined the location and size of the drainage features.
Hydrogeology	Parts of the DCO boundary fall within Flood Zone	Huntingdonshire	N	A detailed Flood Risk Assessment has

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	3 due to the close proximity to the River Nene. It is understood that areas for compensatory flood storage have been included. It will be for the LLFA and EA to consider if the flood risk impacts will be adequately mitigated through the proposals. We trust that, as a result of mitigation within the scheme design, the proposals will not increase flood risk to land and properties within Huntingdonshire. Previously it was noted by HDC that one of the key risks could be from polluted water entering the river. We look forward to the detailed design, which we hope will address this.	District Council		<p>been undertaken for the finalised scheme and is summarised in Appendix 13.1 of the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.3). Mitigating measures have been proposed to ensure the Scheme does not increase fluvial flood risk.</p> <p>The new drainage systems including new attenuation basins, with pollution control devices, to control discharges to local watercourses (see Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.1)).</p>
Landscape	Previously it was noted that there will a loss of vegetation and trees that need to be mapped and mitigation proposed. We are aware, from recent contact with HE's consultants, that a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment is being prepared and we welcomed the opportunity to provide input. We look forward to seeing the detailed assessment in due course. We welcome the reported reduced visual effects upon the Nene Valley Green Infrastructure Priority Area, which have been assessed as an outcome of the more northern alignment of the 2020 scheme. HDC's Landscape Officer has previously had a conversation with the lead landscape architects regarding landscape and visual effects of the proposals, namely any possible impacts and enhancements that could be delivered to the Nene Valley corridor through the project. The current documents do not appear to	Huntingdonshire District Council	N	<p>A study of the landscape and the visual effects of the Scheme, including proposed mitigation, has been undertaken and summarised in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p> <p>A landscaping scheme is included in the Environmental Masterplan (TR010039/APP/6.8). The landscape and planting design has been developed to be in keeping with the current character of the immediate setting of the existing A47 and surrounding area as summarised in Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.1). All mitigation will be detailed and implemented as part of</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	include any amount of detail on the assessment, or what is being proposed in terms of enhancements and mitigation, which we expect to see at a later date. In landscape and visual terms the comments above regarding the need to ensure that the proposals support the aspirations of the Nene Park NIA and Natural Cambridgeshire's 'Doubling Nature' vision are reiterated. In addition, as the A47 provides a backdrop to a stretch of the river valley, the aspiration should be to minimise visual detractors and provide the valley with a strong edge.			the record of environmental actions and commitments (REAC) and in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (TR010039/APP/7.5). Newly created or enhanced habitats will be managed and monitored for five years after planting.
Landscape	Previously it was noted that there will a loss of vegetation and trees that need to be mapped and mitigation proposed. We are aware, from recent contact with HE's consultants, that a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment is being prepared and we welcomed the opportunity to provide input. We look forward to seeing the detailed assessment in due course. We welcome the reported reduced visual effects upon the Nene Valley Green Infrastructure Priority Area, which have been assessed as an outcome of the more northern alignment of the 2020 scheme. HDC's Landscape Officer has previously had a conversation with the lead landscape architects regarding landscape and visual effects of the proposals, namely any possible impacts and enhancements that could be delivered to the Nene Valley corridor through the project. The current documents do not appear to include any amount of detail on the assessment, or what is being proposed in terms of	Huntingdonshire District Council	N	<p>A study of the landscape and the visual effects of the Scheme, including proposed mitigation, has been undertaken and summarised in Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p> <p>A landscaping scheme is included in the Environmental Masterplan (TR010039/APP/6.8). The landscape and planting design has been developed to be in keeping with the current character of the immediate setting of the existing A47 and surrounding area as summarised in Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.1). All mitigation will be detailed and implemented as part of the record of environmental actions and commitments (REAC) and in the</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	enhancements and mitigation, which we expect to see at a later date. In landscape and visual terms the comments above regarding the need to ensure that the proposals support the aspirations of the Nene Park NIA and Natural Cambridgeshire's 'Doubling Nature' vision are reiterated. In addition, as the A47 provides a backdrop to a stretch of the river valley, the aspiration should be to minimise visual detractors and provide the valley with a strong edge.			Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (TR010039/APP/7.5). Newly created or enhanced habitats will be managed and monitored for five years after planting.
Noise	<p>The need to consider residential impact of noise was previously flagged. Details as to whether noise barriers will be required are looked forward to. PEIR (from HDC's 2020 consultation response) 'The Council is not yet in a position to agree with the findings of the PEIR. While the document identifies many of the issues that will require mitigation, it does not then put forward exactly what the mitigation might be. There is a lack of definition. The Council will want to see the designed solution which we are advised will be provided in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) available in Spring 2019.</p> <p>In addition, where the new road comes closest to the river, the design shows a hedgerow provided as the barrier between the riverbank and the road. A walking path also exists on the riverbank. The additional noise generated through higher capacity and faster speed limit will adversely affect wildlife and walkers -it is surprising that, from the information on the available drawings,</p>	Huntingdonshire District Council	N	<p>The assessment of operational noise found that with embedded mitigation comprising a low-noise surface no significant operational noise effects, adverse or beneficial, are predicted at any noise sensitive receptor (including dwellings) within the operational Study Area. As such, permanent noise barriers (i.e. acoustic fencing) are not required. The potential impacts, design, mitigation and enhancement measures are set out in 11.8 and 11.9 of Environmental Statement Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p> <p>The area included in the noise assessment includes a study area which includes receptors at which there is the greatest potential for significant effects due to construction noise. The assessment of operational noise has been carried out for a study area within</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
	<p>there is no acoustic barrier or other solution planned along this section.</p> <p>In terms of nearby settlements, the PEIR recognises Wansford and Sutton as receptors but does not include Stibbington. Noise impact on this settlement should also be considered. With specific reference to air quality, the Cambridgeshire wildlife site to the south of the road should be a consideration and any impact on this should be considered. The EIA will need to detail the mitigation measures proposed to ensure the impact of the proposed scheme is minimal to all receptors.</p> <p>Use of a Construction Environmental Management Plan to manage construction phase noise is appropriate, and again when more details of the construction phase are available and this document is prepared, we also welcome consultation on this.</p> <p>The non-technical PEIR summary also published raises a further issue. It sets out the adverse effects and how these will be mitigated but there is no mention of the river - a significant and concerning omission, given its environmental importance.'</p>			<p>600m of the new or altered links. This study area includes receptors at which there is the greatest potential for significant effects due to operational noise.</p> <p>An Environmental Management Plan this is included in the DCO submission – (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p> <p>Noise and visual disturbance resulting in the impacts to sensitive ecological receptors within and adjacent to the construction footprint has been considered in Chapter 8 Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p> <p>During construction, disturbance from noise would be mitigated by use of temporary noise barriers, quieter plant, leaving a buffer zone around sensitive receptors and reducing time on noisy activities. Real-time noise monitoring shall be provided on sites where there are sensitive ecological receptors. Vibration would be reduced with early warning, pre-condition surveys, short work durations, and vibration monitoring. Habitat planting along the existing A47 would include tall trees and will also reduce noise impacts during operation.</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
Safety	As the current scheme stands, we believe the access road known as the Drift and the junctions onto Langley Bush Road and Sutton Heath Road are un safe with the increased usage following the closure of Upton Road and again do they comply with the DMRB On behalf of the Milton Estate, we are in support of the Dualling of the A47 but will be minded to appeal against this application as it stands.	2020046	N	<p>Further works are included in the Scheme, including amending the geometry of Upton Drift and increasing the size of the passing places to make them capable of accommodating large vehicles. These works have been discussed with Peterborough City Council and the emergency services.</p> <p>Upton Drift will remain open, will be improved and will continue to provide access to Upton.</p> <p>Access to the A47 from Upton will be via Upton Drift, Langley Bush Road and the new link road which connects with the Sutton Heath roundabout.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment (TR010039/APP/7.3) has been undertaken where future traffic caused by the Scheme is modelled. Traffic impacts of the Scheme have also been analysed using the forecast model traffic flows, link delays and capacities for locations including Sutton Heath Road. The Scheme includes amendments to access to Sutton Heath Road and Langley Bush Road. The network upgrades provide additional capacity on the A47 side roads as they are connected to the new Sutton Heath</p>

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				Roundabout
Utilities	<p>Due to the proximity of some of our assets, NGET and NGG wish to express their interest in further consultation while the impact on our assets is still being assessed. In respect of existing NGET and NGG infrastructure, both will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus including compliance with relevant standards for works proposed within proximity of its apparatus.</p> <p>Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of NGET's & NGG's apparatus, both will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights.</p> <p>National Grid infrastructure within / in close proximity to the order boundary Electricity Transmission National Grid Electricity Transmission has a high voltage electricity overhead transmission line within or in close proximity to the proposed order limits...</p>	National Grid	N	Highways England have consulted with National Grid throughout the development of the Scheme and will continue to do so throughout the DCO and construction.
Utilities	On behalf of Anglian Water Services Limited I have received a Statutory Consultation letter. I note that part of my client site now falls within the DCO boundary and more specifically under 'New Rights'. Please can you clarify what rights there are?	Anglian Water (via Savills)	N	The new rights referred to are in regard to utility diversions that may be required as part of the A47 Wansford to Sutton dualling scheme. As part of the road Scheme Highways England will potentially need to divert two 1600mm water mains from the pumping station and this is what the plan indicated referred to in the consultation response. As part of the Development Consent Order

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				<p>(DCO) process, all land that may be affected or have permanent works undertaken is included and this is why it is shown on the plans. There is no intention to affect the pumping station in any way other than carrying out utility diversions and Highways England will not be looking to take any of this land permanently or to have any rights over this land.</p> <p>Highways England are currently engaging with Anglian Water regarding these diversions.</p>
Utilities	Further details of the proposed development are needed to ascertain if works will affect either the plant or its coverage.	MBNL (via Turner & Townsend)	N	The information that has been provided has been passed to our design team to assess the impacts that the Scheme may have on your plant/coverage. Should there be any impacts we will be in touch to arrange further discussions and will continue to keep you informed as the Scheme develops
Utilities	Can I clarify that this is separate to the A47 Improvements Blofield to North Burlingham Dualling? We have progressed to C4 on this project. Have you requested a C3 from us for this section?	Vodafone	N	To clarify, although both schemes are part of the A47 Corridor Improvement Programme, this is being delivered as a separate scheme to the A47 Blofield to North Burlingham dualling. Highways England has provided an image of the Scheme location points for reference. We have been liaising with Vodafone with regards to the diversionary works for the A47 Wansford to Sutton Scheme and

Topic area	Consultation response	User ID (s):	Change (Y/N)	Highways England's response (inc. the regard had to the consultation response):
				have provided the C4 estimates for information.
Utilities	I believe the Cornerstone Telecoms site impacted could be 543o2, located at Wansford Pumping Station, A47, Peterborough, Cambridgeshire, PE8 6LG, is that your understanding? Please can you confirm if the mast needs to be relocated to make for your works.	Cluttons (Cornerstone Telecoms)	N	The diversionary works will be carried out on the Anglian Water pumping station; however, the Cornerstone Telecoms mast will not be impacted by these works and 24/7 access will be maintained to the area.
Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding	We still would like to be able to ride a horse under the new carriageway as mounting blocks can be risky with the noise of the traffic above, and a good rider can control and work a horse better mounted than having 2 feet on the ground!!! The new roundabout will not provide a realistic option for traversing the new A47 which the present single carriageway roundabout does at present.	2020016	N	The path under the Scheme is only designed for cyclists and walkers.