

# A47 Wansford to Sutton Dualling

**Scheme Number: TR010039**

**Volume 9**

## **9.6 Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1)**

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010  
Rule 8(1)(c)

Planning Act 2008

February 2022

Deadline 2

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning  
(Examination Procedure) Rules 2010**

A47 Wansford to Sutton Dualling  
Development Consent Order 202[x]

---

**9.6 APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO THE EXAMINING  
AUTHORITY'S FIRST WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

---

<b>Regulation Number:</b>	Rule 8(1)(c)
<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b>	TR010039
<b>Application Document Reference</b>	TR010039/EXAM/9.6
<b>BIM Document Reference</b>	PCF STAGE 4   HE551494-GTY-LSI-000-RP-TX-30112   P01.01
<b>Author:</b>	A47 Wansford to Sutton Dualling Project Team, National Highways

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
Rev 0	February / 2022	Deadline 2

## CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Purpose of this Document.....	4
<b>2</b>	<b>ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO THE EXAMINING AUTHORITY'S FIRST WRITTEN QUESTIONS.....</b>	<b>5</b>

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Purpose of this Document**

- 1.1.1 The Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the A47 Wansford to Sutton Scheme was submitted on 05 July 2021 and accepted for examination on 02 August 2021.
- 1.1.2 The purpose of this document is to set out National Highways' (the Applicant) response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions 1 (ExQ1), published on the 18 January 2022.

## **2 ABBREVIATIONS**

- 2.1.1 The following abbreviations have been used in the Applicant's responses to the First Written Questions:

- ALC = Agricultural Land Classification
- BMV = Best and Most Versatile
- CCC = Cambridgeshire County Council
- dDCO = draft Development Consent Order
- DfT = Department for Transport
- DMRB = Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
- EA = Environment Agency
- EIA = Environmental Impact Assessment
- EM = Explanatory Memorandum
- EMP = Environmental Management Plan
- EqIA = Equality Impact Assessment
- ES = Environmental Statement
- ExA = Examining Authority
- FN = Footnote
- FRA = Flood Risk Assessment
- HMBCE = Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (Historic England)
- HRA = Habitats Regulations Assessment
- ISH1 = Issue Specific Hearing 1
- LOAEL = Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level
- NPPF = National Planning Policy Framework 2021
- NPSNN = National Policy Statement for National Networks 2014
- NSN = National Site Network
- OTMP = Outline Traffic Management Plan
- PCC = Peterborough City Council
- PP = Protected Provisions
- REAC = Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments
- SMP = Soil Management Plan
- SOAEL = Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level
- SoCG = Statement of Common Ground
- SSSI = Site of Special Scientific Interest
- TA = Transport Assessment
- the Scheme = the A47 Wansford to Sutton Dualling Scheme
- WCH = Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding

### 3 APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO THE EXAMINING AUTHORITY'S FIRST WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
<b>1.0 General Questions</b>			
1.0.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Name of Applicant</b></p> <p>The Applicant changed its name to National Highways Limited on 8 September 2021. Could the Applicant please make any necessary changes. By "necessary", it is not necessary to undertake changes retrospectively or where the change would make no material difference. "Necessary", in this context is required going forward from this time, having an implication for, if consented, how the Proposed Development were to be implemented. It is not necessary to change a document only for this reason if it anticipated that the document will be updated for another reason later in the Examination. In that situation then both changes can be made at the same time.</p>	<p>The Applicant has formally advised the Planning Inspectorate of the change of name at Procedural Deadline A on 11 January 2022. As was noted, the change of name was simply that as the underlying company remained the same.</p> <p>At this stage of the Examination, the Applicant does not consider that there are any necessary changes which need to be made to Examination documents beyond amending the definition of the "undertaker" in the dDCO (<b>AS-10</b>) and EM (<b>APP-017</b>). These documents will be amended and provided at Deadline 3.</p>
1.0.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Updated documents and plans</b></p> <p>When submitting revised documents, with the exception of the Application Documents Tracker (see ExQ1.0.12 below), documents should be provided as a 'clean' new document and 'tracked change' from the previous submission version. However, there is no need for tracked change versions of drawings or plans since the changes should be set out in the table of revisions on the drawing and identified with a revision number.</p>	<p>This is noted.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.0.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Location Plan</b> The Location Plan [APP004] does not conclude in the south-eastern corner, could the Applicant please resolve this.</p>	<p>The Location Plan has been updated to address this issue and has been submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/2.1 Rev 1</b>).</p>
1.0.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Works Plans</b> In the Works Plan [AS-006] individual works/ elements of the works are shown with a series of dotted lines. Those lines frequently overlap with one another making it hard to establish where works begin and end, including whether they are set for the inside or outside of the lines. This set of plans are difficult to interpret by anyone with a red/ green or other colour deficiency, or visual stress condition.</p> <p>Could the Applicant please reconsider how these are displayed to seek to resolve the difficulties identified above.</p> <p>(It is appreciated that this may also involve changes to the dDCO, particularly to deal with limits of deviation.)</p>	<p>The following potential improvements have been considered by the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Greying out' of the Scheme design to allow the work plan boundaries to become more prominent</li> <li>• Line width reduction for work plan boundaries to improve differentiation when boundaries are in close proximity</li> <li>• Solid lines for all work plan boundaries</li> </ul> <p>An example of these improvements is shown in <b>Annex A – Works Plans Sheet 4 Example (TR010039/EXAM/9.7)</b>. Sheet 4 was used as this sheet was considered to demonstrate the potential difficulties identified by the Examining Authority.</p> <p>It is considered that these amendments are as much as the Applicant is able to do reasonably to improve the issues identified. If the Examining Authority is satisfied with the Applicant's proposed improvements, the same improvements will be applied to the remaining sheets of the Works Plans (<b>APP-006</b>) and these will be submitted at the next appropriate deadline.</p>
1.0.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Works Plans</b> The key to the original version of the Works Plans</p>	<p>A drawing has been produced to clarify the position geographically of the proposed construction compounds</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		[APP006] included "Construction Compound"; this was not included within the plans themselves and this has been omitted from the key from the revised version [AS006]. Could the Applicant please clarify the position geographically of any proposed construction compounds.	and was provided at Deadline 2 (See <b>Annex B – Site Compounds and Storage Areas</b> ) ( <b>TR010039/EXAM/9.7</b> ).
1.0.6	The Applicant	<p><b>Engineering Drawings</b></p> <p>a) Can the Applicant please put chainage markers from the Engineering sections onto a plan showing the proposed works (preferably as additional drawings at the end of the Engineering Sections or as an addition to the Works Plans). Chainages need only be shown every 50m so as to avoid too much information on the drawings.</p>	The Engineering Drawing and Sections have been updated to address this request and provided at Deadline 2 ( <b>TR010039/APP/2.5 Rev 1</b> ).
		b) Can the location of the sections shown on sheets 4, 5 and 6 of the Engineering drawings also be shown on plans.	The Engineering Drawings and Sections have been updated to address this request and have been provided at Deadline 2 ( <b>TR010039/APP/2.5 Rev 1</b> ).
1.0.7	The Applicant	<p><b>Engineering Drawings</b></p> <p>Could sections please be prepared along the line of the proposed Sacrewell Farm entrance private way showing the relationship both along the length and across the width.</p> <p>The length should be, at the south, from the proposed junction with the new link to 10m beyond the tie in at the northern end.</p> <p>There should be at least four cross-sections north of the proposed underbridge, and these should be from</p>	The Engineering Drawings and Sections have been updated to address this request and have been provided at Deadline 2 ( <b>TR010039/APP/2.5 Rev 1</b> ).

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		at least 10m to the west of the edge of the proposed cutting to 10m to the east of the existing right of way.	
		Could any necessary changes please be made to the extent of the cutting as shown on the plans? Given the shape of the existing landform there are doubts as to whether the consistent nature as shown is accurate.	The extent of the cutting shown on the General Arrangement Plans ( <b>TR010039/APP/2.6 Rev 1</b> ) has been amended and provided at Deadline 2.
1.0.8	The Applicant	<b>Rights of Way and Access Plans</b> a) Key has Schedule X and Y – please amend.	The Rights of Way and Access Plans have been amended to address this request and have been provided at Deadline 2 ( <b>TR010039/APP/2.4 Rev 2</b> ).
		b) Some drawings are titled “Rights of Way and Access Plans” and other “Public Rights of Way and Access Plans” – is there a reason for this or should/ can this please be made consistent?	The plans have been amended to address this inconsistency and have been provided at Deadline 2 ( <b>TR010039/APP/2.4 Rev 2</b> ).
1.0.9	The Applicant	<b>Environmental Masterplan</b> Each of the seven sheets contained within the Environmental Masterplan [AS021] is titled “Confidential Badger Report Environmental Masterplan Sheet [X] of 7”. Could this please be amended as appropriate.	This was an error, and the correct Environmental Masterplan ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.8 Rev1</b> ) has been provided at Deadline 2.
1.0.10	The Applicant	<b>Site Area</b> Could the Applicant please set out the Application site area: Table 4.3 of Appendix 9.2 [APP117], Table 9-10 of Chapter 9 of the ES [APP047] and paragraph 4.1.2 of the Statement of Reasons [APP020] all give different figures (although those in the Table 9-10	Table 9-10 of ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 2</b> ) is now consistent with Table 4.3 of the updated ES Appendix 9.2 Agricultural Land Classification Report ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.3 Rev 1</b> ) provided at Deadline 2).



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		and the Statement of Reasons are similar).	<p>At the time of the ALC survey (September 2020) a larger study area was used (hence the figure of 103.1ha in Table 4.3 originally), however the scheme was subsequently refined. ES Appendix 9.2 Agricultural Land Classification Report (<b>TR010039/APP/6.3 Rev 1</b>) now includes, in Table 4.3, the results for the Scheme as submitted and also includes, in Annex 2 Map 1 the submitted Scheme area.</p> <p>The site area is as per the Statement of Reasons (<b>APP-020</b>) – 71.07ha.</p> <p>Table 9-10 of ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 2</b>) gives a figure of 71.1ha due to rounding up from 71.07ha.</p>
1.0.11	The Applicant	<p><b>Construction Period</b> Section 2.6 of Chapter 2 of the ES [AS-013] indicates that construction is expected to take approximately 16 months, to be carried out in phases as set out in Table 2-3 and is scheduled to start in March 2023. However, the EMP indicates that construction is anticipated to take 18 months. The approximate programme time for Phase 5 (construction of A1 alternative access to properties) also differs to that presented in Chapter 2 of the ES Table 2-3. Please can the Applicant clarify these points and confirm the basis on which the assessments in the ES were made.</p>	<p>The reference to 16 months in ES Chapter 2 The Proposed Scheme (<b>AS-012</b>) Section 2.6.7 is an error and should be 18 months, this Chapter has been updated and submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 2</b>). This is consistent with Phase 6 in Table 2-3 which shows Compound Removal in month 18.</p> <p>The programme time for Phase 5 is approximately 3 months.</p> <p>The ES assessments have been made on the basis of an 18 month construction programme.</p> <p>The construction phase programme will be refined in 2022, with continued reference to the phases and durations set out in the EMP.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.0.12	The Applicant	<p><b>Application Documents Tracker</b>            Could the Applicant please check the list of documents in the Application Documents Tracker. The current version [AS002] has errors, for example Chapter 8 of the ES which was superseded in July 2021 is still shown as the original.</p> <p>The Application Documents Tracker document only should be kept in "tracked changes" from the original submitted with the application [APP003] rather than being amended incrementally.</p>	<p>A Guide to the Application (<b>REP1-007</b>) which supersedes the Application Document Tracker was submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>The Guide to the Application document has been updated for Deadline 2 (clean and tracked changes versions) (<b>TR010039/EXAM/9.1 Rev 1</b>).</p>
1.0.13	The Applicant	<p><b>National Planning Policy Framework</b>            The Framework was revised in July 2021 after the submission of the application. Could the Applicant please set out in a schedule any changes that it considers material, along with a response.</p>	<p>None of the changes to the NPPF in the July 2021 revision are material to the Scheme, as there has been no amendment to NPPF paragraph 5 which notes that the NPPF does not contain specific policies for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs). The NPPF remains an important and relevant consideration.</p> <p>Some of the changes to the NPPF are considered nevertheless to be relevant. Among the key changes to the NPPF are updated policies aiming to improve the design of new developments, in response to the findings of the government's Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>changes to the overarching social objective of the planning system (paragraph 8b) to include the fostering of "well-designed, beautiful and safe places". The old version had merely required "a well-designed and safe built environment".</li> </ul>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>introducing a new test that development should be well-designed (paragraph 133). This says that "development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes".</li> <li>the test goes on to say that "significant weight" should be given to "development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes". Significant weight should also be given to "outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area", the new paragraph 133 says.</li> </ul> <p>Ongoing stakeholder engagement has been taken into account as the design of the Scheme has developed.</p> <p>The Scheme lies adjacent to the River Nene and the Nene Valley, the landscape setting and the river valley has been considered throughout the development of the Scheme. For instance, after reviewing the feedback from statutory consultation the Scheme was moved away from the Nene Valley and moved as close as possible to the southern edge of the existing A47 at the eastern end of the Scheme in order to protect the Nene Valley, as highlighted in the Case for the Scheme (<b>AS-022</b>). Where the Nene Valley is</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>impacted, the ecological impacts are mitigated where possible, as shown in ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (<b>AS-015</b>).</p> <p>Paragraph 7 in the section on "Achieving sustainable development" states that "the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development". It now adds: "At a similarly high level, members of the United Nations – including the United Kingdom – have agreed to pursue the 17 Global Goals for Sustainable Development in the period to 2030. These address social progress, economic well-being and environmental protection."</p> <p>Where unavoidable impacts are generated by the construction or operation of the Scheme it is demonstrated that the substantial and long-lasting transportation, economic and community benefits to the public, will outweigh any post mitigation local impacts. Dualling of this section of the A47 will contribute to sustainable economic growth. The Scheme will provide additional capacity and improved journey times underpinning sustainable economic growth in the local and wider areas, supporting opportunities for employment and housing, as set out in the Case for the Scheme (<b>AS-022</b>).</p>
1.0.14	PCC HDC	<p><b>Development Plan</b></p> <p>a) Could PCC and HDC please provide respectively a copy of the Peterborough Local Plan and the Huntingdonshire Local Plan which may affect consideration of the Proposed Development, along with appropriate extracts and key from the policies map?</p>	

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		b) Could PDC and HDC indicate any parts of their Plan which they consider to be of particular relevance to the consideration of the Proposed Development?	
		c) Is either Local Plan subject to review?	
		d) If so, at what stage has it reached?	
		e) Does any emerging Local Plan review have any implications for the Proposed Development?	
1.0.15	The Applicant PCC CCC	<p><b>Development Plan</b> The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Minerals and Waste Plan was adopted on 28 July 2021. Are there any implications of this for the consideration of the Proposed Development?</p>	<p>The policies of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Minerals and Waste Plan have been reviewed.</p> <p>The Scheme passes through a Sand and Gravel Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) and a Limestone MSA. ES Appendix 10.3 Mineral Impact Assessment (<b>APP-122</b>) considers the MSAs which intersect the Scheme and identifies that proven mineral resources will not be needlessly sterilised by the development (see Section 10.7)</p>
1.0.16	PCC Parish Councils	<p><b>Neighbourhood Plans</b> a) Could PCC and the Parish Councils please provide details of any designated Neighbourhood planning areas, along with current details of progress towards any such Neighbourhood Plans being made.</p>	

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>b) Where Neighbourhood Plans have been made, published for consultation, or later, purposes could copies please be provided, along with any relevant documents, such as Examining Authority Reports.</p>	
1.0.17	The Applicant	<p><b>Equality Impact Assessment</b> [APP147]</p> <p>a) What evidence is there that the consultation has involved stakeholders for those representing those with protected characteristics by each protected characteristic?</p>	<p>The Consultation Report (<b>AS-011</b>) and supporting annexes provide evidence of the consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>This included online information, public events and targeted consultation with local and regionally based groups and individuals.</p> <p>All venues used for consultation events were chosen to be compliant with the Equality Act 2010.</p> <p>To support the participation of hard-to-reach groups in the consultation, copies of consultation materials were available in alternative, accessible formats on request.</p> <p>This approach provided opportunity for protected characteristic groups (PCG) to provide input.</p> <p>Stakeholders have not raised concerns in terms of actual, perceived or potential discrimination against the PCG.</p>
		<p>b) In relation to the protected characteristic of religion or belief, while it is noted that there are eight churches in the area no information on</p>	<p>The denomination of the churches in the area was not considered to change the level of significance identified in the assessment. On that basis, the Applicant has not collected, and cannot provide, information on</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		denomination has been provided. Can this please be provided?	denomination.
		c) For each denomination could the Applicant please identify how many are ministered together, with a plan identifying these?	See response to Q1.0.17 (b) above.  This detail is not considered as part of the Equality Impact Assessment. This is not included as part of the baseline and would not change the conclusions of the assessment.
		d) Could the Applicant please ascertain any differences in distances which would be required to travel between individual places of worship within any single denomination and/or benefice if the Proposed Development were to be operational.	The methodology to assess impacts from the Scheme resulting in a change of distance to/from community assets is set out in section 12.4 of ES Chapter 12 Population and human health ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b> ). This is in line with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 112.  The denomination of individual places of worship is not however considered.  This assessment in ES Chapter 12 has informed the EqIA.
		e) In relation to the protected characteristic of age – older people - it is indicated that journey length will increase from the east for accessing the Castor Lodge Care Home. Could this please be quantified?	This text was included in error and no increase in journey length is anticipated from the east, due to the Scheme, to the Castor Lodge Care Home.  The EqIA report has been updated accordingly and submitted at Deadline 2 ( <b>TR0100339/APP/7.7 Rev 2</b> ).
		f) In relation to the protected characteristic of age – young people - could the Applicant please assess the effect of the Proposed Development on travel distance to places of education,	The methodology to assess impacts on receptors, including education facilities and the local community as a result of the Scheme is set out in section 12.4 of ES Chapter 12 Population and human health

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>particularly in respect of those living to the north of the Proposed Development?</p>	<p>(TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1). This is in line with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 112.</p> <p>This assessment has informed the EqIA.</p>
1.0.18	The Applicant	<p><b>Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The ExA understands that following recent changes to DMRB the Applicant utilises a single EMP rather than different titles during application, construction and operational phases, but instead uses "iterations".</p> <p>However, the use of this term introduces an unnecessary level of complication which does not seem to take account of the fact that several versions of the 'first iteration EMP' might emerge prior to the Examination's close (see, for example, ExQ 1.7.7), while the second iteration EMP could also be subject to significant revision.</p> <p>The dDCO relies upon mechanisms to relating to first, second and third iterations of the Environmental Management Plan.</p> <p>The drafting of the dDCO would be a lot clearer if 'iterations' were dispensed with and references were made to an 'outline EMP' and 'the EMP'. If outline EMP and the EMP were to be used this would not preclude the EMP evolving as a 'live document', as may be necessary, during the Examination and following any DCO being made.</p>	<p>Th EMP (TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2) has been written and referred to in accordance with the DMRB standard (LA112). This approach is consistent with other recent submissions by National Highways.</p> <p>The Applicant is not able to change the terminology used for this Scheme but has reported the ExA's concerns internally.</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.0.19	The Applicant	<p><b>Consent/licences/permits</b>            Table 1.6 of the EMP [AS027] identifies the consents and permissions that “may be required to deliver the EMP”, to which references are made in the ES (and HRA report). Please can the Applicant provide an update on progress with applications or shadow applications for the required consents/ licences/ permits.</p>	<p>The Applicant provided an oral update at ISH1, which is set out in Ref 30 of the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1 (<b>REP1-011</b>). At present, there are no further updates on progress.</p>
1.0.20	The Applicant	<p><b>Overall design</b>            Could the Applicant please explain how the proposal was drawn up to take account of “Design Principles for National Infrastructure” published by the National Infrastructure Commission.</p>	<p>The design was developed by a professional and independent engineering design consultancy employed by the Applicant.</p> <p>The design applied industry approved standards and has been developed in accordance with the following ten principles of good road design, as set out in Highways England's Corporate report 'The Road to Good Design'.</p> <p>Good road design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• makes roads safe and useful</li> <li>• is inclusive</li> <li>• makes roads understandable</li> <li>• fits in context</li> <li>• is restrained</li> <li>• is environmentally sustainable</li> <li>• is thorough</li> <li>• is innovative</li> <li>• is collaborative</li> <li>• is long lasting</li> </ul> <p><b>Annex C - Design Principles (TR010039/EXAM/9.7)</b></p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>explains how these design principles align with the four "Design Principles for National Infrastructure" published by the National Infrastructure Commission.</p> <p><b>Annex C - Design Principles</b> also describes how the Scheme has considered each of the design principles with examples of how each principle has been applied within the design of the Scheme.</p>
1.0.21	All parties	<p><b>Covid-19 pandemic</b></p> <p>a) Does any party have any view as to whether the Covid-19 pandemic has had any material implication as to how the Proposed Development should be considered?</p> <p>b) If so, they should explain why they hold that view, evidenced where possible.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not believe Covid-19 gives rise to any material implication regarding the Scheme.</p> <p>The traffic modelling and economic appraisal for the Scheme were undertaken in accordance with the Department for Transport (DfT) Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG).</p> <p>No updates have been published by the DfT with regards to the impact on the traffic growth caused by COVID-19. As discussed in the Case for the Scheme (Section 5: Economic Case Overview) (<b>AS-022</b>), in assessing the value for money of the Scheme, the analysis includes high and low growth traffic sensitivity tests. Under the low growth scenarios (which potentially acts as a proxy for uncertainties such as the impact of COVID-19) the Scheme still represents medium value for money.</p>
1.0.22	All parties	<p><b>Environment Act 2021</b></p> <p>All parties are given the opportunity to make comment in light of the passing into law of the Environment Act 2021 in relation to the consideration of the Proposed Development. Any response should</p>	<p>The coming into force of the Environment Act 2021 will not result in any changes to the design, assessment and mitigation proposed for this Scheme. The Act itself does not present any provisions which would cause a change to</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		make reference to those applicable parts of the Act that have come into force, those which come into force on a stated date and those parts which will come in force by Regulation.	the Scheme or its construction or operation as described. However, as secondary legislation is yet to be made, any regulations or procedures made by way of statutory instrument will be reviewed and taken into account only where the time scales are relevant to this Scheme.
1.0.23	Upton Community Council	<p><b>Upton Community Council</b></p> <p>Could the Community Council explain its legal status? Any response should include details of its constitution, membership and objectives along with any criteria for membership or office holding. It would also be useful for details to be made as to decision making processes and how persons are authorised to make representations on its behalf.</p>	
1.1	<b>Air Quality and Emissions</b>		
1.1.1	IPs PCC NNC HDC	<p><b>Affected Road Network</b></p> <p>a) Do IPs, particularly the Councils, agree with the extent of the Affected Road Network as defined by the Applicant?</p> <p>b) If not, could you please explain why you think it should be different, setting out the extent and giving reasons for your position.</p>	
1.1.2	IPs PCC NNC HDC	<p><b>Risk of Poor Air Quality</b></p> <p>a) Do IPs, particularly the Councils, agree with the Applicant (paragraph 5.4.10 of Chapter 5 of the ES [APP043]) that where the PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations are lower than the threshold, it can be assumed there is no risk of the PM<sub>2.5</sub></p>	

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>threshold being exceeded and consequently, there is no need to model PM<sub>2.5</sub>?</p> <p>b) If you do not agree, please explain why you take the view that you do, and what implications this may have.</p>	
1.1.3	IPs PCC NNC HDC	<p><b>Air Quality Assessment</b></p> <p>a) Do the IPs, particularly the Councils, agree with the Applicant's assumptions set out in paragraph 5.4.18 of Chapter 5 of the ES [APP043] in relation to the NO<sub>x</sub> to NO<sub>2</sub> conversion and the use of "All other urban UK traffic" for modelling purposes?</p> <p>If you do not agree, please explain why you take the point of view that you do, what, if any alternative model you would use, and what implications this may have.</p>	
1.1.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Air Quality Assessment</b></p> <p>a) Paragraph 5.7.10 of Chapter 5 of the ES [APP043] indicates that a six-month NO<sub>2</sub> survey was undertaken from September 2019 to March 2020. Could the precise dates of this be provided?</p>	The diffusion tubes were deployed from 4 September 2019 through to 5 March 2020.
		<p>b) Should any adjustment be included for the early effects of the Covid-19 pandemic on these results?</p>	This assessment was completed before the Covid-19 pandemic lockdowns and therefore an adjustment is not required.
		<p>c) If so, what implications does this have?</p>	No response required.

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.1.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Receptors</b> Table 5.14 in Chapter 5 of the ES [APP043] sets out various modelled receptor results for various locations shown in Figure 5.4 [APP057]. Table 5.14 includes Receptor ID R_11. However, this is not shown on Figure 5.4. Could this please be rectified, or an explanation given as to why it is not on the Figure?</p>	<p>This was an error. ES Figure 5.4 (formerly APP-057) has been amended and submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/6.3 Rev 1</b>).</p>
1.1.6	The Applicant	<p><b>Receptors</b> Table 5.16 in Chapter 5 of the ES [APP043] the last Transect receptor ID is given as "1_SH_SSSI_1". Could it please be confirmed that this should be "Sutton Heath and Bog".</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this is the transect ID for Sutton Heath and Bog. Table 5.15 in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (<b>APP-043</b>) references the 4 designated habitats assessed in the air quality assessment. Table 5.16 provides the transect IDs in the order each designated habitat has been listed.</p>
1.1.7	The Applicant	<p><b>Receptors</b> a) Table 5.17 in Chapter 5 of the ES [APP043] sets out a list of Transect receptor IDs in the form "1_SH_SSSI_X". Could the details of the locations of all these please be identified or do they all relate to Sutton Heath and Bog.</p>	<p>These transect IDs all relate to Sutton Heath and Bog.</p>
		<p>b) If so, could the locations be identified on a Figure.</p>	<p>ES Figure 5.8 (<b>APP-057</b>) shows the location of the Sutton Heath and Bog ecological transect.</p>
		<p>c) Assuming that they are all within Sutton Heath and Bog, could this Figure also show a line 40m from proposed road alignment.</p>	<p>An ecological transect modelled for air quality purposes is a series of points spaced 10m apart in distance, up to a maximum of 200m altogether. This transect begins at the edge of a designated ecological site which is closest to the modelled road, with the ecological points being spaced</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>10m apart further into the site. This transect is perpendicular to the road.</p> <p>In relation to the Sutton Heath and Bog ecological transect and its results, it is the first four transect points (which equate to a distance of 40m into the SSSI starting from the edge of the SSSI which is closest to the road) which resulted in a change in NOx deposition being greater than 1% of the critical load of that site with the Scheme in operation (this assessment criteria is outlined in the methodology section and is in line with LA105).</p>
1.1.8	The Applicant IPs	<p><b>Air Quality Assessment</b></p> <p>a) Do the Government's policy statements 'Decarbonising transport: a better, greener Britain' and 'Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener' have any implications for the air quality assessment on the basis that this would result in an increase in electric vehicles rather than those powered by internal combustion engines, as electric vehicles do not emit gases of combustion?</p>	<p>Please see the answer to Question 1.1.14 below for information on the Government's policy statements on Decarbonising transport and the Net Zero Strategy. In terms of air quality, they will result in similar or lower emissions to air. It is not possible to quantify these effects for the ES but as the Government strategies will result in lower emissions of gases from combustion than those used in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (<b>APP-043</b>), the assessment presented is based on the worst-case scenario</p>
		<p>b) If so, what would be the resultant effects?</p>	<p>See the response to 1.1.8 (a) above.</p>
1.1.9	The Applicant	<p><b>WHO Standards</b></p> <p>In September 2021 the World Health Organisation published new Global Air Quality Guidelines.</p> <p>Could the Applicant please set out their response to these guideline standards, setting out any implications that this may have for the consideration</p>	<p>The September 2021 guidelines published by the World Health Organisation have yet to be incorporated into the regulatory and policy framework for air quality in England and so do not have implications for the consideration of the Scheme.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		of this Proposed Development.	
1.1.10	The Applicant PCC	<p><b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change adaption</b></p> <p>With respect to greenhouse gas emissions, the cumulative impact assessment that the Applicant has undertaken is limited. At paragraph 14.8.9 of the Chapter 14 of the ES [APP052] it is predicted that the Proposed Development would contribute 0.0078% to the UK's fourth, fifth and sixth Carbon Budgets.</p> <p>However, the Proposed Development has been assessed in isolation from any in combination effects associated with the implementation of projects forming part of the Road Improvement Strategy. While the Proposed Development of itself may have a limited effect on greenhouse gas emissions, this Scheme when taken with others might '... have a material effect on the ability of the Government to meet its carbon reduction targets' (paragraph 5.18 of the NPSNN).</p>	Please refer to <b>Annex D - Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change Adaption (TR010039/EXAM/9.7)</b> .
		<p>In light of the quashing of the A38 Derby Junctions DCO by the High Court, further representations are requested on the following matters:</p> <p>a) the carbon impact of the development; the implications, if any, of the development in relation to the Paris Agreement and the UK's nationally-determined contribution under the Paris Agreement, the 2050 net zero target in the</p>	Please refer to <b>Annex D - Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change Adaption (TR010039/EXAM/9.7)</b> .

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>Climate Change Act 2008, and carbon budgets set under the 2008 Act (including the sixth carbon budget as set out in the Carbon Budget Order 2021); and, whether the increase in carbon emissions resulting from the development is so significant that it would have a material impact on the ability of the Government to meet its carbon reduction targets;</p> <p>b) the direct, indirect and cumulative likely significant effects of the development on climate, including greenhouse gas emissions and climate change adaptation, in light of the requirements set out in the EIA Regulations and in light of paragraphs 5.17 and 5.18 of the NPSNN.</p> <p>The Assessment should provide (or, to the extent that it has already been provided, identify) its assessment of the cumulative effects of Greenhouse Gas emissions from the Scheme with other existing and/or approved projects on a local, regional and national level on a consistent geographical scale (for example an assessment of the cumulative effects of the Road Investment Strategy RIS 1 and RIS 2 at a national level). This should: take account of both construction and operational effects; identify the baseline used at each local, regional and national level; and identify any relevant local, regional or national targets and/or budgets where they exist (as set out) It should be accompanied by reasoning to explain the methodology adopted, any likely</p>	



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>significant effects identified, any difficulties encountered in compiling the information, and how the assessment complies with the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations.</p>	
1.1.11	The Applicant	<p><b>Emissions from construction activity</b> Paragraph 14.5.1 of Chapter 14 of the ES [APP052] sets out that plant emissions have only been included for site clearance, earthworks and drainage for the purposes of this environmental assessment.</p> <p>a) Can the Applicant please explain why the remaining emissions cannot be at least estimated given the assumptions as to the vehicles to be used as set out in Appendix 11.5 – Construction noise assessment [APP127]?</p>	<p>Carbon emissions associated with plant require information based on the type of plant, time operating and fuel consumption. Assumptions on plant type have been made for the Construction Noise Assessment (as set out in ES Appendix 11.5 Construction noise assessment (<b>APP-127</b>)), however this information would not be sufficient to undertake a carbon emissions assessment for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) The ‘% on time’ has been estimated based on the precautionary approach to ensure that the longest time the machinery would be running in a day is accounted. Whilst this gives a worst case for the noise assessment, this would not produce an accurate assessment of how long each vehicle would be operating during a typical day to calculate emissions.</p> <p>2) The data represents a typical worst-case day. As such, this does not provide the level of information of how often each piece of plant or machinery would be used over the Scheme’s construction phase. It would not be accurate to assume that each machine would be operating to the ‘% of time’ levels every day of the Scheme’s construction phase.</p> <p>3) Assumptions in ES Appendix 11.5 Construction</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>noise assessment (<b>APP-127</b>) are based on sound data which is provided in look-up tables in BS 5228-1:2009 (Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites - Noise). This provides data specific to noise assessments based on the type of plant and its power and/or weight. It doesn't provide any data on fuel consumption.</p> <p>Although variation from project-to-project, the emissions from plant that have been included (Site Clearance, Earthworks and Drainage) would typically be the largest sources of plant emissions. As such, including these with the materials and TA (<b>TR010039/APP/7.3 Rev 2</b>) captures the majority of construction emissions. As stated within ES Appendix 14.1 Embodied Carbon Report (<b>APP-133</b>), it would not be expected that plant emissions from other sources would materially influence the carbon estimates for construction.</p>
		<p>b) If this reasonably allows such emissions to be estimated during the remaining construction phases beyond site clearance, earthworks and drainage, could this please be undertaken, and any implications reported for the overall analysis?</p>	<p>Please refer to response in 1.1.11 (a).</p>
		<p>c) In light of this, is it possible to undertake a plant fuel use analysis (including that associated with the replacement of the wearing surface course)? If so, could this please be undertaken.</p>	<p>Please refer to response in 1.1.11 (a).</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		d) If this assumption, referred to in question EXQ <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> a), does not allow such an estimation can this please be explained?	Please refer to response in 1.1.11 (a).
		e) Please also provide an analysis in the light of your response to ExQ <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b>	Please refer to response in 1.1.11 (a).
1.1.12	PCC IPs	<p><b>Emissions from maintenance activity</b></p> <p>a) The Applicant considers in paragraph 14.5.2 of the ES [APP127] that including carbon emissions from future activities beyond the replacement of the wearing surface course due to inherent uncertainty over frequency and extent. Do IPs consider that a reasonable approach?</p> <p>b) If not, what approach should be followed, and does the respondent have any information which could assist that assessment?</p>	
1.1.13	The Applicant	<p><b>Relationship to East Midlands Region</b></p> <p>Given the proximity of the application site to the East Midlands climate district, could the Applicant undertake a sensitivity analysis if the regional climate data for that region were to be used rather than that for Eastern England, and implications from that be reported.</p>	A review has been undertaken to understand what, if any, changes there would be between the 'East of England' and 'East Midlands' using the Met Office's UKCP18 Climate Projections. Following the same method as was used to determine the probabilistic projections used in ES Chapter 14 Climate ( <b>APP-052</b> ) (projection of 2080s under RCP8.5 at the 50th percentile), it is expected that the assessment given in Table 14-8 ( <b>APP-052</b> ) for 'East of England' would be the same as for 'East Midlands'. As such, there are no further implications from those already reported.

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.1.14	The Applicant	<p><b>Decarbonisation of transport - Emissions</b></p> <p>a) Do the Government's policy statements 'Decarbonising transport: a better, greener Britain' and 'Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener' have any implications for the emissions assessment on the basis that this would result in an increase in electric vehicles rather than those powered by internal combustion engines, as electric vehicles do not emit gases of combustion?</p>	<p>The DfT's Transport Decarbonisation Plan was published in July 2021. The plan outlines a number of commitments by the Government to remove all emissions from road transport to achieve net zero target by 2050. Commitments that will have a direct impact on road user emissions from the Scheme will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An end to the sale of new petrol and diesel cars and vans by 2030</li> <li>• All new cars and vans to zero emissions at the tailpipe by 2035</li> <li>• All new L-category vehicles to be fully zero emissions at the tailpipe by 2035</li> <li>• The end of the sale of all non-zero emissions HGVs by 2040</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the Government is providing support for at least 4,000 zero emission buses and has committed to holding a consultation on a date to end the sale of new non-zero emissions motorbikes.</p> <p>The Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener was published in October 2021 and sets out the next steps to be taken to cut carbon emissions in order to meet the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033 – 2037) and also the UK's 2030 Nationally Determined Contribution for the purposes of the Paris Agreement on Climate Change (described in the Technical Appendix to the Net Zero Strategy publication at pp 309 – 310). This also references the DfT's Transport Decarbonisation Plan.</p> <p>The assessment used to calculate end-user emissions has used expected emissions in 2040 and extended this to the</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>end of the appraisal period (2085). As such, the expected increase in electric vehicles aligned to the Government's strategy would significantly reduce end-user emissions from those presented.</p> <p>The assessment has used the vehicle fleet mix from the DfT's WebTAG data book. This is considered industry best practice. However, these tables do not currently align to the Government's policy and the predicted uptake in non-combustion vehicles is lower than would be required to meet the Government's targets. This also suggests that the assessment undertaken is an overestimate of end-user emissions.</p>
		b) If so, what would be the resultant effects?	<p>Please see the answer to 1.1.14 (a) above.</p> <p>The expected increase in electric vehicles aligned to the Government's strategy would significantly reduce end-user emissions from those used in ES Chapter 14 Climate (<b>APP-052</b>) so the assessment presented is based on the worst-case scenario.</p>
1.2	Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))		
1.2.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Legal Compliance</b> Regulation 7 of the Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010 requires the SoS to have regard to the United Nations Environmental Programme Convention on Biological Diversity of 1992. Could the Applicant please explain how it considers that the proposal would comply with this obligation.</p>	<p>The planning and regulatory frameworks that apply to the DCO application, including ecological and landscape designations, ensure compliance with obligations placed on the UK Government by the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). This is because relevant provisions of the CBD are incorporated into the decision-making process for the Proposed Scheme, in particular through (1) the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended) (2) the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, section 40, which is mirrored in Regulation 7 of the Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010, (3) the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, sections 41, (4) the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and (5) the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2016 (as amended).</p> <p>As noted in ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (<b>AS-015</b>) section 8.3.1, the assessment has been undertaken in accordance with key legislation and policy.</p> <p>The biodiversity assessment for the Proposed Scheme concluded there would be no likely significant adverse effects. By taking into account the environmental information provided as part of the EIA process by the Applicant, Natural England and others, including members of the public, the Secretary of State and ExA will also have regard to the Convention on Biological Diversity.</p>
1.2.2	The Applicant IPs PCC HDC NNC NE EA	<p><b>Assessment criteria</b> Paragraph 8.4.21 of the ES [AS015] sets out the assessment criteria for biodiversity.</p> <p>a) Given the location of the application site close to the boundary with Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire, the latter being in a different English Region, could the Applicant explain why the relative biodiversity resource importance were not considered in relation to the East</p>	<p>DMRB LA 108 paragraph 3.9 states that baseline studies shall establish the relative importance of the biodiversity resources using the guidance in Table 3.9, which sets out the hierarchy of biodiversity resources that is summarised at paragraph 8.4.21 of ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (<b>AS-015</b>). Note 2 to LA 108 Table 3.9 states that where a biological resource falls into more than one category, the highest value category applies. This ensures that if a) the zone of influence for an ecological receptor spanned different administrative areas and b) the ecological receptor was ascribed a different sensitivity in each area,</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		Midlands Region, and Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire.	<p>then the assessment will attribute to that receptor the highest sensitivity value category.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (<b>AS-015</b>) Table 8.2 sets out the extents considered for each species, which extend up to 30km for bats. As noted in 8.6.2, the zones of influence for each ecological resource have been established through guidance outlined in in CIEEM Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland (CIEEM 2018), DMRB standards LA 108 Biodiversity and professional judgement and are based on ecological and not administrative factors.</p>
		<p>b) Do IPs agree with the Applicant's approach, or do they consider other geographic areas should be considered?</p> <p>c) If IPs consider other geographic areas should be considered, then could they please explain what that area should be and why they hold that view.</p>	
		d) Could the Applicant please undertake a sensitivity analysis on the assessment based on comparisons with the East Midlands Region, and Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire.	<p>The application of the DMRB LA 108 methodology would ensure that, in the event that neighbouring administrative authorities valued a particular ecological receptor differently, then the value ascribed to that receptor in the ES assessment would be the higher of the sensitivity values.</p> <p>Within ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (<b>AS-015</b>) all potentially significant impacts are given a geographical scale (see Table 8-2). Where study areas extend beyond local or regional this is stated within the geographical context. As noted in 1.2.1 above, the assessment has also followed</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>CIEEM Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland (CIEEM 2018).</p> <p>The Applicant therefore does not believe a sensitivity analysis is required.</p>
1.2.3	The Applicant IPs	<p><b>Surveys</b></p> <p>a) Table 8-3 in Chapter 8 of the ES [AS-015] indicates that a number of the ecological surveys that were undertaken are three or more years old. Please can the Applicant explain why it considers the surveys remain current and whether the age of the survey data introduces any uncertainty into the biodiversity assessment?</p>	<p>The survey information was current at time of chapter preparation. As the assessment has assumed the presence of species, the worst case approach has been adopted and further surveys will be confirmatory rather than capable of changing assessment findings. These surveys are being updated in the appropriate ecological windows. Where survey results are available prior to the close of the Examination an update will be provided to the environmental information. Prior to commencement of construction surveys will be updated as appropriate and will inform detailed design.</p>
		<p>b) Do any IPs consider that any of the surveys are no longer current? If so, could these please be specifically identified, with a reason given for the view held.</p>	
1.2.4	The Applicant NE	<p><b>Surveys</b></p> <p>Appendix A - Table of consents and agreements of the Consents and Agreements Position Statement [APP-018] indicates that further surveys for great crested newts, bats, badgers and water voles will be undertaken. Similarly, paragraph 8.5.3 of Chapter 8 of the ES [AS015] indicates the Applicant intended to undertake eDNA surveys of the ponds that could</p>	<p>Please refer to response 1.2.3 (a) above.</p> <p>These surveys are currently ongoing and are being undertaken at appropriate times of year for individual species.</p> <p>Bat hibernation surveys are currently ongoing, the results of these are therefore not ready. Great crested newt, badger and water vole surveys will be undertaken in the</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>not be accessed in 2020.</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please set out whether these have now been done, and if so, report the results with an assessment of any implications.</p>	<p>coming months.</p>
		<p>b) If not, could details of when all the surveys will be undertaken be provided and when the results will be delivered?</p>	<p>The programme for upcoming surveys is currently being determined and an update will be provided at a later deadline.</p>
		<p>c) If not, how can the SoS be satisfied that species and habitats are protected from the adverse effects of the Proposed Development (see paragraph 5.35 of the NPSNN)?</p>	<p>Further surveys are confirmatory. The results of the assessment presented in the ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (<b>AS-015</b>) will not change as a 'worst case' approach has been adopted and species have been assumed to be present.</p> <p>Draft licences for protected species are currently being agreed with Natural England.</p>
		<p>b) Does NE have any comments on the final assessment approach and whether there are any 'gaps' in surveys, and if so, how they are to be filled?</p>	
1.2.5	<p>PCC NE CCC HDC NNC</p>	<p><b>Biodiversity Zones of Influence</b></p> <p>a) Do IPs consider the Zones of Influence set out in Table 8-2 of Chapter 8 of the ES [AS015] for biodiversity resources are appropriate?</p> <p>b) If not, could you please explain which ones you consider to be unsuitable giving a full explanation for your views.</p>	

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.2.6	IPs	<p><b>Construction and operational impacts on ecology</b></p> <p>a) Do IPs agree with the Applicant's assessment of impacts during both construction and operation as set out in Tables 8-9 and 8-10 of Chapter 8 of the ES [AS015]?</p> <p>b) If not, could you explain why not and what needs to be amended?</p>	
1.2.7	IPs	<p><b>Construction and operational ecological mitigation</b></p> <p>a) Do IPs agree that the Applicant's approach to ecological design and mitigation measures during construction and operation as set out in Tables 8-11 and 8-12 of Chapter 8 of the ES [AS015] are appropriate?</p> <p>b) If not, could you explain why not and what needs to be amended?</p>	
1.2.8	The Applicant	<p><b>Sutton Heath and Bog</b></p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please provide further information on the work that has been done to determine the location and distribution of qualifying features of the SSSI that are sensitive to nitrogen deposition so as to demonstrate that there would be no significant effect on the SSSI?</p>	<p>There are no significant effects on the SSSI. A 200m buffer from triggered links was used to identify ecological sites sensitive to nitrogen deposition.</p> <p>A triggered link is a road link which meets the traffic screening criteria set out in the DMRB LA 105 guidance – i.e. it experiences an increase/decrease in AADT traffic flow by 1000 vehicles or 200 HGV with the Scheme in place.</p>
		b) Could the Applicant set out the measures to be	The modelled air quality transect has shown an impact on

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>used for mitigation and monitoring of air quality impacts on Sutton Heath and Bog SSSI and how they are to be secured.</p>	<p>nitrogen deposition 40m north of the proposed alignment at Station House. The assessment has confirmed that the habitat 40m into the SSSI is largely deciduous woodland containing species which are not sensitive to nitrogen deposition. Therefore, any significant impacts on Sutton Heath and Bog SSSI were ruled out. With significant impacts ruled out, no mitigation or air quality monitoring is required.</p>
1.2.9	The Applicant	<p><b>Ancient woodland</b>            Figures 8.2 to 8.3 [APP072] set out various ecological constraints. However, ancient woodland is not included. Please can the Applicant provide a plan that identifies the location of the ancient woodland that was assessed in the ES? This can either be an amendment to Figure 8.2 or an additional plan.</p>	<p>The location of ancient woodland is shown on ES Figure 5.5 Ecological Designated Habitats (<b>APP-057</b>).</p>
1.2.10	The Applicant	<p><b>Felling of trees</b>            To fully assess the Proposed Development the need for the felling of trees should have been identified. However, in Appendix A to the Consents and Agreements Position Statement [APP018] it is stated that there is insufficient detail of the design in relation to the felling of trees to ascertain whether a Felling Licence under the Forestry Act will be required.</p> <p>Could the Applicant please undertake an analysis so that the decision can be properly informed in respect of biodiversity and ecology?</p>	<p>The Applicant will consider the Consents and Agreements Position Statement (<b>APP-018</b>) further and come to a definitive view on whether a felling licence will be required and will provide a further version of APP-018 at Deadline 3</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.2.11	The Applicant	<p><b>Veteran Tree (T20)</b> Appendix 4: Tree Survey Schedule to Appendix 7.6 of the ES [APP096] indicates that the oak tree identified as T20 is a veteran tree and is identified for felling.</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please explain why it has come to the view that this is a veteran tree?</p>	<p>At this stage T20 is considered to be a veteran tree on the following basis:</p> <p>It has a stem diameter calculated at 1400mm giving a girth of 4.4m which is considered to be large and very much getting close to be a Veteran tree. The Applicant has therefore provided a 'worst case scenario' and currently considers this to be a veteran tree.</p> <p>Further arboricultural surveys will be undertaken at detailed design (secured through LV3 in the REAC) which will include the collection of further detail such as the condition/ features throughout the crown of the tree or its stem, deadwood, cavities, water pockets or fungal fruiting bodies. Once this information is available, the status of T20 will be confirmed as either veteran or Locally notable. A revised ES Appendix 7.6 Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/6.3 Rev 1</b>).</p>
		<p>Paragraph 5.32 of the NPSNN indicates that the SoS should not grant development consent for any development that would result in the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the national need for and benefits of the development, in that location, clearly outweigh the loss. Where such trees would be affected by development proposals, the applicant should set out proposals for their conservation or, where their loss is unavoidable, the reasons for this.</p> <p>b) Could the Applicant please set out its reasons for</p>	<p>To accord with the NPSNN Paragraph 5.32, the reason for removal is set out below: The removal of T20 is unavoidable and necessary due to it being located within the footprint of the Scheme as shown in ES Appendix 7.6 Arboricultural Impact Assessment (<b>TR010039/APP/6.3 Rev 1</b>) Plan 5/9.</p> <p>Compensation has been provided as part of the planting proposals shown in the Environmental Masterplan (<b>TR010039/APP/6.8 Rev 1</b>).</p> <p>The NPPF does note exceptions to the refusal of consent</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		the felling of this tree, the options assessed for its retention and the compensation proposed?	to remove veteran trees – <i>“For example, infrastructure projects (including nationally significant infrastructure projects, orders under the Transport and Works Act and hybrid bills), where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat.”</i>
1.2.12	The Applicant	<p><b>Hedgerows</b> In its RR [RR036] PCC indicates it considers that the translocation of hedges should be considered as compensation rather than mitigation, hedges which have been identified to be translocated should be risk assessed for the potential of failure after translocation and any potential for failure of translocation should have a backup plan for replacement of the habitat appropriate to the potential loss of hedge.</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please respond to this view and request, indicating how any measures would be secured?</p>	<p>Translocation of the hedgerow is referred to as mitigation as the hedgerow is not being replaced, it is being moved.</p> <p>REAC Commitment BD3 within the EMP has been updated to include the need for a risk assessment where translocation occurs. The revised EMP (<b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b>) has been submitted at Deadline 2. The EMP is secured by Requirement 4 to the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>).</p>
		b) Could the Applicant also respond to the request from PCC for additional tree planting in various hedgerows and alternative species as set out in PCC's RR [RR036]?	<p>The requests raised by PCC are a matter of detailed landscape design and would not alter the levels of residual landscape and visual effects reported in ES Chapter 7 Landscape and visual effects (<b>APP-045</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant is continuing to engage with PCC and is hoping to deal with this matter through the SoCG.</p> <p>PCC will be consulted as part of the Stage 5 Detailed Design (see Requirement 3 of the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>)).</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.2.13	The Applicant	<p><b>Future Baseline</b>            ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity [AS015] Section 8.7, identifies the existing baseline conditions. Please can the Applicant explain how the future baseline has been considered in the assessments on the basis of the absence of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>The future biodiversity baseline was established through review of documents as listed in ES Appendix 8.17 Legislation and policy framework (<b>APP-115</b>), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peterborough Local Plan Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity (local) (Adopted 2019);</li> <li>• Planning Policy: Peterborough City Council Biodiversity Strategy (Adopted 2018);</li> <li>• Natural Cambridgeshire: Developing with Nature Toolkit;</li> <li>• Local Priority Species (formerly Local Species Action Plans);</li> <li>• Nene Valley Improvement Area.</li> </ul> <p>As these documents set out future visions and objectives for ecological systems and priority species, the future baseline has been considered in the biodiversity assessment.</p>
1.2.14	The Applicant	<p><b>Biodiversity matrix</b>            a) Paragraph 8.4.15 of Chapter 8 of the ES [AS015] indicates that biodiversity net gains and losses have been assessed by using the Defra Biodiversity metric 2.0. Could this assessment please be submitted, along with information on the date when it was undertaken?</p>	<p>The Biodiversity Metric has been provided at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/EXAM/9.8</b>). The assessment was undertaken in April 2021. No updates have been required since that date.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>b) If this was after 9 July 2021 could the Applicant explain why the Defra Biodiversity metric 3.0 was not used?</p>	<p>Defra Metric 2.0 was replaced by 3.0 when the Environment Act 2021 came into force, but it remains subject to variation and is expected to be consulted upon in 2022.</p> <p>To satisfy the requirements of Defra Metric 3.0, additional surveys would be necessary. As Defra Metric 3.0 was published on 7 July 2021 and post-dates the ecological surveys carried out to inform the biodiversity assessment, the scope of these surveys did not extend to capturing and recording the necessary condition information required as input data into the metric.</p>
1.2.15	The Applicant	<p><b>Decarbonisation of transport</b></p> <p>a) Do the Government's policy statements 'Decarbonising transport: a better, greener Britain' and 'Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener' have any implications for the biodiversity assessment on the basis that this would result in an increase in electric vehicles rather than those powered by internal combustion engines, as electric vehicles have a different emissions profile?</p>	<p>Please see the answer to 1.1.14 above for information on the Government's policy statements on Decarbonising transport and the Net Zero Strategy. In terms of biodiversity, they will result in similar or lower emissions to air and may also reduce noise emissions. It is not possible to quantify these effects for the ES but as the Government strategies will result in similar or lower effects on ecological receptors, the biodiversity assessment presented at ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity (<b>AS-015</b>) is based on the worst-case scenario.</p>
		<p>b) If so, what would be the resultant effects?</p>	<p>Please see 1.2.15 (a) above.</p>
1.2.16	The Applicant	<p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment – Clarifications</b></p> <p>a) It is stated below Table C-1 that "The NSN site included within the screening assessment is the River Wensum SAC.". This appears to be erroneous text as this European site was not</p>	<p>An amended Report to Inform a HRA (<b>APP-140</b>) will be submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>a) This error will be removed.</p> <p>b) Table A-1 will be amended to state correct distance.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>considered in the HRA and is not otherwise mentioned in the NSER.</p> <p>b) It is stated in Table A-1: Nene Washes SAC Screening Matrix (DMRB) (page 41) that the SAC is adjacent to the proposed works. This appears to be an error as it is also stated in the same table and throughout the NSER that it is 10km/16.3km away from the Proposed Development, which is reflected on the 'Designated Sites Map' contained in Appendix E of the NSER.</p> <p>Could these please be amended as appropriate.</p>	
1.2.17	The Applicant	<p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment – Clarifications</b></p> <p>Other than a reference to NSER Appendix B (Potential effects) in FN (a) and FN (g) of Table C-2 (The Nene Washes SAC), the FNs to the matrices do not provide cross-references to the location in the application documents (including the NSER) of the supporting evidence. Please can the Applicant provide, in an updated HRA report, explicit cross-references in the screening matrices footnotes to the location in the application documents (including the NSER) of the supporting evidence.</p>	<p>Appendices A-H are referenced throughout the Report to Inform HRA (<b>APP-140</b>) including the screening matrices where appropriate.</p> <p>It is considered that adding further references is not necessary.</p>
		<p>Many of the FNs to the screening matrices are not relevant to and do not address the potential effects identified in the matrices, particularly in respect of the SPA and Ramsar site. For example, FNs (a) and</p>	<p>The Applicant considers the FNs to provide useful supporting information to the screening matrices.</p> <p>The Report to inform the HRA (<b>APP-140</b>) will be updated.</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>(b) to the SPA and Ramsar site screening matrices (Tables C.3 and C-3, respectively) appear to bear no relation to the potential effects in the matrices with which they are meant to correspond.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant correct the footnotes in an updated HRA report.</p>	<p>and the footnotes amended as appropriate. The Report (<b>APP-140</b>) will be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
1.2.18	The Applicant NE EA Anglian Water	<p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment – Rutland Water SPA and Ramsar site</b></p> <p>Paragraph 13.7.13 of Chapter 13 of the ES [AS017] states that there is an Anglian Water pumping station located on the River Nene south of the Proposed Scheme and that water from the River Nene is transferred to Rutland Water, which is located 21km north-west of the Proposed Development. It is also clear that that there would be outfalls from the drainage systems for the Proposed Development which would feed into the River Nene above this intake (see also question ExQ<b>Error! Reference source not found.</b>).</p> <p>a) Given this quote does the Applicant, NE, the EA or Anglian Water consider that the Rutland Water should be considered to be hydrologically connected?</p>	<p>Yes, the Applicant considers Rutland Water to be hydrologically linked.</p>
		<p>b) If the Applicant considers this to be the case, could the Applicant please explain why it considers (top of page 2 of Appendix H of the NSER) that this Proposed Development does not</p>	<p>The drainage strategy for the Scheme provides enhancement in terms of water quality, hence why ES Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (<b>AS-017</b>) concludes no adverse impact (slight beneficial).</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>have a potential hydrological or hydrogeological linkage to a NSN site containing a groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystem which triggers the assessment of NSN sites in accordance with LA 113?</p>	<p>There would be no impact on the water quality of the Nene abstractions or Rutland Water groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystem. The scoping out of Rutland Water from the HRA is therefore correct.</p>
		<p>c) If, on reflection, the Applicant considers that there is a hydrological connection, could the Applicant undertake a screening analysis of potential effects, and if necessary further analysis.</p>	<p>As noted above, the water quality assessment concluded no adverse impacts on the River Nene. As noted in ES Chapter 13 Road Drainage and Water Environment (<b>AS-017</b>) section 13.7.13 water from the River Nene is transferred to Rutland Water, therefore the Rutland Water has already been considered as part of the water quality assessment.</p>
		<p>d) Does NE, the EA or Anglian Water have any comments on the above?</p>	
1.2.19	The Applicant	<p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment – Nene Washes SPA and Nene Washes Ramsar (qualifying features)</b>            Garganey is not identified as a qualifying feature of the Nene Washes SPA in NSER Appendix C Table C.3 (Planning Inspectorate screening matrix), although it is referenced in FN (b) to that matrix and included in NSER Section 3 Table 3-2 (Interest Features).             The qualifying features of the Nene Washes Ramsar site identified in the NSER do not appear to match</p>	<p>Appendix C Table C.3 will be updated to include Garganey and an updated Report to Inform HRA will be submitted at Deadline 3 (<b>TR010039/APP/6.9 Rev 1</b>).</p> <p>The updated Report will also clarify the position of each European site in relation to the qualifying species.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>those listed on the Nene Washes RIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ramsar Criterion 2 is not addressed;</li> <li>• additional features that are not listed in the RIS under Criteria 2 and 6 are identified in NSER Section 3 Table 3-3 (Interest Features), Appendix A Table A-34 (DMRB screening matrix) and Appendix C Table C-3 (Planning Inspectorate screening matrix), ie non-breeding Whooper swan, Eurasian wigeon, Pochard, Eurasian teal, Golden plover and Ruff;</li> <li>• Gadwall and Shoveler are additionally identified in Appendix C Table C-3; and</li> <li>• Garganay are referenced in FN (b) to Table C-3 although they are not listed in the table.</li> </ul> <p>Please can the Applicant clarify the position in respect of each European site and consistently identify the correct qualifying species in an updated HRA report.</p>	
1.2.20	The Applicant	<p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment – Identification of effects</b></p> <p>Paragraph 2.2.10 of the NSER states that additional European sites should be subject to screening where the existence of ecological connectivity between the Proposed Development and European sites is identified beyond the screening criteria set out in paragraph 2.2.8.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant explain how these criteria</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.2.10 of the NSER is a "catch-all" in the event that the application of the screening criteria at 2.2.8 has been applied but subsequent habitat or species specific assessments indicate that other ecological connectivity exists between the project and NSNs. An example of such a connection could arise in the case of a project having a likely significant effect on migrating birds that used NSNs not identified by application of the screening criteria at 2.2.8. No indication of any ecological connectivity between the project and other NSNs was identified during</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>have been applied to exclude sites from consideration.</p>	<p>the assessment and so the "catch all" of 2.2.10 does not need to be applied.</p>
1.2.21	The Applicant	<p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment – Invasive non-native species</b>            The spread of invasive non-native species is identified in NSER Table 4-3 as a potential effect on the Nene Washes Ramsar site, however it is not subsequently discussed in the NSER or included in the Planning Inspectorate screening matrix contained in NSER Appendix C Table C-3.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant confirm whether this was included in error or provide an assessment in an updated HRA report, which is reflected in an updated screening matrix.</p>	<p>An updated Report to Inform HRA (<b>APP-140</b>) will be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
1.2.22	The Applicant	<p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment – Invasive non-native species</b>            The potential effect of invasive non-native species is identified in NSER Table A-1 as a vulnerability for spined loach, the qualifying feature of the Nene Washes SAC. However, this effect is not addressed in the NSER, other than in FN (a) to the screening matrix contained in NSER Appendix C Table C-2. The matrix refers to the prevention of the spread of invasive species through "strict biosecurity measures" set out in NSER Appendix B, however that does not address the issue of invasive species.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant provide a description of the proposed measures in an updated HRA report.</p>	<p>An updated Report to Inform HRA (<b>APP-140</b>) will be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.2.23	The Applicant	<p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment – Visual disturbance</b></p> <p>Visual disturbance is identified as a potential effect on the SPA, and although not identified as a potential effect on the Ramsar site in Table 4-3 it is discussed in the Ramsar site DMRB screening matrix (Table A-34) contained in NSER Appendix A. However, it is not included in the Inspectorate screening matrices for the SPA and Ramsar site contained in NSER Appendix C.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant provide updated screening matrices and any consequential amendments to the HRA report.</p>	<p>The Report to Inform HRA (<b>APP-140</b>) will be updated and submitted at Deadline 3 to ensure clarity regarding visual effects.</p>
1.2.24	The Applicant	<p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment – Updates</b></p> <p>NSER Table A-2 (DMRB Nene Washes SPA Screening Matrix) states that the information presented in the matrices will be updated when more information is available, including receipt of the noise and air quality assessments (e.g. in relation to reduction of habitat area, reduction in species density and interference with the key relationships that define the structure of the site). The same statement is made in Table A-34 in relation to reduction in species density for the Ramsar site.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant confirm whether further updates to the HRA report to address such information are intended, and if so when the updated HRA report will be submitted to the Examination.</p>	<p>The air quality and noise assessments have been provided in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (<b>APP-043</b>) and ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>).</p> <p>The air quality and noise assessments concluded no likely significant effects on the SPA. The updated Report to Inform HRA (<b>APP-140</b>) will be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.2.25	The Applicant	<p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment – Water abstraction and de-watering</b></p> <p>FN (h) to the Nene Washes SAC screening matrix (C-2) refers to a potential need for abstraction from an aquifer and to dewatering, for which consents would be required from the EA. It is concluded that as any abstraction and dewatering would have to be agreed with the EA, and take into account the SAC, there are no likely “foreseeable impacts” to the SAC. This implies that measures may be required to mitigate potential effects of abstraction and dewatering on the SAC, which would be contained in consents yet to be the subject of applications and which are outwith the DCO application. It is not apparent that a precautionary approach has been applied and that the worst case has been considered.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant provide an assessment of the potential effects of abstraction and dewatering on the European sites in an updated HRA report, which identifies mitigation measures that may be required and any residual effects following their implementation.</p>	<p>The ES and Report to Inform HRA (<b>APP-140</b>) have been undertaken on a reasonable worst case basis. In referring to a potential need for abstraction and dewatering in FN (h) the Applicant has taken a precautionary approach and assumed that the Environment Agency would not grant any applications for abstraction licence/ environmental permits if they would have an adverse effect on the SAC. Accordingly, no abstraction or dewatering would be undertaken that affected the SAC and so there is no need to update the Report (<b>APP-140</b>). Clarification will be provided in the updated Report (<b>APP-140</b>) to be provided at Deadline 3.</p>
1.2.25	The Applicant	<p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment – Potential effects</b></p> <p>NSER Appendix Table C-1 identifies the potential effects described in the NSER and the headings under which they are presented in the Inspectorate screening matrices. However, the effects considered</p>	<p>The Report to Inform a HRA (<b>APP-140</b>) will be updated and submitted at Deadline 3.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>in the matrices do not reflect those set out in Table C-1, nor are they consistent with the effects identified in the main body of the NSER. For example, the effect heading in the matrices entitled 'Reduction in/decreased air quality' also encompasses lightspill.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant explain the inconsistencies between the effects identified in the various documents and/or update the HRA or matrices as relevant.</p>	
1.2.26	PCC CCC HDC NND NE EA Anglian Water	<p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment</b></p> <p>Can the parties please comment on the NSER and whether they consider it to be satisfactory.</p>	
1.3	<b>Compulsory Acquisition (CA), Temporary Possession (TP) and Other Land or Rights Considerations</b>		
1.3.1	The Applicant	<p><b>CA and TP Negotiations</b></p> <p>Can the Applicant please provide an update of the current situation of negotiations with affected landowners and occupiers over potential acquisition by agreement? Please complete Annex A with this information.</p>	<p>The latest CA and TP position are shown in the Negotiations Tracker Compulsory and Temporary Possession submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/EXAM/9.9</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted the negotiations tracker following the same format that has been used for other recent applicant submissions.</p> <p>The Applicant views the current status for all land parcels as being yellow - no objection and negotiations continuing</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>and therefore the tracker has not been colour coded as the Applicant does not feel that this will add any context.</p> <p>The Applicant will begin to use colour coding as discussions progress and diversify.</p>
1.3.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Crown Land</b></p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please provide the latest information in respect of the Crown Land within the Application site and whether the appropriate Crown authorities have given written consent under S135 of the PA2008.</p> <p>b) If so, could the Applicant please provide those written consents.</p>	<p>The Applicant is liaising with Government Legal Department (GLD) to obtain s135 consent and will provide an update in the course of the Examination.</p>
1.3.3	The Applicant Statutory Undertakers	<p><b>Statutory Undertakers</b></p> <p>Can the latest position of the current situation of negotiations with Statutory Undertakers be updated and in particular with regard to the protective provisions?</p>	<p>Vodafone is content that the Order may be made in its current form and will not be making representations.</p> <p>National Grid (NGET and NGG) – we expect standard protective provisions to be agreed before the end of the examination.</p> <p>Anglian Water – Bespoke protective provisions are largely agreed between the parties, however there are three points of principle between the parties. The Applicant will be submitting a SoCG setting out the three areas of dispute which are likely to remain outstanding at the end of the examination, although the Applicant will of course seek to engage with Anglian Water to seek to resolve these issues.</p> <p>Western Power - The Applicant is discussing the need to</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>bespoke protective provisions with Western Power.</p> <p>EXA (Formally Gtt and Interoute) – Accepted the standard PPs within the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>).</p> <p>Gigaclear – Accepted the standard PPs within the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>).</p> <p>BT Openreach - Have agreed to the majority of the standard provisions detailed within the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>). We are seeking clarification on one point.</p> <p><b><u>Masts</u></b></p> <p>Note the masts are not affected by the scheme, but we have sought to contact the following in relation to access arrangements only:</p> <p>EE &amp; THREE Mast Sites – We have contacted MBNL who manage their network and their agent Avison Young, but have not had a request for greater protection that contained in the standard PPs contained in Part 2 of Schedule 9.</p> <p>O2 Mast Sites – We have contacted CTIL (Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure Ltd), but have not yet had a response to date from CTIL agent's, Cluttons, despite several requests of their acceptance of the standard PPs included within the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>).</p>
1.3.4	The Applicant Anglian Water	<b>Operational Land</b> In looking at the information submitted, it would	(a) The Applicant understands that these plots are all operational land of Anglian Water.

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>appear that Plot 3/8b and Plots 5/7a, 5/7b, 5/7c and 5/7d on the Land Plans [AS004] are all operational land of Anglian Water.</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant and Anglian Water please confirm whether this understanding is correct?</p>	
		<p>b) If this is not correct, could the parties explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) why this is not the case; and</li> <li>(ii) whether there are any other land plots that should be considered to be operational land.</li> </ul>	<p>See response to 1.3.4 (a) above.</p>
		<p>c) Could Anglian Water confirm whether or not it has objections to the Proposed Development specifically in relation to these plots (that is those identified in the preamble and parts a) and b) of this question)?</p>	
		<p>d) If Anglian Water does have objections, could the parties set out their positions in respect of the matters set out in Section 127(6) of the PA2008? The ExA notes that the preamble to the dDCO [AS010] does not make any reference to this section.</p>	<p>The Applicant is engaged in ongoing discussions with Anglian Water and is seeking to agree a solution that will not require the diversion of existing apparatus. Relevant protective provisions will be negotiated with Anglian Water to ensure that the Scheme will not interfere with, nor affect, their apparatus.</p> <p>The Applicant is not aware of other made DCOs citing s127 in the preamble (see for example A1 Birtley to Coal House, A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling, A485 Windy Harbour, A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross DCOs). Inclusion of this provision is not necessary since material detriment is not engaged.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.3.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Identification of Category 3 persons</b> Paragraph 4.6.4 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-020] indicates that information for new residential developments identified in the Peterborough Local Plan and any information held by PCC or CCC on developments with planning permission were taken into account.</p> <p>How can the SoS be satisfied that all persons with an appropriate interest have been identified and given opportunity for representation if this does not include land within the NNC and HDC areas?</p>	<p>The administrative area of Huntingdon District Council is nearest to the Scheme. Land that potentially could fall within section 10 (Category 3) is located south of the Scheme boundary and south of the River Nene. Much of the area is listed as part of the Lowland Fen Priority Habitat Inventory. There is one freehold property at this location: The Bungalow, Old Great North Road, Stibbington [Title no. CB225252], which is not currently included in the Book of Reference. It is located to the south of the wetlands area and is therefore not considered close enough to the Scheme to be affected by it.</p> <p>The North Northamptonshire Council area is not considered close enough to the A47 for Category 3 persons to be affected.</p>
1.3.6	The Applicant	<p><b>Land Plans</b> [AS004]</p> <p>a) Could an inset please be provided for the area in front of 6 – 12 (evens) Great North Road to clarify the land parcels (from the northern extent of Plot 1/5a to the southern extent of Plot 1/9a)? (This will also need to be provided on the Crown Land Plans.)</p>	<p>The Land Plans have been updated and submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/2.2 Rev 2</b>).</p> <p>The Crown Land Plans have been updated and submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/2.8 Rev 1</b>).</p>
		<p>b) Could a further inset please be provided for the area in the middle section of Church Walk on the Old North Road to clarify the land parcels (from the western extent of Plot 5/4b to 10m beyond the eastern extent of Plot 5/7d)?</p>	<p>The Land Plans have been updated and submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/2.2 Rev 2</b>).</p> <p>The Crown Land Plans have been updated and submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/2.8 Rev 1</b>).</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>c) Sheet 3 Inset B – could this please be moved on the areas on the west of the proposed works on Sheet 2, enlarged and all referencing amended. In its current location it is not easily readable as all the identification markers are small. It also does not show the necessary northern 'cut line'.</p>	<p>The Land Plans have been updated and submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/2.2 Rev 2</b>).</p> <p>The Crown Land Plans have been updated and submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/2.8 Rev 1</b>).</p>
		<p>d) Within Sheet 3 Inset B there is a reference to Plot 3/4i which does not appear in the Book of Reference, and the ExA has not been able to find a Plot 3/4i. Could this be clarified, and confirmation that the necessary consultations have been carried out provided?</p>	<p>The Land Plans have been updated and submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/2.2 Rev 2</b>).</p> <p>The Crown Land Plans have been updated and submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/2.8 Rev 1</b>).</p>
		<p>e) Could an inset please be provided for the area to the east of the current junction of The Drift with the A47 to clarify the land parcels (from the western extent of Plot 6/1d to the eastern extent of Plot 6/5d)?</p>	<p>The Land Plans have been updated and submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/2.2 Rev 2</b>).</p> <p>The Crown Land Plans have been updated and submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/2.8 Rev 1</b>).</p>
1.3.7	The Applicant	<p><b>Extent of Land subject to CA and TP</b>            There are a number of areas of land within the Order limits which are subject to proposals for CA, TP or TP with permanent rights, that are not subject to Works set out in Schedule 1, particularly as the works includes the specific Limit of Deviation (see Article 8 of the dDCO [AS010]). For example, the area to the north of Work 24 (the A1 southbound link road) forming part of Land Plans [AS004] Plot 3/2c, and the area to the north west of the existing Pumping Station surrounded by Works 8, 16, 26 and 27. Plot 3/4f.</p>	<p>Plot 3/2c: Temporary possession is sought to provide a temporary welfare and compound area including a haul route.</p> <p>Plot 3/4f: Temporary possession and permanent rights are sought to carry out the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• diversion of 11kV electricity cable</li> <li>• diversion and removal of electronic communication cables and apparatus and diversion of water pipes and construction of a site office</li> <li>• diversion and removal of electricity cable to mobile</li> </ul>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>Given any interference with private rights should be the minimum necessary to deliver the project, could the Applicant please set out specifically by individual area, full justification as to why these areas should be subject CA, TP or TP with permanent rights as applicable.</p>	<p>mast</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• protection, diversion and resilience works to large diameter water pipelines and associated apparatus.</li> </ul>
1.3.8	Interested Parties	<p><b>Human Rights Act</b></p> <p>a) Do parties consider that the Applicant's approach as set out in Section 6 of the Statement of Reasons [APP020] is a fair summation?</p> <p>b) If not then, please explain why and if they consider the balance has been inappropriately described.</p>	
1.4	Cultural Heritage		
1.4.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Legislative Requirements/General matters</b></p> <p>Regulation 3 of the Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010 requires the SoS to have regard to various matters in respect of heritage in coming to their decision. Could the Applicant please explain how it considers that the Proposed Development would comply with this obligation?</p>	<p>Regulation 3 requires the Secretary of State to have regard to the desirability of preserving various heritage assets. The effects on listed buildings, conservation areas and scheduled monuments are set out in ES Chapter 6 - Cultural heritage (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>), with further information in ES Appendix 6.1 Cultural heritage information (<b>APP-085</b>). For completeness and transparency, an assessment of all impacts before site specific mitigation is set out in Table 5 of ES Appendix 6.1 Cultural heritage information (<b>APP-085</b>). This meets the obligations of regulation 3</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.4.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Nomenclature</b>            In Chapter 6 of the ES [APP044] in section 6.6 the Heritage Record WAN01 is called "Wansford Road Railway Station". However, in sections 6.8 and 6.9 it is referred to as "Wansford Railway Station". Could the nomenclature be clarified so as to avoid confusion with the Wansford Railway Station on the Nene Valley Railway between Sibson and Stibbington, which is said not to be affected by the Proposed Development?</p>	<p>The terminology has been updated to "Wansford Road Railway Station" in a revision to the ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>) which was submitted at Deadline 2.</p>
1.4.3	IPs, particularly local authorities and HBMCE	<p><b>Identification of heritage assets</b>            a) Do the IPs agree with the list of heritage assets identified in Appendix 6.1 [APP-085]?            b) If not,                (i) if the party considers any heritage asset has been omitted could they please set out a table of such assets and why they consider each to be of heritage significance;                (ii) if the party considers that any identified assets should not be considered to be a heritage asset or has been incorrectly attributed (for example to an incorrect list), again could they be set out in a table and explain why they hold the view they do?</p>	
1.4.4	The Applicant PCC HBMCE	<p><b>Identification of heritage assets</b>            It is not clear from paragraph 6.6.67 of Chapter 6 of the ES [APP044] whether the Stamford to Wansford railway line is being considered as a non-designated</p>	<p>The railway line (53529) is considered separately within ES Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Information (<b>APP-085</b>). This part of the assessment considers all assets separately for the sake of transparency. The asset is</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>heritage asset in its own right or as part of the "group".</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please clarify and could IPs give their opinions as to how it should be considered?</p>	<p>marked on Figure 6.2C (<b>APP-058</b>) as per data provided by PCC.</p> <p>ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (<b>TR010039APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>) (previously APP-044) groups this with WAN1, 2 and 11 as the value/sensitivity of the assets is the same rating and the impacts are all directly related. This grouping is for ease of narrative only and the impacts on all of these assets (including site-specific mitigation) is set out separately in 6.6 of ES Chapter 6.</p>
		<p>b) If the Applicant or any IP considers that the railway line should be considered to be a non-designated heritage asset in its own right, could they please provide a plan showing the geographic extent.</p>	<p>The asset is a non-designated heritage asset in its own right and a plan has been created and submitted at Deadline 2, please refer to <b>Annex E - Heritage Non-Designated Asset - Railway Line (TR010039/EXAM/9.7)</b>.</p>
1.4.5	The Applicant PCC HBMCE	<p><b>Assessment of non-designated heritage assets</b></p> <p>a) Could the Applicant and IPs give their view as to whether in the light of the decision of the High Court in <i>Save Stonehenge World Heritage Site Limited v Secretary of State for Transport</i> [2021] EWHC 2161 (Admin) the effect on each non-designated heritage asset should be considered individually rather than as a group?</p>	<p>The Applicant is of the view that the correct assessment has been undertaken in light of effect of <i>Save Stonehenge World Heritage Site Limited v Secretary of State for Transport</i> [2021] EWHC 2161 (Admin).</p> <p>All individual designated and non-designated heritage assets affected by the Scheme are listed in ES Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Information (<b>APP-085</b>) with an assessment of their heritage value, impact magnitude and significance of effect. This Appendix also provides the historic background necessary to place the assessments in context. The methodology for individual assessment is set out in Chapter 6 of the EIA Scoping Report (<b>APP-136</b>) (2018). The scope of this assessment has been reviewed and changed to reflect the most up to date standards in</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>DMRB LA 106 (Highways England 2020).</p> <p>All assets are considered separately. The zones of archaeological potential are not assets, as those features and anomalies which have been positively identified/verified have been destroyed by archaeological trenching. The exceptions to this are the burials identified in Zone 3, which were left in-situ. These are discussed in the impact assessment of Zone 3 contained in 6.6.73, 6.8.13 and Table 6.6 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>) (previously APP-044).</p> <p>All anomalies and features are discussed in the Appendices: 6.2 Geophysical Survey Report (<b>APP-086</b>); 6.3 Geophysical and Metal Detector Survey (<b>APP-087</b>); 6.4 Archaeological Observation Report (<b>APP-088</b>); 6.5 Geophysical Survey of the Scheduled Monument (<b>APP-089</b>) and 6.6 Archaeological Trial Trenching Survey Report (<b>APP-090</b>). Therefore, the SoS can be fully informed.</p>
		<p>b) If the Applicant takes the view that each non-designated heritage asset should be considered individually could it please undertake such an assessment for all assets which have been considered as a group.</p>	<p>Please refer to response in 1.4.5 (a).</p>
1.4.6	The Applicant	<p><b>Future Baseline</b> Chapter 6 of the ES [APP044] Section 6.6 identifies the existing baseline conditions. Please can the Applicant explain how the future baseline has been considered in the assessments on the basis of the absence of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>The future baseline is identical to the current baseline for the purposes of cultural heritage. Those future changes noted elsewhere in the ES are not significant enough to affect the heritage assessment from the baseline.</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.4.7	The Applicant	<p><b>Long-term/ Permanent effects</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that the assessment of cultural heritage effects has been considered for construction and operation of the Proposed Development. However, no consideration has been given for differences in effects between the opening year and a future year.</p> <p>Can the Applicant please explain how it has assessed the long-term and/ or permanent effects of the Proposed Development on the setting of heritage assets?</p> <p>In this question a “long-term” effect is one that will cease at a defined point in the future (either by date or event), while a “permanent” effect is one that will not cease during the life of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>The impacts of the Scheme (ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>)) Table 6.6 and 6.7) are provided before and after mitigation.</p> <p>All physical effects are permanent.</p> <p>All setting effects are considered to begin at the un-mitigated impact magnitude at the opening year, and transition to the mitigated impact magnitude between that point and the future year. The future year used is that given in the LVIA (ES Chapter 7 Landscape and visual effects (<b>APP-045</b>)) as 15 years after opening, as the mitigation is primarily achieved through landscape design. Precise dates are not possible to give for each asset, as this will depend on growth rates of vegetation. These impacts are long term and the final residual effects are considered permanent as the eventual decommissioning/replacement design of the Scheme is unknown and a defined date cannot be predicted.</p>
1.4.8	The Applicant HBMCE	<p><b>Scheduled monument north of A47 (List entry 1006796)</b></p> <p>Could the Applicant and HBMCE please provide the full description of the cropmark site of a barrow cemetery and quadrilateral ditched enclosure with pits and a pit alignment?</p>	<p>A copy of the listing description for this asset is appended as <b>Annex F - Scheduled monument north of A47 (List entry 1006796) (TR010039/EXAM/9.7)</b> [REDACTED] extracted 22/12/2021).</p> <p>Further information is presented in ES Appendix 6.5 Geophysical Survey of the Scheduled Monument (<b>APP-089</b>).</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.4.9	HBMCE	<p><b>Scheduled monument north of A47 (List entry 1006796)</b>            Could HBMCE please set out why it considers List entry 1006796 meets the criteria as a scheduled monument, and particularly why the southern part both within and immediately to the north of the application site are significant either as part of the monument itself or its setting (this should be differentiated).</p> <p>The ExA would like to make clear it is not for it to go behind the designation of the scheduled monument, but rather to ascertain what harm (in all senses) may be caused to the scheduled monument and its setting, and thus its significance, by the Proposed Development.</p> <p>HBMCE should be aware that a number of IPs consider that any significance that the southern part of the site may have had has been lost due to works that have taken place over time. It is also asserted by IPs that the route of the Proposed Development should be further to the north and thus the application site should include more of the scheduled monument area than currently proposed (on the basis that all significance has previously been lost).</p>	
1.4.10	The Applicant	<p><b>Effect on Scheduled Monument</b>            Could a plan be prepared showing precisely the overlap between the scheduled monument and the proposed works, along with any construction 'buffer zones' that may be required, including details of how</p>	<p>A plan of the overlap between the Scheduled Monument and the proposed works has been submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>Annex G - Effect on Scheduled Monument</b>) (<b>TR010039/EXAM/9.7</b>).</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		the remainder of the heritage asset is to be protected. A scale of no greater than 1:500 should be used.	With regards to the buffer zones, the highly constrained nature of the Scheme in this area means that there is no space available for a buffer. The protective measures are set out in Table 6.6 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b> ). These state that the Scheme boundary will be surveyed and marked with a fence, which will be archaeologically monitored. Precise details of the works are to be discussed with HBMCE during development of the detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy (also referred to as the Detailed Heritage Written Scheme of Investigation in the EMP (Commitments CH2, CH5 CH6, CH7 and CH8 ( <b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b> )). An archaeological clerk of works will be present to observe all works within 30m of the Scheduled Monument to ensure that there is no further encroachment (Section 6.8.12 of ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b> ). HBMCE will be accorded an oversight role in the Mitigation Strategy to ensure all works are carried out to the agreed standard as set out in ES Chapter 6 ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b> ) section 6.1.15.
1.4.11	PCC HDC	<p><b>Conservation Areas</b></p> <p>a) Could PCC and HDC advise whether Conservation Area Appraisals (or similar documents) have been prepared for any of the Conservation Areas said to be affected by the Proposed Development?</p> <p>b) If so, could they be provided?</p>	
1.4.12	The Applicant	<p><b>Sutton Conservation Area</b></p> <p>PCC has indicated that the historic access to the village of Sutton is, effectively, to be removed by the closing of The Drift to most traffic. This would</p>	The Drift is to remain accessible rather than closed and will allow for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. It is therefore not severed for these transport modes, and that aspect of the Sutton Conservation Area historic access is

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		therefore mean that the historic interest of the Sutton Conservation Area was be reduced. Does the Applicant consider that there should be any mitigation for this harm? (Please also see ExQ <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> )	not impacted. The impact from reduced motorised vehicle traffic is small but quite nuanced and is discussed in the ES Table 6.7 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b> ).
1.4.13	The Applicant	<p><b>Temporary Construction Impacts</b></p> <p>a) In paragraphs 6.7.2 to 6.7.4 of Chapter 6 of the ES [APP044] the Applicant has set out various effects which have been scoped in/ out of assessment. Could the Applicant clarify whether one matter that has been scoped in, "traffic diversions", includes the effects of the siting of haul roads?</p> <p>b) If not, should it be scoped in and assessed?</p>	Discussion of the effects of the siting of haul roads as a factor in assessment is given in paragraphs 6.7.2, bullet 4, and 6.7.3 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b> ). The effects of diversions as specified in paragraph 6.7.4 includes any disruption to access of the publicly accessible asset, including from haul roads that would necessitate diversions. This is assessed in Table 6.5 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b> ).
1.4.14	The Applicant	<p><b>Permanent Construction Impacts</b></p> <p>a) In paragraph 6.7.7 of Chapter 6 of the ES [APP044] the Applicant has set out various effects which could affect the setting of heritage assets. Given the location of the main line through the Scheduled Monument should this be direct effects as well as indirect effects?</p>	Physical impacts to the Scheduled Monument are discussed in section 6.7.10 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b> ). The effects on the setting of the monument from the presence of the Scheme in the landscape is not considered as the asset has been assessed as not sensitive to setting impacts (Table 5 in <b>APP-085</b> ). In part this is due to the lack of upstanding remains but also due to the lack of investigation works on the Scheduled Monument and the surrounding landscape to inform the nature of its setting. Since setting is defined as: " <i>The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve [...]</i> " (NPPF, Annex 2: Glossary), the unknown nature of the setting may become clearer following archaeological works as proposed.



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.4.15	The Applicant HMBCE PCC	<p><b>Archaeology</b></p> <p>a) Paragraph 6.5.9 of Chapter 6 of the ES [APP044] indicates some areas have not been archaeologically tested. How can the SoS assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected (NPSNN, paragraph 5.128) if there is no available evidence on this?</p>	<p>Limitations on archaeological testing are a standard part of these works. Testing is designed to enable reasonable extrapolation based on the distribution and character of identified remains in conjunction with the other sources listed in ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>). The potential significance of those untested areas is assessed based on all sources, not just archaeological testing.</p>
		<p>b) Similarly, paragraph 6.6.73 of Chapter 6 of the ES [APP044] sets out the various zones of archaeological interest. Neither Zone 8 nor Zone 9 has been surveyed.</p>	<p>Please refer to response in 1.4.14 (a) for general principles.</p> <p>Specifically for zones 8 and 9, these are adjacent to roads that would cause geophysical survey to be unusable due to magnetic interference. Also, due to likely disturbance from prior road construction, trenching is not likely to be especially useful in these areas. The detailed design of works in these locations has the potential to limit the footprint of works significantly and so trenching may also represent a larger potential impact than enabling/construction works. The small areas of enabling/construction works mean that even unexpected highly important archaeological remains could be appropriately mitigated prior to or during works. On that basis, investigation would represent poor value for money.</p>
		<p>c) Is it intended to undertake any further survey work?</p>	<p>The commitment to delivery of mitigation works through the Heritage Mitigation Strategy (REAC Commitments CH2, CH5 CH6, CH7 and CH8) of the EMP (<b>TR010039/APP/7.6 Rev 2</b>) does not, at present, prescribe particular techniques or footprints. Appropriate techniques will be developed in consultation with PCC and HBMCE</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			and investigative techniques to reduce residual budget and programme risk are not precluded.
		d) If so, when will those results be reported?	Results of all works under the Heritage Mitigation Strategy (REAC Commitments CH2, CH5 CH6, CH7 and CH8) of the EMP ( <b>TR010039/APP/7.5/Rev 2</b> ) will be reported on timescales to be agreed as part of the strategy. This would allow for any staged or phased works as appropriate.
1.4.16	The Applicant	<p><b>Archaeology</b> Paragraph 6.6.73 of Chapter 6 of the ES [APP044] refers to a number of zones, which are named differently from those shown in Appendix 6.6 [APP090]. There is also a reference to Figure 6.4 [APP058], but this deals with Historic Landscape Character. Could a plan be prepared showing the Zones referred to in paragraph 6.6.73 on an Ordnance Survey base with their numbering as in paragraph 6.6.73.</p>	The reference has been amended in ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b> ) and submitted at Deadline 2. Paragraph 6.6.73 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage has been updated stating that as the zones are slightly different to account for additional information such as cropmarks and Historic Environment Records (HER) data.
1.4.17	PCC HBMCE	<p><b>Archaeology</b> a) Do the IPs agree with the Applicant's approach to assessing effects by grouping assets into zones of archaeological potential? b) If not, could they provide a view as to how they should be assessed?</p>	
1.4.18	HMBCE PCC	<p><b>Archaeology</b> Paragraph 6.8.19 of Chapter 6 the ES [APP044] indicates that PCC "usually requires archaeological WSIs to be written by the appointed archaeological</p>	

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		contractor undertaking the work". However, this paragraph continues "government policy may require an agreed scope of works in order to undertake appropriate procurement". Do HBMCE and PCC have any views on this approach?	
1.4.19	The Applicant PCC	<p><b>Mile Marker</b></p> <p>a) PCC has identified the Mile Marker on the north verge of the A47 to the east of the petrol station. Could the Applicant please clarify how protection of this is to be ensured during any construction operations and thereafter?</p>	This was added to the EMP REAC Commitment CH4 submitted for Deadline 1, which set out an amendment to the heritage commitment ( <b>REP1-005</b> ). In brief, this will consist of protection and restoration during construction followed by proposal for listing (national HBMCE list or PCC local list) to further protect the asset in the longer term.
		b) Does PCC consider the mile marker to be a non-designated heritage asset?	
1.4.20	HMBCE PCC IPs The Applicant	<p><b>Wansford Road Railway Station</b></p> <p>a) The Applicant has indicated that it considers that the loss of the Wansford Road Railway Station would result in a moderate adverse significance of effect. Do IPs agree with this analysis?</p> <p>b) If not, could the party please explain why they hold that view?</p>	
		c) Could the Applicant please explain how its approach is reconciled with the advice in the PPG Reference ID: 18a-018-20190723 relating to substantial harm and less than substantial harm.	The Applicant acknowledges that some harm will occur to the asset. The levels of harm do not map directly to the categories of significance of effect and are a matter of the decision-maker's judgement. However, the assessment of impact presented in ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1/Rev 1</b> ) states that the magnitude of



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>impact is reduced from Major to Moderate through the proposed mitigation. The Applicant suggests that, in this particular case, Major adverse would be equivalent to substantial harm, and Moderate adverse would be equivalent to less than substantial harm. In any case, sufficient information is presented such that the SoS can be informed adequately to make a judgement, per the requirement of PPG Reference ID: 18a-018-20190723.</p> <p>As the asset is not a designated heritage asset, NPS NN 5.125 is relevant:</p> <p>Paragraph 5.125 - <i>“The Secretary of State should also consider the impacts on other non-designated heritage assets (as identified either through the development plan process by local authorities, including ‘local listing’, or through the nationally significant infrastructure project examination and decision making process) on the basis of clear evidence that the assets have a significance that merit consideration in that process, even though those assets are of lesser value than designated heritage assets”.</i></p>
		<p>d) Could the parties please set out the level of harm that they consider would be caused by the Proposed Development for the Wansford Road Railway Station in all its elements, both individually and cumulatively?</p>	<p>Subject to the understanding set out above in response to 1.4.20(c), the Applicant considers the assessed residual effects, after mitigation, to map to the following levels of harm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Former Wansford Road Railway Station (WAN1). Moderate Adverse = Less than substantial</li> <li>• Wansford to Sutton Railway Bridge No.6 (WAN2). Minor Adverse = Less than substantial</li> </ul>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heath House (WAN11). Minor Adverse = Less than substantial</li> <li>• Former Stamford and Wansford Railway (53529). Moderate Adverse = Less than substantial.</li> </ul> <p>Cumulatively = Less than substantial</p>
		<p>e) Could the Applicant please explain what its proposals are for the recording of the asset, and how they would be secured?</p>	<p>Proposals are set out in ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 2</b>) section 6.8.6-9 and Commitment CH4 of the REAC within the EMP (<b>TR010039/APP/7.5/ Rev 2</b>). The EMP is secured by Requirement 4 to the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>).</p>
		<p>f) It is suggested by PCC that the Station Building may be dismantled and re-erected in another location. Could the Applicant please give its response to this suggestion and if it is agreeable, explain where it would be located and how this would be secured?</p>	<p>The discussion with PCC on relocation of the former station has been in the context of 3<sup>rd</sup> party proposals and does not form part of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant has used the information provided by PCC to invite, and is in the process of receiving, funding requests from several 3<sup>rd</sup> parties to the Environment Designated Fund (EDF) Scheme for projects to relocate or reuse the asset. The submission process is underway and is administered outside of the project team for the Scheme and so cannot be commented on until completed. This may change during the Examination and any relevant updates will be notified to the Examining Authority. Any successful proposals would be an entirely separate project, and this is therefore not assessed as mitigation and is not committed to by the Scheme.</p> <p>However, commitment CH3 within the REAC of the EMP</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>(<b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b>) states that the project will offer materials to appropriate bodies, and a successful EDF funded project would qualify. Detailed proposals are welcome from appropriate bodies/projects outside of the EDF and any proposals would need to be safe and practicable in terms of their interface with the Scheme.</p>
		<p>g) Could the Applicant please explain further its proposals for the gate piers at the station?</p>	<p>This is set out in sections 6.8.7 and 6.8.8 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>). The gate piers will be recorded as part of the Wansford Road Railway Station (WAN1), removed and made available (see responses to 1.4.20-e and f above).</p>
1.4.21	The Applicant	<p><b>Wansford Road Railway Station Bridge</b></p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please explain further the relationship between the existing bridge (a non-designated heritage asset), the proposed structure S02 (as shown on the Rights of Way and Access Plans [AS008] and the Engineering Drawings [APP008]) and the NMU route?</p> <p>It is not clear from the Engineering Drawings (and in particular drawing HE551494-GTY-SBR-S02-DR-CB-39001) what elements of the existing bridge are to be retained.</p>	<p>The treatment of the existing bridge (WAN2) will be developed during detailed design in consultation with PCC and HBMCE. Development of the design is contingent on vegetation clearance and the results of the proposed historic building recording as well as structural surveys.</p> <p>The existing bridge will be retained and will be viewable to people using the pedestrian, cyclist and horse-rider rights of way.</p>
		<p>b) On the assumption that the existing bridge is to be retained could the Applicant please explain how this is to be secured with appropriate protection during the construction period?</p>	<p>This is included in REAC Commitment CH4 within the EMP (<b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b>), and is secured through Requirement 4 to the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>).</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.4.22	The Applicant	<p><b>Archaeology</b>            In paragraph 6.9.6 of Chapter 6 of the ES [APP044] the Applicant has indicated that the loss of future opportunities to analyse archaeology at the Cropmark site of a barrow cemetery and a quadrilateral ditched enclosure Scheduled Monument would result in a reduction in the magnitude of impact. Could the Applicant please explain how, in this context, the loss of protection and future potential would reduce an effect rather than increase it?</p>	<p>The intent of this wording was not to imply the opportunity cost is a mitigating factor. The opportunity cost means that mitigation excavations would not reduce the magnitude of impact to No Change.</p> <p>This is in line with assessments for impacts to the archaeological potential zones, but has been set out here in particular because Scheduled Monuments are specifically intended to (among other things) preserve archaeological remains for future generations and techniques.</p>
1.4.23	The Applicant	<p><b>Model Farm, Upton</b>            a) Paragraph 11.8.21 of Chapter 11 of the ES Noise and Vibration [APP049] indicates that "there is a risk of compactor vibration exceeding 15mm/s PPV at distances closer than approximately 4m to the [listed] wall at the Model Farm Upton." What heritage assessment has been undertaken as to the potential effects on this designated heritage asset from vibration?</p>	<p>Assessment of the wall, and the potential effects of vibration are addressed in sections 6.7.16, 6.8.10 and Table 6.6 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>).</p>
		<p>b) What measures are to be in place to ensure that the historic interest of the wall is to be preserved?</p>	<p>Measures are set out in section 6.8.10 and Table 6.6 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>) and in REAC Commitment CH4 of the EMP (<b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b>).</p> <p>A level 2 historic building record and structural survey are proposed as part of the Heritage Mitigation Strategy. Results of these works will inform any further works deemed appropriate in consultation with PCC and HMBCE.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.4.24	PCC HMBCE IPs	<p><b>Assessment</b> Table 5 in Appendix 6.1 (Cultural heritage information) [APP085] sets out the Applicant's assessment of impacts prior to mitigation.</p> <p>a) Do the IPs agree with the Applicant's assessment of impacts as set out in this Table? If not, could the IP please set out their view, giving a reasoned explanation for the view that they hold?</p>	
1.4.25	PCC HMBCE	<p><b>Recording of heritage assets</b> Do PCC and HMBCE agree that the methods of recording heritage assets when there are interventions/demolition as set out in Section 8.3 of Chapter 8 of the ES [APP046] are appropriate?</p>	
1.5	Cumulative and cross-cutting effects		
1.5.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Assessment with other projects</b> Paragraph 15.3.16 of ES [AS018] indicates a search for 'Tier 2' projects was completed in the CCC and PCC areas.</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please explain why it did not undertake a search for 'Tier 2' projects in the North Northamptonshire area or the East Midlands Region?</p>	The cumulative assessment uses the list of proposed developments identified as part of the TA, referred to as the Uncertainty log. Table 6-1 of the TA (TR010039/APP/7.3 Rev 2) sets out the uncertainty log criteria. The cumulative assessment is therefore reliant on the developments identified as part of the TA.
		b) Could it please undertake such searches and report any implications?	See response to 1.5.1 (a).

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.5.2	PCC CCC HDC NNC	<p><b>Assessment with other projects</b></p> <p>a) Do the Councils consider that the Long List screening set out in Appendix 15.1 [APP0134] is comprehensive and includes all 'other developments'?</p> <p>b) If not, could they please supply details and why they consider that such proposals should be considered in line with the criteria set out in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Seventeen: Cumulative effects assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects.</p>	
1.5.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Assessment with other A47 projects</b></p> <p>Could the Applicant please expand its statement in paragraph 15.3.17 of Chapter 15 of the ES [AS018] in relation to other projects on the A47 (as identified in paragraph 2.1.3 of the Statement of Reasons [APP020]), on the basis that notwithstanding they might be outside the defined ZOI they may have effects within the ZOI as "Together, the proposals will relieve congestion and improve the reliability of journey times for drivers".</p>	Please refer to response 1.5.1(a).
1.5.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Relationship of Effect on Scheduled Monument, SSSI, veteran tree T20, and Flood Compensation</b></p> <p>Could the Applicant prepare a plan at a scale of no less than 1:250 showing the Scheduled Monument, SSSI, Flood Zone 3 and proposed works in the area of the junction of Wittering Brook and the River Nene. The plan should cover an area no less than 200m north and south of the centre line of the</p>	<p>A Plan showing the Scheduled Monument, SSSI, Flood Zone 3 and proposed works in the area of the junction of Wittering Brook and the River Nene has been submitted as <b>Annex H - Relationship of Effect on Scheduled Monument, SSSI, Veteran Tree T20, and Flood Compensation (TR010039/EXAM/9.7)</b> at Deadline 2.</p> <p>If this was to be shown at a scale of 1:250 on the standard</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		Proposed Development and no less than 300m east and west of the centre line of Wittering Brook.	A1 sheet size, this would require 16 No. sheets to created. The Applicant has therefore shown on one sheet at 1:1000 but can provide the 1:250 scale if still required by the Examiner.
1.5.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Relationship of Effect on Scheduled Monument and Flood Compensation</b></p> <p>In paragraph 6.9.9 of Chapter 6 of the ES [APP044] the Applicant notes that “a much smaller area of land to the south of the A47 needs to be compulsorily acquired”. Could the Applicant please set out both in area and graphically, the alternative scenario of not directly affecting the Scheduled Monument but providing flood compensation works and provide an analysis of why the current proposal is the most appropriate.</p>	<p>The flood compensation storage volume required is approximately 700 cubic meters taking up an area of approximately 2735 square meters. This volume would increase to approximately 1800 cubic meters and an area of approximately 7290 square meters if the alignment did not directly affect the Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.9.9 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (<b>APP-044</b>) explains that the main justification for the encroachment of the Proposed Scheme onto a section of the scheduled monument is that under the current proposed alignment, a much smaller area of land to the south of the A47 needs to be compulsorily acquired, with consequently less impact on flooding, than would otherwise be required if the scheme was to avoid the scheduled monument completely. The ExA will note from the comparison of the plans that the area of land take for the flood compensation scheme is almost three times the area of land take where the alignment encroaches on to a very small area of the scheduled monument. The requirement for the Applicant to minimise the area of land take for compulsory acquisition (see paragraph 6.9.10), the strict conditions for essential infrastructure in Flood Zone 3 (see <b>APP-128</b> Flood Risk Assessment) and having secured the agreement of both HBMCE and the PCC archaeologist provided the Applicant with the justification that this is the most appropriate solution.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.5.6	IPs	<p><b>Relationship of Effect on Scheduled Monument, SSSI, veteran tree T20 and Flood Compensation</b></p> <p>Do IPs consider that the Applicant has struck the appropriate balance between requiring more land for compulsory acquisition through requiring more land for flood compensation when compared to the direct effects on the scheduled monument, the veteran tree T20, the Sutton Heath and Bog SSSI and any other matter.</p>	
1.5.7	The Applicant	<p><b>Wittering Brook Crossing &amp; A1 Mill Stream culvert</b></p> <p>a) Please also see ExQ<b>Error! Reference source not found.</b></p>	
		<p>b) Paragraph 13.9.39 of Chapter 13 of the ES [AS017] states that a mammal ledge should be provided above the design flood level for the A47 Wansford Sluice Extension and the A1 Mill Stream culvert to maintain connectivity of the habitat and allow mammal, including otter, passage. However, it is explained that it may not be possible to place the ledge above the design flood level if there is a requirement to throttle flood flows. Please can the Applicant state when this would be determined, and how potential effects on mammals would be mitigated if the mammal ledge would lie below the design flood level.</p>	<p>The text in paragraph 13.9.39 of ES Chapter 13 Road Drainage and Water Environment (<b>AS-017</b>) is an error. The A47 Wansford Sluice is a new structure and the A1 Mill Stream culvert is being extended. ES Chapter 13 will be updated and submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>There is therefore no proposal to include a mammal ledge in the existing A1 Mill Stream culvert or the extension.</p> <p>The proposed mammal ledge will be provided within the 600mm freeboard and above the 1 in 100 year (plus 65% climate change allowance) design flood level of the proposed A47culvert.</p> <p>The text in paragraph 13.9.39 regarding the requirement to throttle flood flows will be removed from the ES Chapter 12</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			(AS-017) at Deadline 3.
1.5.8	The Applicant	<p><b>Underpass lighting</b></p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please advise whether either or both of the Wansford NMU and Sacrewell Farm underpasses are to be lit?</p>	<p>Neither of the underpasses are lit or proposed to be lit.</p> <p>In accordance with CD143 of the DMRB there is no need to light the underpasses unless there is a perceived risk to personal security.</p>
		<p>b) If so,</p> <p>(i) during what hours is lighting to take place and how is this to be secured;</p> <p>(ii) could the ExA be directed to where the biodiversity and ecological effects and the landscaping and visual effects of this lighting have been explicitly assessed; and</p> <p>(iii) if the effects have not been explicitly assessed, could this please be undertaken.</p>	<p>(i) and (iii) are not applicable.</p> <p>(ii) As there are no current proposals to light the underpass these assessments have not been undertaken.</p>
		<p>c) If either or both are not to be lit, could the Applicant undertake an assessment as to the public safety implications of each.</p>	<p>The Applicant has been in discussions with Cambridgeshire Constabulary in respect of the Scheme. Considering the ExA's question, the Applicant will prepare a specific risk assessment in respect of these underpasses in consultation with Cambridgeshire Constabulary. That risk assessment will focus on public safety and ecological effects and will be provided during the Examination.</p>
1.5.9	The Applicant	<p><b>Table of likely significant residual effects</b></p> <p>Could the Applicant please ensure that at each submission it submits and updates a summary table of the likely significant residual effects.</p>	<p>A summary table of likely significant residual effects has been submitted at Deadline 2 (TR010039/EXAM/9.10).</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
	The Applicant	<p><b>Construction Traffic</b> Paragraphs 2.6.22 to 2.6.24 of Chapter 2 of the ES [AS013] indicates a 50/50 split for the delivery of construction materials from east and west along the A47, and that there would be abnormal loads.</p> <p>a) Can the Applicant please identify the number of movements of abnormal load deliveries that were used to inform the assessments/modelling and confirm whether these have informed the worst case construction traffic assessment.</p>	<p>Less than 100 abnormal load deliveries will be required throughout the construction period.</p> <p>Due to the low number of the abnormal load deliveries, they have not informed the worst case assessments.</p>
		<p>b) Is it reasonable to assume that waste will also be disposed on a similar disposition?</p>	<p>In practice a large proportion of waste from the Scheme is likely to be recovered rather than disposed of to landfill, therefore reducing the volume of traffic on the surrounding roads. It is reasonable to assume that the traffic associated with this will follow the same 50/50 split east and west along the A47.</p>
		<p>c) If so, could the Applicant please explain why waste disposal has only been assessed in relation to the East of England region and not the East Midlands given its proximity, and undertake such an assessment?</p>	<p><u>Material Assets and Waste</u></p> <p><i>Hazardous Waste</i></p> <p>The proximity principle was considered in relation to the disposal of potentially Hazardous Waste. As there are no Hazardous waste landfills within the East of England region, the study area for managing these wastes was extended to include the East Midlands region, with the closest hazardous waste landfill located in Northamptonshire.</p> <p><i>Inert and Non-hazardous Waste</i></p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>As the East of England region was assessed as having sufficient capacity for the disposal of these wastes, the requirement to dispose outside of the region, and implementation of the proximity principle was not considered necessary.</p> <p>Should the secondary study (for waste) have been extended to include both the East Midlands and the East of England, the total volume of waste generated during construction would still not result in a great than 1% reduction in the combined landfill capacity of these areas.</p> <p>Therefore, there would be no change to the predicted residual effect (with mitigation) of slight adverse and not significant.</p> <p>In practice a large proportion of waste from the Scheme is likely to be recovered rather than disposed of to landfill, further reducing the overall quantities of waste requiring landfill disposal.</p>
		<p>d) If not, can the Applicant please justify why there would be a different distribution for materials and waste?</p>	<p>As set out above in the response to 1.5.9 (c), the proximity principle does not apply to materials. The reasoning for the assumed materials distribution is that after considering the available concrete, asphalt and aggregate supply locations in the local area and taking into account material shortages, the Applicant has assumed using multiple suppliers.</p>
1.5.11	The Applicant	<p><b>Major Accidents and Disasters</b> ES Chapter 4 Section 4.1.10 [APP-042] explains that as the safety risk associated with the pipelines has been considered within the Proposed Development</p>	<p>This is in reference to the National Grid High Pressure gas main located at Work No.4.</p> <p>Whilst removal of existing pavement may be required,</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>risk register (held by the Principal Contractor) further assessment of the major accident pipelines within the ES has been scoped out. In the absence of the risk register please can the Applicant explain if and how it has been assessed that the risk can be ruled out or remains within acceptable limits.</p>	<p>excavation within the easement strip will be avoided if at all possible.</p> <p>Consultation with National Grid will continue throughout the design and construction process and all National Grid procedures for working in the vicinity of high pressure gas mains will be adhered to, to ensure the risk will remain within acceptable limits.</p> <p>The Applicant has a standard side agreement and protective provisions with National Grid for gas and electricity apparatus affected by highway schemes. These documents are currently being formalised and are expected to be completed before the end of the examination.</p>
1.5.12	The Applicant	<p><b>Geotechnical risk</b></p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please explain what analysis has been undertaken of ground conditions in the vicinity of the River Nene to show that the Proposed Development could be satisfactorily constructed and what construction techniques may be required to ensure that the Proposed Development is not affected by scouring from the River Nene, taking into account the effects of climate change (see also ExQ1.12.11)?</p> <p>b) Could the Applicant please demonstrate how the Proposed Development would be constructed within the defined Limits of Deviation without exceeding the environmental parameters assessed should worst-case ground conditions be discovered?</p>	<p>a)</p> <p>As part of the PCF Stage 3 Assessment, a detailed Ground Investigation (GI) was specified pertinent to the preferred option (at the time) for the Scheme on behalf of National Highways. The Ground Investigation was undertaken by a specialist ground investigation contractor.</p> <p>The ground investigation comprised drilling 46no. boreholes using techniques including cable percussion, rotary coring and windowless sampling, along with in-situ testing. In addition 30no. trial pits were excavated along the scheme.</p> <p>Retrieved soil samples were subsequently submitted to a laboratory for geotechnical and chemical testing.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>The ground conditions encountered along with the results from the lab tests have informed the ground model and outline design. This has included preliminary slope stability analysis at critical sections through the proposed earthworks to assess the feasibility of the design slope angles.</p> <p>Stability analysis was undertaken using propriety modelling software GeoStudio 2020 – Slope/W by GeoSlope International, using limit equilibrium methods, and in accordance with the appropriate Eurocodes.</p> <p>Scour assessments will be undertaken at detailed design stage – refer to the response to 1.12.11.</p> <p>b) Worst case ground conditions may comprise the presence of solifluction shear surfaces within the Whitby Mudstone. The investigation of the presence of such features has been captured within the proposed supplementary GI.</p> <p>Should the presence of such features be identified then constructional techniques to overcome this may include construction of a shear key under the toe of the embankment.</p> <p>In terms of construction, this would involve excavating at the toe, placement of embankment fill, and placing a well</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>compacted engineered fill. The key is designed to intercept and cut off the critical slip circle thus improving stability.</p> <p>Extensive soft alluvial deposits have not been encountered within the 2018 GI exploratory holes. Encountered superficial deposits tally with the shown on the geological map produced by the British Geological Survey.</p>
1.6	<b>Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [AS-010] &amp; Explanatory Memorandum (EM) [APP-017]</b>		
1.6.1	The Applicant	<p><b>dDCO Generally</b>            Various typographic errors, including double spaces or unnecessary single spaces between words and punctuation, have been noted. Another example is that the "Book of Reference", "River Nene" and some other terms have sometimes been capitalised and in other locations not. Could the dDCO please be comprehensively checked for such errors.</p> <p>All future iterations should be submitted in tracked change from the previous version.</p>	<p>The dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) will be amended and resubmitted at Deadline 3 (clean and tracked change versions).</p>
1.6.2	The Applicant	<p><b>dDCO Generally</b>            At present it appears that there is no reference to the 2017 EIA Regulations; Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 15 Good Practice Point 4 deals with this. The Applicant is asked to make sure that any relevant Articles or Requirements could not be construed as circumventing the provisions of the 2017 EIA Regulations, by incorporating the recommended wording in point 4 where necessary.</p>	<p>Whilst Advice Note 15 'Good Practice' Point 4 does recommend the following text be added to the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) "insofar as those provisions are not inconsistent with the 2017 EIA Regulations and any orders, rules or regulations made under the PA2008" it is noted that no made DCO contains such wording. The Applicant believes this is because the wording is otiose since if the provisions were inconsistent, they would be unlawful.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
	The Applicant	<p><b>EM Generally</b></p> <p>a) In the EM the Applicant often refers to the Model provisions. These have been withdrawn. Given this, could the Applicant please set out from precedent, preferably from recent transport DCOs, where only model provisions have been cited in the EM.</p>	<p>In paragraph 4.1 of the EM (<b>APP-017</b>) the Applicant acknowledges that Model Provisions have been repealed: <i>"Whilst the Infrastructure Planning (Model Provisions) (England and Wales) Order 2009 (S.I. 2009/2265) has been repealed, the draft Order is based on the model provisions (general and railway), as well as other development consent orders that have been made to date."</i></p> <p>As requested, the retained Model Provisions will be identified, citing recent transport DCOs that also adopt them, in a revised EM to be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
		<p>b) Similarly, the EM also refers to other highway DCOs (occasionally not even specifying which Orders), but without explaining why that particular drafting as used in that Order is relevant to this proposal. Could this also be addressed.</p>	<p>The Applicant will take the approach used for the Birtley A1 DCO EM showing how the Model provisions are used (or not) from precedent DCOs to justify their use in the revised EM (<b>APP-017</b>) to be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
		<p>c) The EM and draft DCO do not contain any reference to whether they contain novel provisions. If they do then need to be clearly identified (and set out in a separate schedule), Please see the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 15, for guidance on this point.</p>	<p>A separate schedule of novel provisions will be provided in the revised EM (<b>APP-017</b>) to be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
		<p>d) Could the EM be comprehensively reviewed to ensure comprehensive justification for the provisions.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant will undertake a comprehensive review in the revised EM (<b>APP-017</b>) to be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.6.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 – Definitions and Schedule 2 – Requirement 1</b></p> <p>Could the Applicant please review the definitions in both Article 2 and paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 and the dDCO more generally.</p> <p>As a general principle, any term only used in Schedule 2, but in more than one Requirement, should be defined in paragraph 1 of that Schedule, but any term used within any other part of the dDCO (and/ or in Schedule 2) should be defined in Article 2. If a term is only used once or within an individual Article or Requirement, then it should be defined within the relevant Article or Requirement.</p> <p>There are inconsistencies, for example, DMRB is defined in the Schedule 2, but not in Article 2 but is also used outside Schedule 2. There are also a number of acronyms that are not defined, for example “INNS” and “UXO” in Requirement 4. There are also occasions where terms are defined within an Article/ Requirement and then used elsewhere. An example being “business day” which is defined in Requirement 14 but also used elsewhere (for example in Requirement 17).</p> <p>Could the dDCO please be comprehensively reviewed to deal with these anomalies.</p>	<p>The Applicant will address the inconsistencies noted by the ExA and any others in the revised EM (<b>APP-017</b>) to be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
1.6.5	PCC	<p><b>Article 2 – Definitions and Schedule 2 – Requirement 1</b></p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 15, paragraph 19.1 states that Requirements should</p>	



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>generally be drafted to identify the relevant planning authority or authorities by name. The relevant provisions in this dDCO have been drafted in that way (see draft EM 4.27.4, 4.44, 4.140 and description of requirements at EM 5.5 (c), (f), (g), (i) and (j)).</p> <p>Could PCC confirm whether it is content with the current drafting?</p>	
1.6.6	The Applicant IPs	<p><b>Article 2 – Definition of “commence” and Schedule 2 – Requirement 2</b></p> <p>a) Do any amendments need to be made to the dDCO in light of the judgement of the High Court in <i>Tidal Lagoon (Swansea Bay) PLC v Secretary of State for Business Energy and Industrial Strategy &amp; others</i> [2021] EWHC 3170 (Admin) over the use of the terms “commence” and “begin” (or their derivatives)? The ExA notes, unlike that case, the dDCO does seek to use utilise powers under Section 120 of the PA2008.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not consider that any amendments need to be made to the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) in light of the Swansea Bay judgment and is conscious of the section 120 powers to disapply legislation. The Applicant's reasoning is provided in the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1, Agenda Point 4: Part 1, point 2 – Preliminary Matters at (<b>REP1-011</b>). The timeframe for commencing works under the DCO outside of the initial ground investigations is expected to fall comfortably within the five year commencement period. Funding, contractors and resources are available.</p>
		<p>b) Could the Applicant set out in lay-language what the provisions are intended to deliver; this should be provided in the EM.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided an explanation of what the provisions are intended to deliver and the controls in place for preliminary works in the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1, Agenda Point 4: Part 1, point 3 – Preliminary Matters (<b>REP1-011</b>). The revised EM to be submitted at Deadline 3 will provide the necessary explanation.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.6.7	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 – Definitions</b></p> <p>a) The definition of “local highway authority” refers to Norfolk County Council. Could this please be amended.</p>	<p>The local highway authority is Peterborough City Council (PCC) but the Applicant will adopt the formula used in the M54/M6 dDCO of referring to the definition in the Highways Act 1980 and thereby make reference to the local highway authority throughout.</p>
		<p>b) If this is, correctly, defined, why is there a need for a definition for the “relevant highway authority”, or is there no need for a definition for the “local highway authority”? Consequential amendments would need to be resolved.</p>	<p>Please see response to 1.6.7 (a) above.</p>
1.6.8	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 – Definitions and EM</b></p> <p>a) Sub-paragraphs 4.6 (b) to (d) of the EM do not give precedents for the provisions. Either could these be provided, or if novel, explain why necessary; the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 15 1.1, 1.2, 1.4 etc give guidance on this point.</p>	<p>The Applicant will provide an updated EM (<b>APP-017</b>) at Deadline 3 including details of precedents and / or explanation of provisions as appropriate.</p>
		<p>b) Sub-paragraph 4.6(d) of the EM makes reference to the limits of deviation in the “Order limits” definition. However, there is no such reference. Could this please be clarified.</p>	<p>The Applicant will amend to “the Order limits”, which references the extent of the area within which the authorised development may be carried out” as in the EM (<b>APP-017</b>) for the M54 to M6 link road dDCO.</p> <p>The revised EM (<b>APP-017</b>) will be submitted at Deadline 3</p>
1.6.9	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 2 – Definition of certified documents</b></p> <p>Various definitions refer to documents “certified by the Secretary of State” which are set out in Schedule 10. Should each of these definitions therefore</p>	<p>The Applicant will update the certified document definitions in the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) to be submitted at Deadline 3, defining each of the documents listed in Schedule 10 as ..."for the purposes of the Order and set out in Schedule</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		explicitly refer to Schedule 10 or as otherwise certified? For example: “the Book of Reference” means the document of that description certified by the Secretary of State as the Book of Reference for the purposes of the Order and set out in Schedule 10 (documents to be certified);” (see, for example, the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester DCO).	10 (documents to be certified)".
1.6.10	The Applicant IPs	<p><b>Article 2 -Definition of “commence”</b></p> <p>a) The current definition of “commence” excludes operations of archaeological investigations. If this is the case, how is the archaeological investigation and mitigation work to be secured, if it falls outside the point at which the development is commenced and thus the dDCO becomes operative?</p>	<p>Each of the preliminary works are controlled either by a requirement or by environmental permitting and are therefore properly controlled and secured in the period prior to commencement. Moreover, preliminary works have been considered and assessed as part of the ES.</p> <p>With regard specifically to archaeological investigations and mitigation works, Requirement 9 requires an approved written Scheme of investigation in accordance with the REAC (table 1.5 in the EMP, see <b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b>) to be approved before any commencement. Therefore, any archaeological investigations that are not approved would prevent commencement. The wording also follows the standard pre-commencement archaeological condition used nationally which is generally the model (or variant of) the wording given in Planning Circular 11/95. The Circular itself went out of use in 2014, but Appendix A (Model Conditions) has been retained.</p>
		b) Subject to this resolution, are the IPs content with this drafting?	

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.6.11	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 2(3) and (4), Article 5 and Article 8</b>            Could the Applicant please reconcile:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the use of the term “approximate” in Articles 2(3) and (4);</li> <li>• the use of the term “adjacent” in Article 5(2);</li> <li>• the limits of deviation in Article 8; and</li> <li>• the need to ensure that no development takes place that goes beyond that assessed in the ES?</li> </ul> <p>Please also see questions ExQ<b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> and ExQ<b>Error! Reference source not found.</b>.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided a comprehensive explanation of all these terms and that no development will take place that goes beyond that assessed in the ES in the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1, Agenda Point 4: Part 1, point 3 – Preliminary Matters (<b>REP1-011</b>).</p>
1.6.12	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 5 – Grant</b>            Article 5(2) disapples any enactment “within or adjacent to” the Order lands. However, “adjacent” is not defined.</p> <p>a) Given this may include matters that have not been assessed in the ES should this be defined or limited in some way?</p>	<p>The Applicant's response is provided in the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1, Agenda Point 4: Part 1, point 3 – Preliminary Matters (<b>REP1-011</b>).</p>
		<p>b) How can the SoS be sure that any person whose land may be affected is fully aware of the situation? Any response should deal both with the practical and human rights implications.</p>	<p>The Applicant's response is provided in the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1, Agenda Point 4: Part 1, point 3 – Preliminary Matters (<b>REP1-011</b>).</p>
1.6.13	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 8 – Limits of deviation</b>            a) Should the provision set out Article 8(3) relating to environmental effects also apply in respect of</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees and as in the A1 Birtley DCO the Applicant would intend to add the following wording at sub paragraphs (1) and (2) in the next revision of the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) to be submitted at Deadline 3: “<i>except that</i></p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		those elements set out in sub-paragraphs (1) and (2) as well?	<i>these maximum limits of lateral deviation and commencement and termination limits of deviation do not apply where it is demonstrated by the undertaker to the Secretary of State's satisfaction and the Secretary of State, following consultation with the relevant planning authority, certifies accordingly that a deviation in excess of these limits would not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects from those reported in the environmental statement".</i>
		b) If so, then please re-draft as necessary.	Please refer to response to 1.6.13 (a).
		c) If not, please explain why this limitation is not required?	This question is not applicable.
1.6.14	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 10 – Consent to transfer benefit of Order</b>            The ExA notes the arbitration arrangements which have been cited in the event that the SoS declines to allow the transfer from the Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm Order 2020. Notwithstanding that this Order has been quashed by order of the High Court, the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) included the following drafting in the arbitration article in the Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Windfarm DCO and the draft Hornsea Three Offshore Windfarm DCO (published with a minded to approve decision) to remove any doubt about the application of arbitration to decisions of the Secretary of State and the MMO under the DCO:</p> <p><i>Any matter for which the consent or approval</i></p>	The Applicant will be providing a revised transfer of benefit article based on the A1 Birtley DCO, in the dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) to be submitted at Deadline 3, which will address the ExA's queries.

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p><i>of the Secretary of State or the Marine Management Organisation is required under any provision of this Order shall not be subject to arbitration.</i></p> <p>The Secretary of State for BEIS also agreed with the ExA recommendation to remove reference to arbitration in the transfer of the benefit article and the deemed marine licences (DMLs) in the Hornsea and Norfolk Vanguard DCOs. The Hornsea ExA recommendation report at 20.5.9 details the reasons for removal from the transfer of benefit article, and at 20.5.17 – 20.5.24 regarding removal from the DMLs.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Secretary of State removed the following from the arbitration clause in both DCOs:</p> <p><i>Should the Secretary of State fail to make an appointment under paragraph within 14 days 42 of a referral, the referring party may refer to the Centre for Effective Dispute Resolution for appointment of an arbitrator.</i></p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please explain why an additional appeal mechanism should be applied in this case when for most matters, other than on a point of law, the Secretary of State's decision on most matters is final?</p>	
		<p>b) In respect of the specific transfer provisions, could the Applicant provide the ExA with</p>	<p>Please refer to response in 1.6.14 (a).</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		precedents where this has taken place, preferably in connection with highway schemes.	
		c) Could the Applicant address any implications that may result in view of the Court of Appeal's decision in <i>R (on the application of London Borough of Hillingdon Council) v Secretary of State for Transport</i> [2020] EWCA Civ 1005?	<p>Please refer to response in 1.6.14 (a).</p> <p>The Hillingdon case concerned the lack of information provided by HS2 to the Council.</p> <p>For the A47 Wansford to Sutton Scheme, information is being sent by the Applicant to the Secretary of State. Given that the SoS will determine whether to approve the information provided by the Applicant, the Applicant does not believe that arbitration is appropriate.</p>
1.6.15	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 13 – Classification of roads, etc.</b></p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please explain why Article 13(6) refers to the local planning authority, when these matters are more generally dealt with by the local highways authority?</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees that Article 13 (6) should refer to the local highway authority and the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) will be amended and provided at Deadline 3.</p>
		b) Should Article 13(7) be subject to a time limit by when the roads shall cease to be trunk roads? Possibly by reference to the date of opening of the main line?	<p>The Applicant does not agree that article 13(7) should be subject to a time limit by reference to the opening of the main line since works to a trunk road may follow the main line works. We have also considered the drafting in the A303 Ilchester to Sparkford made Order which takes this approach, but includes notice provisions, and propose to amend the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) in line with the format used in the A303 Ilchester to Sparkford made Order (Article 14)(2), to be provided at Deadline 3.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.6.16	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 14 – Power to alter layout etc. of streets</b> Should the provision of restoration set out in Article 14(2) be subject to a time limit by when the works should be completed? Possibly by reference to the date of opening of the main line?</p>	The Applicant does not consider a time limit to be appropriate. The ExA is referred to the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1: Agenda Point 5: Part 2 – Principal Powers, no. 6 ( <b>REP1-011</b> ).
1.6.17	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 16 - Temporary alteration, diversion prohibition and restriction of use of street</b> Should the provision of restoration set out in Article 16 be subject to a time limit by when the works should be completed?</p>	The Applicant does not consider a time limit to be appropriate. The ExA is referred to the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1: Agenda Point 5: Part 2 – Principal Powers, no. 6 ( <b>REP1-011</b> ).
1.6.18	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 19 – Clearways, prohibitions and restrictions</b> In Article 19(2)(iii) reference is made to Schedule 1 (the Electronic Communications Code) of the Digital Economy Act 2017. This Schedule inserted this provision as Schedule 3A of the Communications Act 2003. Should there, therefore, be reference to the substantive legislation rather than the amending Act?</p>	The Applicant will amend the dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) to refer to the Communications Act 2003 and submit a revised version at Deadline 3.
1.6.19	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 20 – Traffic Regulation and EM</b> Paragraph 4.79 of the EM refers to Norfolk County Council – could this please be amended to refer to the relevant authority (but see also ExQ<b>Error! Reference source not found.</b>).</p>	The EM ( <b>APP-017</b> ) and dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) will be amended to refer to PCC. Revised versions of these documents will be provided at Deadline 3.
1.6.20	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 21 – Discharge of water</b> a) Could Article 21(7)(a) please be made specific to this case, rather than from general provision, for</p>	The Applicant will amend the dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) as required and provide a revised version for Deadline 3.



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		example, there is no internal drainage board in this area.	
		b) Should "Other" in Article 21(7)(b) be non-capitalised?	The Applicant will amend the dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) and provide a revised version for Deadline 3.
		c) Should Article 21(8) be subject to a similar provision as Article 20(12) in relation to notification provisions? If not, please explain why.	The Applicant will remove the requirement from Article 20 (12) as not being necessary and therefore there is no need for it to be imposed in Article 21. The ExA is referred to the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1: Agenda Point 7: Part 4 – Supplemental Powers, no. 7 ( <b>REP1-011</b> ).  The Applicant will amend the dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) and provide a revised version at Deadline 3.
1.6.21	The Applicant PCC	<b>Article 22 – Protective work to buildings</b> a) Is it possible that the provisions of Article 22 would be used in respect of a listed building?	The ExA is referred to the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1: Agenda Point 7: Part 4 – Supplemental Powers, no. 8 ( <b>REP1-011</b> ).
		b) If so, should they be the subject of specific provision to ensure that their architectural and historic interest is preserved?	No - for the reasons given in the Applicant's Written Response referred to in the response to 1.6.21(a) above.
1.6.22	The Applicant	<b>Article 23 – Authority to survey and investigate the land</b> a) Article 23(1) would allow the undertaker to enter any land "which may be affected by the authorised development" for various purposes. Given the wide area affected beyond the Order lands, for example this may include the Zone of	The ExA is referred to the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1: Agenda Point 4: Part 1 – Preliminary Matters, no. 3, written response (d) ( <b>REP1-011</b> ).

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>Theoretical Visibility, would the Applicant please justify this interference both in terms of geography and explain how any person affected (notwithstanding subject to notice period and compensation) should be aware of this power given that this landowner may never have been consulted on the Proposed Development? The response should include reference to human rights implications and should reconcile with the answers to ExQ<b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> and ExQ<b>Error! Reference source not found.</b>.</p>	
		<p>b) Can the Applicant please explain why Articles 23(4) and (6) refer to both the highway authority (that is itself) and the local highway authority?</p>	<p>The Articles refer to both so that in the event that detrunking takes place earlier than completion of the construction and responsibility for the road changes with it.</p> <p>References to the undertaker granting its own permission will be removed from the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) and provided at Deadline 3.</p>
1.6.23	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 27 – Imposition of restrictive covenants</b>            The Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 15, Good Practice Point 9 indicates that Applicants should provide justification which is specific to each of the areas of land over which the power is being sought, rather than generic reasons and include a clear indication of the sorts of restrictions which would be imposed and wherever possible the power should extend only to the particular type of Restrictive</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that Article 27(2) provides for the purpose for imposition of restrictive covenants to be specified in relation to each plot in column (2) of Schedule 5. The Applicant has provided both the type of restrictive covenant and the justification for its imposition in column 2 of Schedule 5. For instance, for plot 1/3f the restrictive covenants would be to protect the apparatus installed, diverted etc under new rights to be acquired for that plot from excavation and to prevent access to the installed apparatus being made materially more difficult.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>Covenant required.</p> <p>Could the Applicant please provide specific justification in the EM for the Restrictive Covenants it is seeking to impose.</p>	<p>The Applicant will update the EM (<b>APP-017</b>) to explain the above table for Deadline 3.</p>
1.6.24	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 29 – Private rights over land &amp; EM</b></p> <p>a) In Article 29(3) – “acquire” should be “acquired”.</p> <p>b) In any event, this may go beyond that set out in the EM because “or used” is wider than “acquired”. Could this please be clarified.</p> <p>c) Could the Applicant please confirm whether it is seeking powers to exclude a particular private right from the blanket extinguishment power? If so, this should be the subject to a power under a separate Article, see paragraph 23.4 of the Planning Inspectorate’s Advice Note 15 and Good Practice Point 8.</p> <p>d) The Applicant is asked to expand the text in the EM to provide a more detailed explanation of the drafting of this Article and why it has been drafted in this way, including why this particular drafting has been selected as suitable to this development.</p>	<p>(a) This is noted.</p> <p>(b and c) The Applicant will amend the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) at Deadline 3 to conform to the wording approved in the A1 Birtley DCO by simplifying Article 29 (3). Also, Article 29 (1) and (2) provide for blanket extinguishment of the rights which is also in accordance with A1 Birtley DCO and no particular right is to be excluded.</p> <p>(d) An explanation will be provided in a revised EM (<b>APP-017</b>) at Deadline 3 to explain why there may be an exclusion to blanket rights extinguishment in the Scheme.</p>
1.6.25	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 34 - Temporary use of land for carrying out the authorised development</b></p> <p>Article 34(1) – if these powers are to be used for the delivery of permanent works (34(1)(d)), how can it be confirmed that those works will be secured permanently, if through 34(3), the Applicant is required to vacate the land? To say that this would</p>	<p>The ExA is referred to the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1: Agenda Point 8: Part 5 – Powers of Acquisition, no. 10 (<b>REP1-011</b>).</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>be secured through Article 27 is no answer, as that only relates to land in Schedule 5 and there is no overlap with Schedule 7 and the provisions of Article 35 only last for five years post opening.</p>	
1.6.26	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 39 – Felling or lopping or trees and removal of hedgerows</b>            Could the Applicant please explain why Article 39(4) does not follow Article 39(1)?</p>	<p>In Article 39 (4) the Applicant has identified the particular hedgerows in Schedule 8 for removal and then more generally with approval of the LPA. Whereas Article 39 (1) paragraph (1) relates to provides for felling and lopping of trees generally without approval in order to allow the flexibility for the contractor to continue with the works where trees may be interfering with the works or a danger to workers.</p> <p>These are also trees not identified in REAC Commitment LV3 within the EMP (<b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b>) and referenced in the Environmental Masterplan (specifying trees to be retained and removed and mechanism for protection (<b>TR010039/APP/6.8 Rev 1</b>).</p> <p>Article 39 does not apply to trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) – for which see Article 40.</p> <p>Paragraphs (1) to (4) are all subject to the same terms in paragraph (2) regarding minimising damage and paying compensation – see response at ExQ1.6.27 below.</p>
1.6.27	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 40 – Trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders</b>            Could the Applicant please explain where in Article 40(2) is the compensation cited in Article 40(4), as it does not seem to relate to any provision there.</p>	<p>The Applicant believes that the drafting is correct and that the compensation provisions are set out adequately in 40(4) and (2) as follows:</p> <p>40(4) Any dispute as to a person's entitlement to</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>compensation under paragraph (2), or as to the amount of compensation is to be determined under Part 1 (determination of questions of disputed compensation) of the 1961 Act</p> <p>This is related to the compensation provision in 40(2)(a):</p> <p>40(2) In carrying out any activity authorised by paragraph (1)—</p> <p>(a) the undertaker must do no unnecessary damage to any tree or shrub and must pay compensation to any person for any loss or damage arising from such activity.</p>
1.6.28	The Applicant PCC NNC HDC	<p><b>Article 47 – Appeals relating to the Control of Pollution Act 1974</b></p> <p>Article 47 of the dDCO addresses Appeals relating to the Control of Pollution Act 1974 (CPA1974) and seeks to introduce an appeals mechanism for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• notices to control noise on construction sites served by the local health/ environmental protection authority (ie PCC) under s60 of the CPA1974; and</li> <li>• consents prior to the commencement of construction works issued by PCC under s61 of the CPA1974.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant has not sought to disapply the initial consenting process under s61 and bring it within the terms of any made DCO. It would therefore only be the decision to refuse a consent or grant a conditional consent that would be governed by any</p>	<p>The ExA is referred to the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1: Agenda Point 10: Part 7 – Miscellaneous and General, no. 12 (<b>REP1-011</b>) for explanation and justification:</p> <p>(a) a precedent can be found in the dDCO for the A428 Black Cat</p> <p>(c) time savings are not the reason, rather appropriateness and proportionality.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>made DCO.</p> <p>As far as s61 is concerned, if the initial consenting mechanism is not being brought within any made DCO, could the Applicant please explain how making an appeal against refusals of consent or conditions imposed on consents should become part of the NSIP regime. The EM provides very little justification for Article 47's inclusion in any made DCO.</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please provide any such precedents?</p> <p>b) Could the Applicant please further justify this provision?</p> <p>c) If time savings are cited as part of an answer, then flow charts with estimated timings should be provided.</p> <p>Does any local authority which may make a determination in this regard have any comments to make on this provision?</p>	
1.6.29	The Applicant	<p><b>Article 49 - Certification of documents</b> Should the provisions of this Article and Requirement 15 in Schedule 2 be combined into order to provide a simple, single point of reference for those wishing to interrogate the documents?</p>	The Applicant will monitor M54/M6 Link Road Order and if a precedent is set will consider the ExA's suggestion for the next version dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) to be submitted for Deadline 3.
1.6.30	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 1 – general</b> The heading indicates Article [X] and [X]. Can this please be marked correctly?</p>	The dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) will be amended and submitted for Deadline 3.

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.6.31	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 1 – general</b> A number of other made DCOs, for example A1 Coalhouse to Birtley and A303 Sparkford to Ilchester have lists of associated works that would also be permitted. These are normally included at the end of the Schedule. Is there a reason for this omission?</p>	The updated list of associated and compensatory works will be included in the dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) provided for Deadline 3.
1.6.32	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 1 – Work 17</b> Is the term “filling statement” correct?</p>	Noted. The dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) will be amended and submitted at Deadline 3.
1.6.33	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 1 – Work 24</b> This work is shown on both works plans 2 and 3, but is only referred to on plan 3 in the dDCO. Could this be clarified?</p>	Work No. 24 is to be amended in the next version of the dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) to be provided for Deadline 3.
1.6.34	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 1 – Work 32</b> Could the Applicant please confirm that the ‘flood compensation’ scheme is going to be limited to tree clearance and ground stabilisation and that no additional works, for example ground works are proposed?</p>	The Applicant will update the description of Work No 32 to include reference to ground works not merely ground stabilisation in the next version of the dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) to be submitted at Deadline 3.
1.6.35	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 1 – Work 34</b> a) Could the Applicant please explain where the design and implementation of the bat hotel is to be secured. The only reference to ‘bat-hotel’ in the Environmental Management Plan [AS027] is in the Table 1.5 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments at MA4 which relates to “potential” opportunities in dealing with material assets and waste.</p>	Please see REAC Commitment BD9 within the EMP ( <b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b> ) regarding design and implementation of the bat house or bat hotel ( <b>REP1-005</b> ).

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		b) Could the Applicant confirm whether it considers the bat hotel "apparatus", as this is the limit of the restrictive covenants for permanent rights set out in Schedule 5, for Plot 4/7b, or whether some other term should be utilised.	The limited life of the bat hotel might render it 'apparatus' rather than 'infrastructure'. The Applicant is willing to change the name if the ExA would prefer another.
1.6.36	The Applicant	<b>Schedule 1 – Work 40</b> "Alterations to the existing A47" implies that it will remain a carriageway open to all traffic. Could this please be clarified.	The Applicant will clarify in the next version of the dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) to be provided for Deadline 3.
1.6.37	The Applicant	<b>Schedule 1 – Work 54</b> Work 54 makes no reference to the removal of the existing carriageway. Could the Applicant confirm that is correct?	The highway at work 54 is to be stopped up, see Schedule 4 part 1, but private rights of way at part 2 are required for maintenance. Hence the metaled surface is not to be removed.
1.6.38	The Applicant	<b>Schedule 1 – Work 59</b> Work 59 refers to a traffic sign. If this is referenced here, why are the main other traffic signs that inevitably will be necessary not referenced?	This traffic sign is at a distance from and removed from the main dualling works hence it is considered required referencing. The other traffic signs will form part of the main works and comply with the relevant regulations.
1.6.39	The Applicant	<b>Schedule 2 – General</b> In R3, for example, it is stated: "agreed in writing by the [SoS], following consultation with the relevant planning authority on matters related to its function". It is not clear in the drafting here whether the consultation is to be undertaken by the undertaker prior to the submission to the SoS, or by the SoS following submission by the undertaker. Could this please be clarified? There are a number of	As currently drafted, the wording makes it clear that it is the undertaker which undertakes the consultation. Further clarification as to how this consultation will be conducted is contained in Requirement 18 (see the dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> )).  The Applicant is not clear where the ExA's alternative wording is contained. It is also noted by the Applicant that other made orders such as A1 Birtley, A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross and A14 contain identical or very similar



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>occasions where drafting of this type occurs. Alternative drafting making this clear has been used in other made DCOs.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no explanation within the EM of the origins/ precedent of the drafting used there, for example whether another DCO's drafting is relied upon.</p>	<p>wording to that included in the draft A47 Wansford to Sutton Order.</p> <p>The Applicant will update the EM (<b>APP-0117</b>), and provide this at Deadline 3, using precedent wording from one of the made orders listed above.</p>
1.6.40	PCC NE EA HMBCE	<p><b>Schedule 2 – General</b> Could PCC, NE, EA and HMBCE please check Schedule 2 and confirm whether they are content as regarding consultations prior to discharge of Requirements? If they consider that they should be additionally included or excluded from any particular Requirement could they please explain why they believe that to be appropriate?</p>	
1.6.40A	Parish Councils	<p><b>Schedule 2 – General</b> a) Do any Parish Councils consider that they should be consulted on any matter regarding the subject of requirements? b) If so, could they please set out precisely which requirement(s) or part of requirement(s) that they feel that they should be consulted upon, and why?</p>	
1.6.41	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 1</b> a) Please see ExQ<b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> b) As all European protected species are nationally</p>	<p>The Applicant has added the words "and are not mutually exclusive" to the definition. The revised dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) will be provided at Deadline 3.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		protected species are these definitions clear to ensure that they are mutually exclusive?	
1.6.42	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 4</b>            Could the Applicant please explain how reference to ISO14001 meets the tests for requirements/ conditions set out in the NPSNN/ Framework/ PPG, rather than just being an internal management approach?</p>	The Applicant considers that international management standards simply provide a recognised standard of presentation for clarity and precision.
1.6.43	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 5</b>            a) Could the Applicant please explain how the 5-year time limit for replacement of landscaping that fails is compatible with ensuring that the Proposed Development is mitigated for its lifetime?</p>	The Applicant will provide additional text at paragraph 5(5) of the dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) Requirements using approved precedent wording from the A1 Birtley DCO and the A428 Black Cat dDCO. The revised dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) will be submitted at Deadline 3.
		<p>b) Could the Applicant please explain how requirement 5(4) meets the tests for requirements/ conditions set out in the NPSNN/ Framework/ PPG?</p>	Preference to relevant standards and codes has been made to ensure a recognised standard of presentation for precision and clarity in accordance with the PPG. It is also in line with the Birtley A1 DCO and the Applicant will amend sub-paragraph 5(4) so that it now also refers to sub-paragraph 5(1) in the revised dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) to be provided at Deadline 3.
1.6.44	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 6</b>            In R6(2) how can the SoS be satisfied that the undertaker will ensure that previously unidentified contamination will be resolved, if the decision on whether or not to remediate that land lies with the undertaker?</p>	As currently drafted, sub-paragraph 6(2) is identical to the provision in the A1 Birtley DCO which is a made order and the SoS is therefore satisfied that the undertaker will resolve previously unidentified contamination where it is required.

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.6.45	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 7</b>            Are shrubs that are removed technically “felled”?            Should a more appropriate term be used?</p>	<p>The Applicant will amend to “removed” in the revised dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) to be provided at Deadline 3.</p>
1.6.46	The Applicant EA PCC	<p><b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 8</b>            Should these matters also be subject to consultation with the EA and LLFA?</p>	<p>The Applicant will in the revised dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>), to be submitted at Deadline 3, update sub-paragraph 8(2) to include reference the following additional wording shown in bold:</p> <p><i>“(2) The surface water drainage system must be constructed in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation by the undertaker with <b>the Environment Agency, the relevant planning authority and the lead local flood authority, on matters related to their functions</b>, provided that the Secretary of State is satisfied that any amendments to the approved details would not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects in comparison with those reported in the environmental statement”.</i></p>
1.6.47	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 9</b>            a) Should this requirement have provisions to deal with the deposit of analysis, reporting, publication or archiving required as part of the response to the works following the undertaking of the written scheme of investigation?</p>	<p>The Applicant will amend this provision in the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) to be submitted at Deadline 3 in line with the A1 Birtley DCO Requirement 9, sub-paragraph (3) as follows:</p> <p>(3) A copy of any analysis, reporting, publication or archiving required as part of the FWSI must be agreed with the relevant planning authority and in consultation with Historic England and deposited with the Historic Environment Record of the relevant planning authority within one year of the date of completion of the authorised</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			development or such other period as may be agreed in writing by the relevant planning authority or specified in the written scheme referred to in subparagraph (1).
		b) What measures are to occur should any archaeological remains not previously identified be revealed when carrying out the authorised development, particularly as the Scheduled Monument was a burial site?	<p>The Applicant will augment the provisions of Requirement 9 to include sub-paragraphs 4 to 6 of the A1 Birtley DCO in the next version dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) at Deadline 3:</p> <p>(4) Any archaeological remains not previously identified which are revealed when carrying out the authorised development must be retained in situ and reported to the relevant planning authority, and to Historic England in the case of the Scheduled Monument area, as soon as reasonably practicable from the date they are identified.</p> <p>(5) No construction operations are to take place within 10 metres of the remains referred to in sub-paragraph (4) for a period of 14 days from the date of any notice served under sub-paragraph (4) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the relevant planning authority or, in the case of the Scheduled Monument area, Historic England.</p> <p>(6) If the relevant planning authority or, in the case of a Scheduled Monument, Historic England determines in writing that the archaeological remains referred to in sub-paragraph (4) require further investigation or mitigation, no construction operations are to take place within 10 metres of the remains until provision has been made for such mitigation or the further investigation and recording of the remains in accordance with details to be submitted in writing to, and approved in writing by, the relevant planning authority or, in the case of a Scheduled Monument,</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			Historic England.
		c) Should there be any particular provisions in the event that human remains are found?	To respond to this query, the Applicant will include a relevant Article taken from the Sparkford DCO but augmented by the A 428 Black Cat dDCO in the next version dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) to be submitted at Deadline 3.
1.6.48	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 10</b></p> <p>a) Please check the drafting of this requirement in light of the response to ExQ<b>Error! Reference source not found.</b></p> <p>b) Could the Applicant please explain how requirement 10 meets the tests for requirements/ conditions set out in the NPSNN/ Framework/ PPG?</p>	<p>Current drafting follows that approved in the A30 Chiverton DCO and is considered necessary for approval of the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) which is currently in outline. Reference will also be made to the local highway authority.</p> <p>The requirement is considered to be compliant with the relevant PPG since further details in the TMP will require approval prior to commencement.</p>
1.6.49	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 2 – Part 2</b></p> <p>a) This Part sets out a procedure for the discharge of requirements by the SoS. However, the EM gives no explanation as to where the wording of this procedure comes from – whether from a model, or precedent provisions. Could these please be provided?</p>	<p>There is precedent for Schedule 2, Part 2, paragraph 13-16 in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A303 Ilchester Schedule 2, Part 2, Paragraph 22-25,</li> <li>• A1 Birtley, Schedule 2, Part 2, paragraph 18-21</li> <li>• A30 Chiverton, Schedule 2, Part 2, paragraph 16-19</li> <li>• A14 DCO, Schedule 2, Part 2, paragraph 20-23 (except definition of business day)</li> <li>• M20 DCO, Schedule 2, Part 2, paragraph 17-20</li> </ul>
		b) Further, the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 15, paragraph 19 and Good Practice Point 3 also recommends a mechanism for dealing with any	The Applicant will be modifying Article 10 – see response at 1.6.14. The Applicant also considers that it has answered the ExA's query at 1.6.14 (c) since an arbitration

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>disagreement between the Applicant and the discharging authority is defined and incorporated in a draft DCO Schedule. Could the Applicant please respond to this taking into account ExQError! Reference source not found..</p>	<p>between the undertaker and the SoS is not considered to be appropriate.</p>
1.6.50	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 2 – Requirement 13</b>            Could the Applicant please amend this requirement so that if the SoS does request further information under requirement 14 and the Applicant does not supply that information that the relevant submission, or part of that submission if severable, is refused so as to avoid matters being approved in default.</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered the wording in the M54 to M6 Link dDCO. The Applicant notes that the M54 to M6 dDCO has not yet been made and as such this is not yet a precedent. It will however monitor the text in that dDCO and come to a decision on any amendments to the A47 Wansford to Sutton dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) to be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
1.6.51	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 3</b></p> <p>a) Throughout - Could the titles please be checked. For example, for the second substantive entry in Part 1 “Proposed free flow link from A1 to A47 new eastbound diverge slip road to be classified as part of the A47 Trunk Road From point E, 350 metres south of the junction between A1 and Windgate Way, in a south-easterly direction to point F (sheet 3), a distance of 2490 metres.” is titled as being on “The classification of road plans – sheet 1”, but occurs on sheets 1, 2 and 3.</p> <p>b) Part 5 - Could the Applicant please provide a copy of the A47 Trunk Road (Wansford, City of Peterborough to Great Yarmouth, Norfolk) (24 Hour Clearway) Order 2013?</p> <p>c) Part 8 – Point L on the Traffic Regulation Plan</p>	<p>(a) The "title" in the table is not designed to set out all of the sheets which a classification, restriction, de-trunking etc. runs through. Instead it shows where a classification, restriction, de-trunking etc. begins. Where the termination point is on a different sheet, that is explained in the table. It is not therefore considered that any amendments are required to the tables in Schedule 3.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to <b>Annex I - A47 Trunk Road (Wansford, City of Peterborough to Great Yarmouth, Norfolk) (24 Hour Clearway) Order 2013 (TR010039/EXAM/9.7)</b>.</p> <p>(c) Noted and to be corrected in the revised dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) to be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		[APP013] appears to be to the east of Wansford eastern roundabout. Could the Applicant please clarify the second substantive entry relating to this roundabout?	
1.6.52	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 4</b>            Could the Applicant please confirm who would be responsible for the maintenance of the new private means of access from point C7 on the rights of way and access plans to Deep Springs?</p>	<p>Although the local highway authority will be liable to maintain the surface of the bridleway to a standard so that it is passable by bridleway traffic, in practice National Highways will maintain the surface, to maintain its access to the drainage pond.</p>
1.6.53	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 5 and Schedule 7</b>            Should the title of the third column of Schedule 5 and the fourth column of Schedule 7 refer to "work" rather than "part"?</p>	<p>This will be amended in the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) to be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
1.6.54	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 9</b>            There is no explanation in the EM as to where the wording for these Provisions comes from, whether from model provisions or precedent. Could the Applicant please confirm whether these are standard Provisions derived from a precedent, and if so where from. Additionally, it would be helpful if this was stated in the EM, along with clarification as to whether there has been any amendment to the wording and, if so, why.</p>	<p>The Applicant will include a carve out clause in the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) and EM (<b>APP-017</b>) submitted at Deadline 3 to explain that where utilities have their own protective provisions the general protective provisions in Part 1 or, as the case may be, Part 2 of Schedule 9 do not apply.</p> <p>For an overview of negotiations of PPs with specific statutory undertakers, the ExA is referred to the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH1: Agenda Point 14, Schedules 9 and 10, no. 29 (<b>REP1-011</b>).</p>
1.7	Geology and Soils		

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.7.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural Land Classification</b></p> <p>a) Paragraph 9.5.6 of Chapter 9 of the ES [APP047] indicates that two areas have not been surveyed for their Agricultural Land Classification. Does the Applicant intend to survey these areas?</p>	<p>As detailed in section 5.5 of the EMP (<b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b>) the two areas that have not been surveyed for their Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) grade will be surveyed prior to construction. This does not affect the assessed long term residual significance of effects.</p>
		<p>b) Do IPs consider that the Applicant's assessment of Grade 3a is reasonable?</p> <p>c) If not, please explain your reasoning.</p>	
1.7.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural Land Classification</b></p> <p>Paragraph 9.7.11 of Chapter 9 of the ES [APP047] indicates that Grade 1 agricultural land makes up approximately 63% of the agricultural land within Peterborough District, while Grade 2 agricultural land makes up approximately 48% of the agricultural land within the district and approximately 47% of the agricultural land is Grade 3. Given that these total more than 100% could this please be explained.</p>	<p>The 63% is a typographical error. Grade 1 agricultural land makes up approximately 3% of the agricultural land within Peterborough District. The ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 2</b>) has been amended and has been submitted at Deadline 2. The Applicant notes that these percentages do not equate to 100%, as the remaining areas are either non-agriculture land or un-surveyed.</p>
1.7.3	Natural England PCC CCC NNC HDC	<p><b>Agricultural Land Assessment</b></p> <p>a) Given that the PCC area is relatively small, should the assessment be considered against other geographic area(s)?</p> <p>b) If so, could IPs please set out the area which should be considered, explaining why?</p>	
1.7.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural Land Assessment</b></p> <p>Table 4.3 of Appendix 9.2 (Agricultural Land Classification Report) [APP117] and Table 9-10 of</p>	<p>Table 9-10 of ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 2</b>) is consistent with Table 4.3 of the updated ES Appendix 9.2 Agricultural Land</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>Chapter 9 of the ES [APP047] do not seem to be consistent.</p> <p>Furthermore, the figures in Table 9-12 of Chapter 9 of the ES for permanent loss of Grade 2, 3a and 3b Agricultural Land and those in paragraph 9.10.5 also do not seem to be consistent.</p> <p>Could the Applicant please explain these discrepancies and could any implications following from this be assessed.</p>	<p>Classification Report provided at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/6.3 Rev 1</b>) dated 19/05/2021.</p> <p>The inconsistencies have been addressed within the revised ES Appendix 9.2 Agricultural Land Classification Report provided at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/6.3 Rev 1</b>).</p>
1.7.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural Land Assessment</b></p> <p>a) Should the effects on Agricultural soils be considered across all soil classifications rather than individually?</p>	<p>The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the guidance in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 104 and LA 109. The guidance recommends different receptor values (sensitivity) for the different ALC grades (Table 3.11 in DMRB LA 109). This is because the loss of higher quality agricultural land would be more significant than the loss of lower quality agricultural land. The Scheme includes land-take of land of different agricultural quality (ALC Grades 2, 3a and 3b) and therefore it is appropriate to carry out the assessment based on each individual ALC grade.</p>
		<p>b) What would the assessment be if this were to be done?</p>	<p>In order to assess the effect on all agricultural soils as a whole rather than by individual ALC grade, the value (sensitivity) of the most valuable ALC grade found within the site is used, which is Grade 2 (very high value). This a worst-case assessment as the areas of lower quality land within the site are given the same value as the higher quality agricultural land.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Based on a very high value (sensitivity), the permanent loss of approximately 28.6 ha of agricultural land is considered to be of major magnitude and very large adverse significance.</p> <p>The temporary loss of agricultural land during the construction phase is considered to be of minor magnitude and moderate adverse significance.</p>
		<p>c) If the assessment were undertaken against BMV soils and non-BMV soils what would be assessment be?</p>	<p>In order to assess the effect on BMV agricultural land rather than by individual ALC grade, the value (sensitivity) of the most valuable ALC grade (Grade 2) found within the site is used to represent worst case for the BMV land.</p> <p>Based on a very high value (sensitivity), the permanent loss of approximately 19.1 ha of BMV agricultural land is considered to be of moderate magnitude and very large adverse significance.</p> <p>The temporary loss of BMV agricultural land during the construction phase is considered to be of minor magnitude and moderate adverse significance.</p> <p>In terms of non-BMV agricultural land, the site was assessed to have only Grade 3b agricultural land. Therefore, the assessment of non-BMV agricultural land remains the same as that assessed for Grade 3b within ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 2</b>). The permanent loss of approximately 9.5 ha of non-BMV agricultural land of medium value (sensitivity) is considered to be of moderate magnitude and moderate adverse significance, while the temporary loss is of minor</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			magnitude and slight adverse significance.
		d) In both cases this should be done as per Table 9-12.	This information is presented in <b>Annex J - Determinations of the sensitivity and magnitude of impacts to agricultural soils (TR010039/EXAM/9.7)</b> .
		e) If this were to be done, would it change the overall assessment	ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 2</b> ) already concludes that the Scheme would have significant effects due to the loss of agricultural land. The current assessed permanent loss of approximately 11 ha of Grade 2 agricultural land is already considered to be of very large adverse significance of effect (highest level of significance). Therefore, there is no change to the overall conclusions of the assessment.
1.7.6	The Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural Land Assessment</b></p> <p>a) Should the effect on BMV land be considered against a geographic area rather than in absolute terms? Otherwise, why was the analysis in paragraph 9.7.11 of Chapter 9 of the ES [APP047] set out.</p>	<p>The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the guidance in the DMRB LA 104 and LA 109. The DMRB recommends that the significance of effects is based on the receptor value and magnitude of impacts (paragraph 3.8 and Table 3.8.1 of LA 104). The criteria for magnitude are provided in Table 3.12 and Table E/2.1 of LA 109 and have been reproduced in Table 9-5 in ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 2</b>). There is no current guidance on how significance of effects on BMV agricultural land could be assessed in terms of a geographic area.</p> <p>The reporting of BMV land within Peterborough District in paragraph 9.7.11 of ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 2</b>) is included to provide the background context of the relative abundance of ALC types within the district. It shows that the district has a</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>relatively high proportion of good quality agricultural land i.e., over 50% of the agricultural land is mapped as Grade 1 and Grade 2 agricultural land. This is based on the Provisional ALC maps<sup>1</sup> which were mapped between 1967 and 1974 to provide general strategic guidance on land quality for planners. Although they provide information at a strategic level, they are not sufficiently accurate for use in detailed assessments. The Provisional ALC maps do not subdivide Grade 3 land into Grades 3a and 3b, which makes it difficult to consider effects on BMV agricultural land against a geographic area (BMV land includes Grades 1, 2 and 3a).</p>
		<p>b) Could an analysis be undertaken against the effect on geographical areas at the District, County (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area combined) and Regional level, with a sensitivity analysis undertaken with regards Northamptonshire and the East Midlands.</p>	<p>Based on comparison of the Provisional ALC maps, the permanent loss of approximately 11 ha of Grade 2 agricultural land represents approximately 0.1% of the mapped Grade 2 agricultural land within the Peterborough District. The permanent loss of approximately 17.6 ha of Grades 3a and 3b agricultural land combined represents approximately 0.1% of the mapped Grade 3 agricultural land within the district (the Provisional ALC maps do not subdivide Grade 3 land into 3a and 3b).</p> <p>This shows that the permanent loss of Grade 2 agricultural land represents a very small proportion of the mapped Grade 2 land within the district. The combined loss of Grade 3a and 3b also represents a very small proportion of the mapped Grade 3 land within the district.</p>

<sup>1</sup> Natural England (2010) East Region, 1:250 000 Series Agricultural Land Classification. Available at [redacted] and [redacted]

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>The Scheme's land take of the ALC grades as a percentage of the county and regional area are considerably less than that of the district. The data is provided in <b>Annex K - Comparison of ALC Grades by Administrative Areas (TR010039/EXAM/9.7)</b>.</p> <p>It is difficult to translate the above analysis into significance of effect, as the significance of effect is based on the guidance in the DMRB LA 104 and LA 109. There is no current guidance on how significance of effects on BMV agricultural land could be assessed in terms of a geographic area.</p>
1.7.7	The Applicant	<p><b>Soils Handling</b></p> <p>a) Could the Applicant explain how the SoS is to be satisfied that that best practice for soils handling is secured, if that is to be dealt with only as part of a Soils Management Plan?</p>	<p>A SMP is the most effective means of securing best practice as it extracts all the necessary guidance, policy and regulatory requirements into one document that the contracting team can then easily refer to during preparation and implementation of the site works. The SMP will be based on Soil Resource surveys and guidance from the Defra Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites.</p> <p>The Applicant will monitor compliance with the SMP at regular intervals as set out in the SMP. It is proposed to undertake monitoring during site visits, to ensure that the soil handling follows the SMP procedures, as well as monitoring post reinstatement to identify if there are soil problems which need to be remediated.</p> <p>The SMP will form part of the Second Iteration of the EMP (<b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b>) and is secured by requirement 4 to the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>).</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		b) Should specific reference be made within the Environmental Management Plan of the Defra Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites?	Specific reference will be made in the SMP as part of the Second Iteration of the EMP (TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2) to the Defra Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites.
		c) Can appropriate commitments be provided within the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments?	The use of the SMP is detailed within REAC Commitments GS1 and GS3 within the EMP (TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2).
1.7.81.7.9	The Applicant	<b>Ground Investigation Report</b> Paragraph 9.4.14 (and other locations) of Chapter 9 of the ES [APP047] refers to a Ground Investigation Report and it forming part of the accompanying documents. However, this has not been submitted. Could it please be submitted?	This document was submitted at Deadline 1 – Ground Investigation Report (REP1-009).
	The Applicant IPs	<b>Baseline for geology and soils</b> a) Paragraph 9.7.49 of Chapter 9 of the ES [APP047] indicates the Construction year baseline is based on information in the Peterborough Local Plan. Given the proximity to administrative boundaries, could the Applicant please set out why it did not consider cross-boundary implications?	Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 (adopted 15 May 2019) covers land directly to the south of the Scheme. A review of the Local Plan has identified no planned developments that will affect either the Construction year baseline (2023) or the Operational year baseline (2025) assessments, as presented in ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 2) paragraphs 9.7.49 to 9.7.52 inclusive.
		b) Do IPs consider the Applicant's approach to be correct? c) If not, what area should be considered?	
		d) Can the Applicant please provide outline	Completed plans will be produced as part of the Second

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		versions of the Soils Management Plan, a Soils Handling Strategy and a Materials Management Plan so that the proposed mitigation and their potential efficacy on ensuring best practice measures for soil handling can be fully understood.	Iteration of the EMP ( <b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b> ), meanwhile outline plans as requested will be provided during the course of the Examination.
1.8	Landscape and Visual		
1.8.1	PCC NNC HDC	<p><b>Valued Landscape</b></p> <p>a) Do any of the Councils consider that any part of either the Order Lands or land within the Zone of Theoretical Visibility represents a Valued Landscape for the purposes of paragraph 174 of the NPPF?</p> <p>b) If so, could the Council please set out on a plan the area(s) concerned and explain why it holds that the land in question represents a valued landscape?</p>	
1.8.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Consultation on Scoping</b></p> <p>Given the proximity of the Proposed Development to Huntingdonshire District/ Cambridge County and North Northamptonshire, why was consultation only undertaken with PCC and not HDC, CCC or NNC (or its predecessor)?</p>	<p>Consultation on detailed matters regarding the scope of the landscape and visual impact assessment and agreement of representative viewpoints for visual assessments is directed to district level and unitary local planning authorities. It is the Applicant's understanding that county councils would not normally respond to such consultation and would expect this to be covered by the respective district and unitary local planning authorities.</p> <p>ES Figure 7.1 (<b>TR010039/APP/6.2 Rev 1</b>) shows the extent of the local planning authorities within the identified</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>study area for the landscape and visual assessment. This shows that the whole Scheme footprint falls within the City of Peterborough but with a reasonably extensive part of the study area close to the scheme footprint to the south falling within Huntingdonshire District. Only a limited part of the study area falls within North Northamptonshire District, to the south west beyond the A1 corridor.</p> <p>ES Figure 7.4 (<b>TR010039/APP/6.2 Rev 1</b>) provides a zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV) for the Scheme. It shows that the ZTV of the Scheme principally extends to areas within City of Peterborough and Huntingdonshire District. As a consequence, consultation relating to the landscape and visual impact assessment and representative viewpoints for the visual assessment included these two district/unitary authorities.</p> <p>As detailing in the consultation section 7.4.14 of ES Chapter 7 Landscape and visual effects (<b>APP-045</b>), PCC was consulted several times regarding viewpoints and other matters between August 2019 and April 2021. Huntingdonshire District Council were consulted in April of 2021 regarding representative viewpoints. No consultations regarding the landscape and visual impact assessment or representative viewpoints for the visual assessment was undertaken with either North Northamptonshire Council or Cambridgeshire County Council as such consultations were not regarded as necessary.</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.8.3	NNC HDC CCC	<p><b>Viewpoints</b></p> <p>a) Are there any other viewpoints that HDC or NNC consider should be assessed?</p> <p>b) If so, could these please be identified on a map to an Ordnance Survey base?</p>	
1.8.4	IPs	<p><b>Assessment</b></p> <p>a) Do any IPs consider that the lack of visits to private property to be a limitation of significance within the assessment?</p> <p>b) If so, could they please identify the precise location, along with details of features that could not be otherwise seen from publicly accessible viewpoints?</p>	
1.8.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Felling of trees</b></p> <p>To fully assess the Proposed Development the need for the felling of trees should have been identified. However, in Appendix A to the Consents and Agreements Position Statement [APP018] there is insufficient detail of the design in relation to the felling of trees to ascertain whether a Felling Licence under the Forestry Act will be required.</p> <p>Could the Applicant please undertake an analysis so that the decision can be properly informed in respect of landscape and visual effects?</p>	Please see response to 1.2.10 above.

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.8.6	The Applicant	<p><b>Trees</b></p> <p>a) PCC has asked for clarity as to the following trees and whether they are to be removed or retained: T18, T97, T98, T104, T113, T115, T116, T117. Could the Applicant please provide this information?</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that all of these trees are retained. This is detailed in Section 3 (Table 2) of ES Appendix 7.6: Arboricultural Impact Assessment (TR010039/APP/6.3 Rev 1).</p>
		<p>b) PCC has asked for various amendments at a number of locations to compensate for the loss of trees. Could the Applicant please give its response.</p>	<p>The Applicant has reviewed the various amendments to the Environmental Masterplan (TR010039/APP/6.8 Rev 1) requested by PCC. These requests are matters of detailed design. The mitigation set out in the Environmental Masterplan is adequate to mitigate the potentially adverse landscape and visual effects of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant is continuing to engage with PCC and is hoping to deal with this matter through the SoCG.</p> <p>PCC will be consulted as part of the Detailed Design (see Requirement 3 of the dDCO) (AS-010)). Wherever possible requests will be incorporated. This will include replacement tree planting along the new access east of the A1, additional trees within various hedgerows across the Scheme, incorporation of native black poplar of local provenance within the tree planting on the meadows next to the river Nene, and selection of appropriate tree species within the setting of the listed building at Upton.</p>
1.8.7	IPs HDC NNC	<p><b>Effect on Rockingham Forest and the Northern Wolds</b></p> <p>a) Do IPs, in particular HDC and NNC, agree that the Proposed Development would not have a</p>	

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>significant adverse effect on either the Rockingham Forest or the Northern Wolds landscape character areas?</p> <p>b) If not, please explain why you consider this to be the case, providing information to support your view and specifying particular locations as appropriate.</p>	
1.8.8	IPs	<p><b>Visual Receptors</b></p> <p>a) Do IPs consider that the list of visual receptors set out allows for a full consideration of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>b) If not, please explain why you consider this to be the case, providing information to support your view and specifying particular locations, preferably shown on a map to an Ordnance Survey base, as appropriate.</p>	
1.8.9	IPs	<p><b>Landscape character</b></p> <p>a) Do IPs consider that the Applicant's assessment of the value of the two identified landscape character areas set out in paragraph 7.7.11 of Chapter 7 of the ES [APP045] is correct?</p> <p>b) If not, please explain why you take that view.</p>	
1.8.10	The Applicant	<p><b>Lighting columns</b></p> <p>a) How high are/ would be the existing and proposed lighting columns at the existing and proposed roundabouts?</p>	<p>The eastern roundabout at the Wansford Junction currently has 10m lighting columns, with 10m columns proposed.</p> <p>The roundabout at the Sutton Junction currently has 8m lighting columns, with 10m columns proposed.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		b) Should the maximum height limit be secured in the dDCO, and if so how?	It is noted that the M54/M6 dDCO contains no reference to height of highway lighting being secured in the dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ). Generally, highway lighting is controlled by the appropriate standards - see BS 5489-1:2020 referred to below.
		c) Do the Limits of Deviation include the lighting columns?	Yes.
1.8.11	The Applicant	<p><b>Lighting at roundabouts</b> Paragraph 2.5.37 of the ES [AS013] indicates that the approaches to the proposed A47 Sutton Heath roundabout would require lighting to provide approximately five seconds of driving time at the expected speed.</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please advise against what standard this has been derived?</p>	<p>This approach is taken from BS 5489-1:2020 (Design of Road Lighting Part 1: Lighting of roads and public amenity areas – Code of practice). Under section 4.1, BS5489-1 states:</p> <p><i>“There is no recommended minimum distance between unlit sections of road, However, one “rule of thumb”, which is already used for conflict areas, is that of the “five seconds rule”. This is the distance travelled in 5 s at the travelling speed.”</i></p>
		b) Could the Applicant please advise as to what distances (on all four arms) this would be, given speed limits, nature of the highways in question and stopping distances particularly as queue lengths at the roundabouts do not seem to have been assessed (see ExQ <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> )?	<p>The following distances are measured from the roundabouts to the extent of the lighting columns on each arm:</p> <p>A47 Sutton Heath roundabout:</p> <p>North – 111m East – 133m South – 133m West – 133m</p> <p>A47 Wansford Eastern roundabout:</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>North – 133m            East – 133m            South – 133m            West – Designed to 75m, as this joins a separate scheme of existing lighting from the A47 Western roundabout.</p>
		<p>c) Could the Applicant please advise whether lighting to this full extent has been assessed in the ES?</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that lighting to this extent was evaluated as part of the Lighting Assessment (ES Appendix 7.7 (<b>APP-098</b>)).</p>
<p>1.8.12</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p><b>Viewpoint assessment</b>            a) Can VP1 please be redone from a viewpoint approximately 50m to the east (this is so as to ensure that the effect of the new roundabout can be fully appreciated, including lighting columns, rather than from behind vegetation).</p>	<p>The existing viewpoint at VP1 on the north eastern edge of the village of Sutton is appropriate to understand the visual effects of the Scheme. The Applicant does not consider that further viewpoint assessment would be appropriate or of assistance.</p> <p>The majority of the proposed new roundabout and its associated lighting to the north west lies within an open direction of view from this existing photographed viewpoint and the visual effect of the roundabout can be appreciated using this current view. Only a small part of the proposed new roundabout (to the left/south west) is obscured by intervening vegetation within the current view. The year 1 photomontage shows lighting and signage at the roundabout.</p> <p>Furthermore, a viewpoint further east (i) would not be representative of the extent of the village and the potential visual effects on residential areas and (ii) a hedgerow is likely to prevent an open view towards the Scheme from being photographed.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>b) Can VP2 please be redone but including a few HDV vehicles on the proposed roads, particularly the proposed slip road between the A1SB and the A47?</p>	<p>As with the response to 1.8.12(a), the existing photomontages are appropriate to understand the visual effects of the Scheme from viewpoint 2.</p> <p>High sided vehicles on the A1SB slip road would not be visible from viewpoint 2. The new road which is visible within the provided photomontages on sloping ground to the south of the roundabout is the proposed new link into Sacrewell Farm. This route would primarily be used by cars visiting Sacrewell Farm. The addition onto the photomontages of high sided vehicles on the access road into Sacrewell Farm may be misleading and will exaggerate its potential visual effects.</p>
1.8.13	The Applicant	<p><b>Visual receptors</b>            Could Sheets 1 to 4 of the Visual Receptors (Figure 7.5 [APP059]) be submitted as only the sheet overview has been provided?</p>	<p>These sheets have been submitted at Deadline 2 ES Figures 7.1 - 7.5 (<b>TR010039/APP/6.2 Rev 1</b>).</p>
1.8.14	The Applicant	<p><b>Overhead electricity line between A47 and River Nene</b>            Photomontages from Viewpoints 3A [APP063] and 3B [APP 064] indicate that the existing overhead line is to be removed. However, this does not appear to be the case in the photomontages from Viewpoint E1 [APP068].</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please clarify whether this overhead line is to be removed?</p>	<p>There is no overhead electricity line (either existing or proposed) visible from Viewpoint 3 (either in direction A or B).</p> <p>An existing overhead electricity line is visible in viewpoint E. Parts of this would be retained along its current alignment (in direction E1) with other parts re-aligned to the bottom of the proposed embankments (in direction E2). The section of overhead line that would be realigned and that is visible in viewpoint E2 has been wrongly shown by the photomontage as being retained on its current</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			alignment.
		b) If so, could the Applicant indicate the extent and confirm how this is to be secured?	<p>Part of the overhead electricity line visible in viewpoint E2 would be realigned to the foot of the proposed earthworks.</p> <p>Discussions are progressing well with the asset owner (Western Power Distribution) to agree this diversion in accordance with the provisions within the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>) and to formalise the Protective Provisions, all expected to be completed before the end of the examination.</p>
		c) If not, could the Applicant explain how harm to the landscape would be minimised (paragraph 5.157 of the NPSNN)?	It is considered that the like-for-like realignment of a small section of overhead electricity line between the A47 and the River Nene would not give rise to additional landscape and visual effects over and above those already reported in the ES Chapter 7 Landscape and visual effects ( <b>APP-045</b> ).
1.8.15	The Applicant	<p><b>Use of highways by WCH</b></p> <p>a) Given the lack of PRoWs on the southern side of the River Nene to the north of Stibbington and the areas to the north of the existing A47 east of Sutton Heath Road, as noted in paragraph 7.7.36 of Chapter 7 of the ES [APP045], what analysis has been undertaken of WCHs using roads in these areas?</p>	Paragraph 7.7.36 of ES Chapter 7 Landscape and visual effects ( <b>APP-045</b> ) sought simply to highlight that there is no public access, whether by road or by public rights of way, to reasonably extensive areas of agricultural countryside to the south of the River Nene north of Stibbington and to the east of Sutton Heath Road. This was mentioned to explain why no representative viewpoints had been selected closer to the Scheme within these areas. In this respect, there are no roads within the areas mentioned in paragraph 7.7.36 that could attract WCH use.

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>b) If none, could the Applicant please undertake an analysis of the visual effects on such users bearing their higher sensitivity to change when compared with other road receptors, given such users are otherwise unable to utilise the PRow network.</p>	<p>It is considered that a full assessment of the potential visual effects of the Scheme on WCH has already been undertaken and is already fully reported in the vicinity of these areas and that no further assessment is required.</p> <p>In respect of the area on the southern side of the River Nene to the north of Stibbington, representative viewpoint 2 is located on a public right of way and provides a thorough assessment of potential visual effects on WCH users from the closest point to which public access is available. Roads in the vicinity are located further to the south and comprise the A1 (which cannot accommodate WCH use) and roads within the village of Stibbington (from which there are no available views due to enclosing buildings and landcover). There is no potential for more significant effects on WCH users in this vicinity than already reported for representative viewpoint 2.</p> <p>In respect of the area to the north of the existing A47 east of Sutton Heath Road, no representative viewpoints were identified from which the Scheme might be seen from publicly accessible locations. Public access is limited to the route of Sutton Heath Road and the route of Langley Bush Road. Both routes were considered and assessed but no views from these routes to the Scheme were identified. This is in part due to the enclosed nature of Sutton Heath Road (tall hedgerows with many trees) and in part due to intervening topography and landcover (the southern end of Langley Bush Road close to its junction with Sutton Heath Road was visited but no view south</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			towards the Scheme is available). Any more detailed assessment of WCH users of these two roads would therefore conclude that there would be no visual effect on WCH users other than at the southern end of Sutton Heath Road where it is directly impacted by the Scheme alignment. The visual effects here have been carefully considered focusing on the residential property at Heath House. There is no potential for more significant visual effects on WCH users of Sutton Heath Road and Langley Bush Lane than has already been reported in ES Chapter 7 Landscape and visual effects ( <b>APP-045</b> ).
		c) If analysis has been undertaken, can this please be provided.	See response to 1.8.15(c).
1.8.16	PCC HDC NNC	<b>Vegetation Growth rates</b> Do PCC, HDC and NNC agree with the assumptions for growth of vegetation set out in Table 7-6 in Chapter 7 of the ES [APP045]?	
1.9	Noise and Vibration		
1.9.1	The Applicant	<b>Clarification</b> Table 11-2 in Chapter 11 of the ES [APP049] the second row refers to "Approximately 0.032 k/m <sup>2</sup> of the River Nene ...". As this is not a SI unit could the Applicant please clarify this measurement.	This should read kilometers squared and so is approximately 32 meters squared. ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (previously <b>APP-049</b> ) has been amended and submitted at Deadline 2 ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 2</b> ).

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.9.2	PCC HDC NNC IPs	<p><b>Base consideration</b></p> <p>a) Do IPs consider that the LOAEL and SOAEL figures set out in paragraph 11.4.15 are appropriate?</p> <p>b) If not, please explain why and how you take that view and set out what they should be.</p>	
1.9.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Operational Study Area</b></p> <p>Paragraph 11.6.6 of Chapter 11 of the ES [APP049] defines the operational study area "as the area within 600m of new road links or road links physically changed or bypassed by the project". Physical works are proposed at the junction of Sutton Heath Road, Langley Bush Road and Church Walk and along Church Walk near Upton. However, Figures 11.2 to 11.8 [APP074] do not show any noise predictions for this area.</p> <p>a) Could it be explained why this area was omitted from the figures?</p>	<p>The physical works in the Upton area were included in the Scheme after the detailed operational noise assessment had been undertaken. Because the proposed works at Upton were not deemed to impact on the traffic flows that had been assessed already, a revision of the operational noise assessment was not assessed as being necessary or proportionate. Therefore, the operational noise study area was not extended to cover the Upton Drift works. Comments to this effect have been added to the ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (previously APP-049) and submitted at Deadline (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>). It was considered that there was potential for significant effects due to construction noise and vibration and therefore the construction noise and vibration study areas were extended to cover these works.</p> <p>To provide further information on the omission of these roads from the operational noise assessment, the following details are provided.</p> <p>The traffic flows on Main Road (the road at Upton on which works are being undertaken) are expected to increase. This is because the existing access from Upton Road to A47 will be severed as part of the proposed works, which means that all traffic in and out of Upton will be routed via</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Main Road. In percentage terms, this increase appears significant, with the number of vehicles using Main Road increasing from 108 in the Do-Minimum to 594 in the Do-Something in the 18-hour day (6 to 33 per hour) in the short-term. However, the traffic flow is still below the level at which accurate predictions of road traffic can be made. The DMRB LA111 method refers to the Calculation for Road Traffic Noise (CRTN) calculation methodology which states that "calculations of noise level for traffic flows below 50 veh/h or 1000 veh/18-hour day are unreliable". Additionally, the only receptor which is impacted by traffic flows on Main Road is Model Farm which is adjacent to both Main Road which will experience the increase in traffic flow, and Upton Road, which will experience the equivalent decrease in traffic flow. Model Farm is approximately 30m from Main Road, and approximately 13m from Upton Road meaning that the traffic flows are decreasing on the road which is closer to the receptor and therefore significant adverse effects are not expected at Model Farm due to operational noise changes. Receptors within Upton (on Church Walk) are not expected to experience significant noise changes as the amount of traffic accessing Upton will not change significantly.</p> <p>The only other receptor that would be added if the operational noise study area was increased to cover the Upton works is Top Lodge Farm. By using the basic noise level (BNL) calculation method the short-term noise change at this receptor is predicted to be 0.7 dB, and the long-term change is predicted to be 1.3 dB. Both short-term and long-term increases represent a negligible magnitude of change and therefore significant effects at</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			this receptor are not predicted due to road traffic noise increase.
		b) Could noise predications please be provided?	Please refer to response in 1.9.3 (a).
1.9.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Clarification</b> Table 11-10 in relation to Address data refers to PRow data being obtained from Norfolk County Council. It is assumed that this is in error. Could the correct data source(s) be identified and any implications for the assessments dealt with?</p>	<p>This is an error.</p> <p>The data is from PCC and Northamptonshire County Council. There are no implications for the assessments as it was a typing error. This has been amended in ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (previously <b>APP-049</b>) and has been submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>).</p>
1.9.5	The Applicant PCC	<p><b>Road surfacing</b> Paragraph 2.5.38 of Chapter 2 of the ES [AS013] gives two potential road surfaces, Thin Surface Course System and Hot Rolled Asphalt.</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please set out the differences in noise levels expected with these two surfaces?</p>	<p>A thin surface course system is what is referred to as a 'low noise surface' in ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>). DMRB LA 111 states that a low noise surface will typically result in traffic noise levels which are 3.5 dB lower than Hot Rolled Asphalt. In Chapter 11, the assessment sets a minimum noise reduction of 2.5 dB for the low noise surface which should therefore be easily achievable.</p>
		b) Could PCC confirm whether or not it generally uses Hot Rolled Asphalt for roads which it maintains, and if not, what surfacing is used (along with details of the noise profile expected).	
1.9.6	The Applicant	<p><b>Land to west of Upton</b> Paragraph 11.7.9 of Chapter 11 of the ES [APP049]</p>	<p>A detailed response to 1.9.3 (a) has been provided which is also relevant to this question. Current and future traffic</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		sets out the number of noise sensitive receptors identified. As set out in ExQ <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> this has not included the area to the west of Upton. Could the analysis in paragraphs 11.7.9 to 11.7.13 please be reassessed to take account of the effects in this area, together with the relevant parts of Sections 11.8, 11.9, 11.10, 11.11 and 11.12.	flows are very low on Main Road meaning that meaningful predictions cannot be undertaken for this road. The amount of traffic accessing Upton (on Church Walk) is not expected to change significantly, and the BNL noise change on Top Lodge Farm shows that significant effects due to operational noise increases are not predicted. Therefore extending the study area and updating the analysis would not alter the outcomes of the operational noise assessment.
1.9.7	The Applicant	<p><b>Land to west of Upton</b></p> <p>a) It would appear that the Upton works are only scheduled for weekends as this is the only times when the effects have been assessed (see Figures 11.23 [APP076] and 11.30 [APP077]). Is this correct?</p>	<p>This is not the correct interpretation of the data. The noise figures are only presented for certain scenarios and not all.</p> <p>ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>). Table 11-11 shows the results of the predictions at Upton on weekdays. Paragraph 11.8.4 states that “maps are presented with and without mitigation, only for the construction stages for which moderate or major impacts are predicted without mitigation”. For Upton (see ES Figure 11.23 (<b>APP-076</b>)), only presents the weekend works as this demonstrates the worst-case scenario.</p>
		b) If this is correct, what is the reasoning for this?	See response in 1.9.7 (a).
		c) If not, why have no day and/ or evening assessments been made?	<p>See response in 1.9.7 (a).</p> <p>The worst case impact for those works is shown in ES Figure 11.23 without mitigation and ES Figure 11.30 (<b>APP-077</b>) with mitigation. These show the assessment of the weekend works.</p> <p>The figures for weekday works were not produced to</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>reduce the number of figures and avoid confusion.</p> <p>Assessments have been made but have not been presented as figures.</p>
1.9.8	The Applicant	<p><b>Noise from construction traffic</b></p> <p>a) Paragraph 11.8.28 of Chapter 11 of the ES [APP049] makes its assumptions based on construction-related traffic using only the A1 and A47. What measures are in place to secure this (it does not appear to be covered within the Outline Traffic Management Plan [APP146])?</p>	<p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) has been updated to include this and submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/APP/6.8 Rev 1</b>).</p> <p>Traffic management is secured by Requirement 10 to the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>).</p>
		<p>b) What implications are there from this not being secured?</p>	<p>See response to 1.9.8 (a)</p>
1.9.9	The Applicant	<p><b>Noise changes – outdoor receptors</b></p> <p>a) Paragraph 11.8.37 of Chapter 11 of the ES [APP049] indicates that outdoor non-residential receptors such as PRowS, church cemeteries and SSSIs have been excluded from the summary of long-term noise changes without the Proposed Development. Could the Applicant please explain why this was done?</p>	<p>Outdoor receptors were assessed separately to the indoor receptors. The predictions that are undertaken without the scheme (Do-minimum opening year against future year) are used only to check that any noise increases are due to the Scheme (and not due to other reasons). If it is found that noise increases are due to other reasons, then this can sometimes be used to demonstrate that a potential significant effect is not significant.</p> <p>As the Do-something predictions are undertaken before the Do-minimum predictions for the outdoor receptors, it was clear from this assessment that any noise increases were due to the Scheme, and therefore there was no need to carry out further predictions of the Do-minimum scenarios for these receptors because they would not have altered to outcomes of the assessment.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		b) What are the implications of including them?	There are no implications. The predictions without the Scheme are used to review the significance of noise increases which may be due to reasons other than the Scheme. This is not the case in this instance and therefore the noise predictions for the outdoor receptors without the Scheme would not change the outcomes of the assessment.
1.9.10	The Applicant	<p><b>Use of Plant and Machinery</b>            ES Chapter 11 Section 11.9 [APP049] paragraph 11.9.5 explains that where there is a risk of significant effect and where the Principal Contractor's preferred plant departed considerably from the plant identified for the noise and vibration assessment the Principal Contractor would need to assess noise and vibration, consult with the Local Authority, and agree appropriate methods of mitigation and monitoring that account for the location of works, hours of work and expected duration.</p> <p>Given that the Applicant allows for mitigation methods to be agreed later with the Local Authority, can the Applicant explain how a worst-case assessment for noise and vibration has been determined?</p>	<p>The assessment is based on an assumed set of plant for each construction phase. The assumed plant is considered to represent a reasonable worst-case in terms of the specifications, the number of each plant types, and the duration for which they operate each day.</p> <p>There will always be potential for different plant types or specifications to be used by the contractor in which case further assessments are proposed as mitigation to ensure that any considerable changes are properly evaluated. This commitment is secured under Commitment NV1 of the REAC within the EMP (<b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b>).</p>
1.9.11	The Applicant	<p><b>Decarbonising transport</b>            Do the Government's policy statements 'Decarbonising transport: a better, greener Britain' and 'Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener' have</p>	The A47 is a high-speed road, and at these speeds, the primary noise emission is tyre noise, and not noise from the engine. Therefore, road traffic noise emissions would not be expected to change significantly on the A47 as a

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		any implications for the noise and vibration assessment on the basis that this would result in an increase in electric vehicles rather than those powered by internal combustion engines, as electric vehicles have a different noise and vibration profile? If so, what would be the resultant effects?	result of the net zero policy statements. Noise emissions may be reduced on low-speed roads in the future, however the extent of there is not sufficient research into this matter to accurately predict this reduction. As the net zero strategies will result in similar or lower road traffic noise levels, the noise and vibration assessment is based on the worst-case scenario.
1.10	Socio-economic effects		
1.10.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Material assets and waste</b></p> <p>a) Paragraph 10.6.5 of Chapter 10 of the ES [APP048] sets the secondary study area for the source of material assets to be the East of England region. Given the proximity of the site to the East Midlands region, should the study area have been extended to include this region?</p>	<p><u>Material Assets and Waste</u></p> <p>Whilst there is a requirement to set a baseline for material availability in DMRB LA110 (it was elected to establish the baseline for the East of England only), there is no requirement to assess any changes or impacts to this baseline within the methodology. Therefore, extending this baseline to include baseline date for the East Midlands would have no tangible effect on the assessment.</p> <p>As detailed in Table 3.13 of DMRB LA110, the significance categories for assessing the effects on material assets from a scheme relates to targets for recycled content, recovery and recycling only. It does not consider the geographical location of materials required to construct a scheme.</p> <p>In accordance with the table of terms and definitions within DMRB LA110, use of the proximity principle only relates to the requirement to treat and/or dispose of wastes in reasonable proximity to their point of generation.</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		b) What implications would there be for also considering that area?	<p><u>Material Assets and Waste</u></p> <p>As detailed in Table 3.13 of DMRB LA110, the significance categories for assessing the effects on material assets from a Scheme relates to targets for recycled content, recovery and recycling only. It does not consider the geographical location of materials required to construct a Scheme.</p>
		c) Can a sensitivity analysis please be provided?	<p><u>Material Assets and Waste</u></p> <p>Unlike other ES topic chapters, no sensitivity analysis is required in DMRB LA110. The significance of effects on material assets and waste are established in accordance with the significance categories within Table 3.13 of DMRB LA110.</p>
1.10.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Recycling of waste</b></p> <p>a) Paragraph 10.7.11 of the ES [APP048] sets out the target recycling rate for the East of England. Could the equivalent target for recycling within the East Midlands region please be provided?</p>	<p><u>Material Assets and Waste</u></p> <p>Table E/1.2 of DMRB LA110 sets the target recycling rate for the East Midlands as 14%.</p>
		b) Can the Proposed Development please be assessed against this for the East Midlands region?	<p><u>Material Assets and Waste</u></p> <p>The Scheme was not assessed against the target recycling rate for the East Midlands as use of the proximity principle does not apply to material assets.</p> <p>However, the assessment was undertaken using the more conservative recycling rate of 31% for the East of England opposed to the 14% target for the East Midlands.</p> <p>Therefore, applying the more stringent target of 14% for the East Midlands would not change the predicted residual</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			effect (with mitigation) of slight adverse and not significant.
1.10.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Secondary aggregates</b>            Paragraphs 10.7.16 to 10.7.20 of the ES [APP048] set out an analysis of alternative (secondary and recycled aggregates) against the East of England target set out in paragraph 10.7.11. Could the equivalent analysis be undertaken against the target for East Midlands region?</p>	<p><u>Material Assets and Waste HG update</u>            Paragraphs 10.7.16 to 10.7.20 of ES Chapter 10 Materials assets and Waste (<b>APP-048</b>) set the context for secondary aggregates supply in the East of England Region.</p> <p>The context was provided as the assessment methodology considers the recycled content of aggregates used in construction within the region the Scheme lies within (in this case, the East of England).</p> <p>The regional recycled aggregates target content for the East Midlands is 14% which is considerably lower than the 31% target for the East of England region.</p> <p>The current assessment was undertaken using the more conservative recycled aggregates target of 31% opposed to the 14% target for the East Midlands.</p> <p>Additionally, as the recycled aggregates are being used in the East of England region, it is considered more suitable to use the 31% target in the assessment.</p> <p>If the Scheme was to be considered against the 14% target for the East Midlands, this would not change the predicted residual effect (with mitigation) of slight adverse and not significant.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Although the scheme lies solely within the East of England Region, DMRB LA110 states in E/1.2 that "Where a project is located in more than one region, the higher of the regional aggregate recycling targets shall be adopted".</p>
1.10.4	PCC NNC CCC HDC IPs	<p><b>Construction and Demolition Waste</b></p> <p>a) Do IPs consider that the wastage rate of 5% as set out by the Applicant in paragraph 10.10.4 of Chapter 10 of the ES [APP048] is reasonable?</p> <p>b) If not, what should it be? Such a rate should be justified.</p>	
1.10.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Construction and Demolition Waste</b></p> <p>a) In Table 10-5 in Chapter 10 of the ES [APP048] set out the potential management route(s) for recycling are all to be off-site. Could the Applicant please explain why on-site recycling (as in the reuse of materials obtained from preparation works including demolition) has not be utilised as a priority management route?</p>	<p>The potential management routes detailed in Table 10-5 of Chapter 10 Materials Assets and Waste (<b>APP-048</b>) are pre-mitigation.</p> <p>As detailed in paragraph 10.9.11 of ES Chapter 10 (<b>APP-048</b>), the EMP <b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b>) requires the Principal Contractor to adopt best practice in the management of construction waste to reduce waste generation and subsequent landfill disposal. This includes consideration, in accordance with the waste hierarchy, to the re-use/recycling of site generated wastes on the site as a priority management route over transportation off-site for re-use or disposal.</p>
		<p>b) What implications would there be is if this were to be applied?</p>	<p>Table 10-6 (Predicted Residual Effects) of ES Chapter 10 Materials Assets and Waste (<b>APP-048</b>) gives a predicted residual effect and significance (slight adverse/not significant) with mitigation and assumes the re-</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			use/recycling of site generated wastes on the site as a priority management route over transportation off-site for re-use or disposal where appropriate.
		c) How should such a method be secured?	This is secured through REAC Commitment MA2 within the EMP ( <b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b> ) and is secured by Requirement 4 to the dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ).
1.10.6	The Applicant	<p><b>Clarification</b></p> <p>a) Paragraph 12.4.10 of Chapter 12 of the ES [AS016] states that the 12 locations for WCH surveys are shown on Figure 12.1. Could it please be confirmed that these are shown on Figure 12.3? (the incorrect reference is used elsewhere, for example in the title rows of Tables 12-5 and 12-6).</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that the WCH survey locations are shown on ES Figure 12.3 and not 12.1 (<b>TR010039/APP/6.2 Rev 1</b>).</p> <p>On review, it was found that the location of Site 16 is not identified on Figure 12.3. Updated versions of ES Figure 12.3 (<b>TR010039/APP/6.2 Rev 1</b>) and ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>) were provided at Deadline 2.</p>
		b) Additionally, in this paragraph some are marked as "All movements", some as types of movement and/ or direction and some are not marked. Could this please be clarified as to what these terms mean?	<p>Clarification as follows:</p> <p>Site 1 – surveys recorded northbound and southbound movements through the subway.</p> <p>Site 2 – surveys recorded eastbound and westbound cycling movements along the dedicated cycling infrastructure provided at the junction. Some eastbound and westbound pedestrian movements were also captured.</p> <p>Site 3 – surveys recorded all movements into and out of Wansford Nene Way Permissive 1 (permissive footpath) at its junction with Peterborough Road.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Sites 4, 5 and 6 – surveys recorded northbound and southbound movements across the A47, eastbound and westbound on the A47 and movements eastbound and westbound along Nene Way.</p> <p>Site 8 – surveys recorded northbound and southbound movements between footpath Sutton 1 and the carriageway of Nene Way.</p> <p>Site 9 – surveys recorded northbound and southbound movements along footpath Wansford 3 where Old Leicester Road and King's Cliffe Road intersect.</p> <p>Site 10 – surveys recorded northbound and southbound movements at the southern end of footpath Northamptonshire PG1 where it exits onto Yarwell Road.</p> <p>Site 11 – surveys recorded all movements at the split of the footpaths in Old Suleway Forest.</p> <p>Site 12 – surveys recorded all east and west movements between Old Peterborough Road, Ailsworth 3 bridleway and Ailsworth 6 permissive footpath at Sutton Crossways.</p> <p>Site 14 – surveys recorded all movements in all directions at the Nene Way junction with Old Peterborough Road.</p> <p>Site 15 – surveys recorded all movements in all directions at the A47 / Old Peterborough Road roundabout.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			Site 16 – surveys recorded all movements along Sutton Heath Road and into / out of bridleway Sutton 5 which lies to the west of Sutton Heath Road.
1.10.7	The Applicant IPs	<p><b>WCH Surveys</b></p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please explain why no WCH surveys were undertaken to the north of the existing A47?</p>	<p>With regards to the routes lying to the north of the existing A47:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surveys at Sites 4, 5 and 6 provide WCH usage information for the existing Sacrewell Farm access road/Wansford Hereward Way Permissive 3 footpath.</li> <li>• Surveys at Site 15 provide usage information for Upton Road.</li> <li>• Surveys at Site 16 provide WCH usage information for Sutton Heath Road and bridleway Sutton 5.</li> </ul>
		<p>b) Do IPs have any information that they feel is relevant to the consideration of the effects of the Proposed Development of these highway users in this area?</p>	
1.10.8	The Applicant	<p><b>Upton and Lower Lodge Farm</b></p> <p>Paragraphs 4.7.24 and 4.7.25 of the Case for the Scheme [AS022] set out increased distances of travel for residents of Upton and Lower Lodge Farm. While the start point is clear, could the Applicant please clarify the end point of the journeys assessed?</p>	<p>The end point for the existing condition is where Upton Road meets the existing Nene Way roundabout.</p> <p>The end point with the Scheme is where the new Sutton Heath Road will meet the proposed Sutton Heath Roundabout.</p>
1.10.9	The Applicant	<p><b>Upton and Lower Lodge Farm</b></p> <p>Paragraphs 4.7.24 and 4.7.25 of the Case for the Scheme [AS022] assessed the effects on the</p>	<p>Paragraphs 4.7.24 and 4.7.25 of the Case for the Scheme <b>(AS-022)</b> summarise the assessment of the effects of the Scheme on private property and housing, as reported in</p>

		<p>residents in Upton as “slight adverse” at Lower Lodge Farm from the Proposed Development as “moderate adverse”.</p> <p>Table 12-2 of Chapter 12 of the ES [AS016] indicates that for WCH an increase of greater than 500m are considered “major”.</p> <p>Could the applicant further justify its statements in paragraphs 4.7.24 and 4.7.25 as to the degree of effect of the Proposed Development for those walking, cycling or horse riding to/ from these properties.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>). Paragraph 12.10.6 states that:  <i>“All changes to journey lengths as a result of the Scheme in relation to private property and housing, community land and assets and development land and businesses relate to journey length when travelling by vehicle.”</i></p> <p>The statements made in paragraphs 4.7.24 and 4.7.25 regarding the effects of the Scheme are therefore justified in this respect given the increases in journey lengths, the Applicant’s interpretation of advice provided in Table 3.12 of Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standard LA 112 Population and Human Health and through the application of professional judgement.</p> <p>The assessment of the effects on WCH of removing the existing A47/Upton Road/Peterborough Road roundabout and severing Upton Road are summarised in paragraphs 12.10.49 to 12.10.51 of ES Chapter 12 (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>). The assessment reports that the severing of Upton Road, which is an advisory cycle route that is frequently used by cyclists, would result in permanent Moderate adverse effects for cyclists travelling between Ailsworth and Upton, despite the provision of the underpass and the shared use footway/cycleways to be provided as part of the Scheme. However, provision of these mitigation measures would result in permanent Large beneficial effects for cyclists undertaking trips between other destinations, e.g. when travelling between Southorpe and Ailsworth.</p> <p>The severing of Upton Road would result in permanent Moderate adverse effects for pedestrians and equestrians using Upton Road to travel between Upton and Ailsworth</p>
--	--	---	--

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>and between Upton and Sutton, given that the additional journey length via the proposed route would be greater than 500m. However, the numbers of users likely to be affected would be very low. The WCH surveys carried out at the existing A47/Upton Road/Peterborough Road roundabout recorded a total of only 10 pedestrians and 10 equestrians crossing the A47 at the junction throughout the 7 day survey period and almost all of these movements likely comprised single users undertaking a return trip of short duration. Furthermore, alternative, slightly shorter and more attractive routes, for pedestrians and equestrians are already provided between Upton and Ailsworth as part of the Public Rights of Way network to the east and south of Upton. These routes are not impacted by the Scheme and the Helpston Road overbridge facilitates the grade separated crossing of the existing A47 dual carriageway for users.</p>
1.10.10	The Applicant	<p><b>Effect on farm holdings</b>            a) Paragraph 12.4.22 of Chapter 12 of the ES [AS016] notes that three owners/ occupiers of three agricultural landholdings had not been contacted at the time of writing. Has any contact now been achieved, and if so, what were the results?</p>	<p>As set out in ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>) three landowners were not contacted at the time of the survey.</p> <p>These landowners have not subsequently been contacted with regards to this particular survey.</p>
		<p>b) If not, what measures are to be put in place to make contact?</p>	<p>National Highways is continuing to contact all landowners/tenants affected by the Scheme, including the landowners who were not contacted at the time of the survey.</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.10.11	The Applicant	<p><b>Human Health</b> Paragraph 12.4.33 of Chapter 12 of the ES [AS016] sets out the wards where data has been interrogated. Given the proximity of North Northamptonshire, what consideration was given to assessing data from relevant ward(s) in close proximity? Paragraph 12.6.2 refers to Prebendel Ward as being in Cambridgeshire, when it is in North Northamptonshire.</p>	<p>Paragraph 12.4.33 of Chapter 12 Population and human health (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>) has been corrected to confirm Prebendal is within North Northamptonshire and the updated document has been submitted at Deadline 2. The relevant wards were identified through consultation with local authorities and review of boundary maps.</p>
1.10.12	The Applicant	<p><b>Baseline conditions</b> Could a similar analysis as undertaken in paragraph 12.7.6 of Chapter 12 of the ES [AS-016] please be undertaken in relation to North Northamptonshire, or at least a sensitivity analysis undertaken?</p>	<p>As noted above in the response to 1.10.11, wards within North Northamptonshire have already been considered in ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>).</p>
1.10.13	The Applicant	<p><b>Baseline conditions</b> Chapter 6 of the ES [APP044] (Cultural Heritage) refers to the Church of St John the Baptist in Upton. This has not been referred to in Chapter 12. Equally, the Church of St John the Baptist referred to as being in Sutton, it is in Stibbington (see paragraph 6.6.42 of Chapter 6 of the ES). Could these errors be investigated and any implications reported in relation to socio-economic effects?</p>	<p>Paragraph 12.7.8 of ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>) has been corrected to refer to Stibbington. The Church of St John the Baptiste has been added to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12.10.19</li> <li>• Table 12-11</li> </ul> <p>ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>) now confirms that access to the Church of St John the Baptiste will be unaffected by the Scheme.</p>
1.10.14	The Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural land holdings</b> Could the Applicant please undertake a sensitivity analysis in similar terms to paragraphs 12.7.15 to</p>	<p>Paragraphs 12.7.15 and 12.7.17 of ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>) are not regionally specific so the Applicant is unable to</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		12.7.17 in relation to the East Midlands region, given the proximity.	undertake a sensitivity analysis of the adjacent region.
1.10.15	Landowners/occupiers of Farms set out in Table 12-4 of ES [AS016]	<p><b>Effect on farm holdings</b></p> <p>a) Could the landowners/ occupiers of the Farm References 1 to 7 as set out in Table 12-4 of Chapter 12 of the ES [AS016], please confirm the land use of their holdings?</p> <p>b) If the use is not as set out in that Table could the party please set out the nature of the land-use, both currently and over the last five years.</p>	
1.10.16	The Applicant	<p><b>Human Health</b></p> <p>Could the Applicant confirm whether the data used for health/ life expectancy set out in Table 12-7 of the ES [AS016] pre-dates the Covid-19 pandemic and, if so, whether there are any implications that should be taken as a result of the pandemic.</p>	<p>The data in Table 12-7 of ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>) was taken from the Census 2011 and Public Health England Fingertips. These data pre-date the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>The assessment is reliant on the data available. Data reflecting the pandemic is yet to be published. There are therefore no implications on ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>).</p>
1.10.17	The Applicant PCC	<p><b>Old Station House</b></p> <p>Could the Applicant and PCC provide dates (first occupation and last occupation) when the Old Station House was occupied as a dwelling?</p>	<p>The Applicant's understanding is that Old Station House was built circa 1865 and was converted into a dwelling circa 1930.</p> <p>Old Station House was last occupied as a dwelling in August 2019 when the occupant left the property.</p>
1.10.18	The Applicant	<p><b>Clarification</b></p> <p>Could the Applicant please confirm the distances set</p>	Paragraph 12.10.9 of ES Chapter 12 Population and human health has been updated to correctly reference

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		out in paragraph 12.10.9. Is it correct that they are 30 millimetres and 340 millimetres?	kilometres and the updated Chapter ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b> ) has been submitted at Deadline 2.
10.10.19	The Applicant	<p><b>Heath House</b>            Table 12-2 in Chapter 12 of the ES [AS016] indicates that an additional distance for a WCH users of greater than 500 metres should be considered to be 'major'. However, in paragraph 12.10.10 the additional distance, albeit by vehicle, would be 770 metres. Any occupier from this property walking to another facility would have to travel a further distance. Could this be quantified and assessed.</p>	<p>Pedestrian access to Heath House is currently provided via Sutton Heath Road, a rural single carriageway road with no footway provision. Sutton Heath Road connects to the existing A47 at its southern end and no pedestrian facilities are provided along the A47 in the vicinity of the junction.</p> <p>Sutton Heath Road would become a cul-de-sac as part of the Scheme as the southern section which connects to the existing A47 will be stopped up.</p> <p>Walking distances to facilities located to the north and east of Heath House would increase by less than 50m as the northern section of Sutton Heath Road would remain open but be slightly re-aligned as part of the Scheme. The magnitude of impact on WCH would therefore be negligible.</p> <p>Although the southern section of Sutton Heath Road would be stopped up as part of the Scheme, a new underpass (Wansford NMU underpass (S02)) suitable for use by pedestrians and cyclists would be provided facilitating a connection between the cul-de-sac section of Sutton Heath Road and the proposed footway/cycleway to be provided on the southern side of the new A47 alignment. The proposed underpass would utilise the disused railway alignment that is in cutting at this point providing a grade separated crossing of the new A47 for pedestrians and cyclists. The walking distances to facilities located to the</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			south of Heath Road are unlikely to increase as a result of the Scheme but facilities would be more accessible on foot and cycle due to the provision of the new infrastructure.
1.10.20	The Applicant PCC	<p><b>6, 8, 10 and 12 Great North Road, Thornhaugh</b></p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please supply, measured on the basis of Ordnance Survey records, the extent of each residential garden of these properties currently and after the Proposed Development both graphically and in square metres.</p>	Please refer to drawing in <b>Annex L – A1 Property Garden Areas (TR010039/EXAM/9.7)</b> .
		b) Does PCC have any adopted standards for the size of gardens which may be applicable to the consideration of this matter?	
1.10.21	The Applicant	<p><b>Decarbonising Transport</b></p> <p>a) Do the Government's policy statements 'Decarbonising transport: a better, greener Britain' and 'Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener' have any implications for the population and human health assessment?</p>	Please see the answer to 1.1.14 above for information on the Government's policy statements on Decarbonising transport and the Net Zero Strategy. In terms of population and human health, they will result in similar or lower emissions to air and may also reduce noise emissions. It is not possible to quantify these effects for the ES but as the Government strategies will result in similar or lower effects on population and human health receptors, the population and human health assessment at ES Chapter 12 Population and human health ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b> ) is based on the worst-case scenario.
		b) If so, what would be the resultant effects?	See 1.10.21 (a) above.  As explained in other responses referred to in (a) above,

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response												
			there is not sufficient research into this matter to accurately predict the resultant effects.												
1.10.22	The Applicant	<p><b>Separation of Communities</b>            Several RRs indicate the historic links between Upton, Sutton, Castor and Ailsworth, which they consider would be severed, or at least severely compromised, by the Proposed Development.</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please set out the distances in the DM and DS scenarios between the following locations:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="542 775 1240 1410"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="542 775 712 826"><u>Start</u></th> <th data-bbox="712 775 1240 826"><u>Finsh</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="542 826 712 944">Model Farm, Upton</td> <td data-bbox="712 826 1240 944">The junction of Nene Way and The Drift in Sutton</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="542 944 712 1062">Model Farm, Upton</td> <td data-bbox="712 944 1240 1062">The junction of Peterborough Road and Main Street in Ailsworth</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="542 1062 712 1181">Model Farm, Upton</td> <td data-bbox="712 1062 1240 1181">Castor C of E Primary School, Castor</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="542 1181 712 1369">Heath House, Sutton Heath Road</td> <td data-bbox="712 1181 1240 1369">The junction of Nene Way and The Drift in Sutton</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="542 1369 712 1410">Heath</td> <td data-bbox="712 1369 1240 1410">The junction of Peterborough Road and</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Start</u>	<u>Finsh</u>	Model Farm, Upton	The junction of Nene Way and The Drift in Sutton	Model Farm, Upton	The junction of Peterborough Road and Main Street in Ailsworth	Model Farm, Upton	Castor C of E Primary School, Castor	Heath House, Sutton Heath Road	The junction of Nene Way and The Drift in Sutton	Heath	The junction of Peterborough Road and	Please refer to the drawings in <b>Annex M - Separation of Communities (TR010039/EXAM/9.7)</b> .
<u>Start</u>	<u>Finsh</u>														
Model Farm, Upton	The junction of Nene Way and The Drift in Sutton														
Model Farm, Upton	The junction of Peterborough Road and Main Street in Ailsworth														
Model Farm, Upton	Castor C of E Primary School, Castor														
Heath House, Sutton Heath Road	The junction of Nene Way and The Drift in Sutton														
Heath	The junction of Peterborough Road and														

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response										
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="537 331 705 478">House, Sutton Heath Road</td> <td data-bbox="705 331 1232 478">Main Street in Ailsworth</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="537 478 705 662">Heath House, Sutton Heath Road</td> <td data-bbox="705 478 1232 662">Castor C of E Primary School, Castor</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="537 662 705 845">Lower Lodge Farm, Upton Road</td> <td data-bbox="705 662 1232 845">The junction of Nene Way and The Drift in Sutton</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="537 845 705 1029">Lower Lodge Farm, Upton Road</td> <td data-bbox="705 845 1232 1029">The junction of Peterborough Road and Main Street in Ailsworth</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="537 1029 705 1212">Lower Lodge Farm, Upton Road</td> <td data-bbox="705 1029 1232 1212">Castor C of E Primary School, Castor</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="537 1212 1232 1393">The distances should be reported along highways open to all traffic and PRowS (if different). It would aid interpretation if the routes could be shown on a plan to an Ordnance Survey</p>	House, Sutton Heath Road	Main Street in Ailsworth	Heath House, Sutton Heath Road	Castor C of E Primary School, Castor	Lower Lodge Farm, Upton Road	The junction of Nene Way and The Drift in Sutton	Lower Lodge Farm, Upton Road	The junction of Peterborough Road and Main Street in Ailsworth	Lower Lodge Farm, Upton Road	Castor C of E Primary School, Castor	
House, Sutton Heath Road	Main Street in Ailsworth												
Heath House, Sutton Heath Road	Castor C of E Primary School, Castor												
Lower Lodge Farm, Upton Road	The junction of Nene Way and The Drift in Sutton												
Lower Lodge Farm, Upton Road	The junction of Peterborough Road and Main Street in Ailsworth												
Lower Lodge Farm, Upton Road	Castor C of E Primary School, Castor												

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		base.	
		b) Does the Applicant wish to make any further written comment about the effects on the separation of communities?	<p><b>Sutton Drift</b> The impact on Sutton of stopping up of The Drift is discussed in ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1) section 6.7.18 and Table 6-7 on page 67.</p> <p>The road will be left open and accessible by vehicles from Nene Way up to the point of severance.</p> <p><b>Sutton Heath Road</b> Sutton Heath Road would become a cul-de-sac as part of the Scheme as the southern section which connects to the existing A47 will be stopped up, as shown on Sheet 4 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans (TR010039/APP/2.4 Rev 2). The resulting 'dead end' at Sutton Heath Road will be in the form of a turning head for vehicles. A gated arrangement will be provided for pedestrian, cyclist and landowner use.</p> <p>A new underpass (Wansford non-motorised user (NMU) underpass (S02) (see Engineering drawings and sections (TR010039/APP/2.5 Rev 1) suitable for use by pedestrians and cyclists would be provided facilitating a connection between the cul-de-sac section of Sutton Heath Road and the proposed cycle track to be provided on the southern side of the new A47 alignment. The proposed underpass would utilise the disused railway alignment that is in cutting at this point providing a grade separated crossing of the new A47 for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>The access to Heath House will be realigned to ensure a safer junction layout. The reference to stopping up is to the 150m length of the existing road as shown on the Rights of Way and Access Plans, Sheet 5 of 7 (<b>TR010039/APP/2.4 Rev 2</b>).</p> <p>With the new gated access, it is not considered that this 'dead end' would attract anti-social behaviour.</p> <p><b><i>Upton Road</i></b>  The assessment of the effects on WCH of removing the existing A47/Upton Road/Peterborough Road roundabout and severing Upton Road are summarised in paragraphs 12.10.49 to 12.10.51 of ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>). The assessment reports that the severing of Upton Road, which is an advisory cycle route that is frequently used by cyclists, would result in permanent moderate adverse effects for cyclists travelling between Ailsworth and Upton, despite the provision of the underpass and the shared use cycle track to be provided as part of the Scheme. However, provision of these mitigation measures would result in permanent large beneficial effects for cyclists undertaking trips between other destinations, e.g. when travelling between Southorpe and Ailsworth. On that basis, there is no requirement to provide a further grade separated crossing of the A47 in the location suggested.</p> <p>The severing of Upton Road would result in permanent moderate adverse effects for pedestrians and equestrians using Upton Road to travel between Upton and Ailsworth</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>and between Upton and Sutton., given the additional journey length via the proposed route would be greater than 500m. However, the numbers of users likely to be affected would be very low. The WCH surveys carried out at the existing A47/Upton Road/Peterborough Road roundabout recorded a total of only 10 pedestrians and 10 equestrians crossing the A47 at the junction throughout the 7-day survey period and almost all of these movements likely comprised single users undertaking a return trip of short duration. Furthermore, alternative, slightly shorter and more attractive routes, for pedestrians and equestrians are already provided between Upton and Ailsworth as part of the Public Rights of Way network to the east and south of Upton. These routes are not impacted by the Scheme and the Helpston Road overbridge facilitates the grade separated crossing of the existing A47 dual carriageway for users.</p> <p>The Applicant has considered ways to deliver improvements that reduce community severance and improve accessibility and has used reasonable endeavors to address any existing severance issues that act as a barrier to non-motorised users, considering what opportunities there maybe to improve access. However, an applicant is not required to address all of the issues with the wider WCH network in the local area as part of its application, especially where the termini lie some distance from the Scheme: the improvement of the network in general is a matter for the local highway authority. This applies to enhancements of WCH connectivity between the villages of Upton and Sutton and improve the cycling route between Ailsworth and Sutton.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>A separate Designated Funds study looking into the feasibility of opportunities to further enhance WCH connectivity in the wider area is currently ongoing. It is understood that opportunities to enhance WCH connectivity between the villages of Upton and Sutton and improve the cycling route between Ailsworth and Sutton would be evaluated as part of this separate study. However, there is no guarantee that funding will be secured, and these potential improvements do not form part of the Applicant's Case for the Scheme (<b>AS-022</b>).</p>
1.10.23	IPs	<p><b>Human Health effects</b></p> <p>a) Chapter 12 of the ES [AS016] paragraph 1.24.37 indicates that DMRB LA 112 does not define the significance of human health effects. Are IPs satisfied with the assessment methodology for human health effects as set out in the ES?</p> <p>b) If not, could you please set out what methodology should be used, justifying your answer.</p>	
1.11	Traffic and Transport		
1.11.1	PCC CCC NNC	<p><b>Traffic Model</b></p> <p>a) Do the Councils agree that the use of the South East Regional Transport Model (SERTM) for traffic modelling is appropriate in all the circumstances of the proposal?</p> <p>b) If not, what other model or geographic area should be utilised?</p>	

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.11.2	The Applicant IPs, particularly PCC and Parish Councils	<p><b>WCH surveys</b></p> <p>a) Paragraph 5.125 of the TA indicates the location for WCH surveys. Was there a particular reason why no surveys were undertaken at the junction of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Sutton Heath Road with the A47;</li> <li>(ii) The Drift with the A47; and</li> <li>(iii) the junction of Wansford 4 with the A47; in relation to crossing of the A47 by WCHs.</li> </ul>	<p>WCH surveys were not undertaken at the junctions of Sutton Heath Road and The Drift as the results of the WCH usage surveys undertaken at Sites 4,5, and 6, Site 15 and Site 16 and an examination of the routes available for user provided by the existing networks were sufficient to inform the Applicant's understanding of WCH user activity in the vicinity of the existing A47. It should be noted that the new facilities for pedestrians and cyclists to be provided as part of the Scheme, as shown on sheets 4 to 6 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>(TR010039/APP/2.4 Rev 2)</b>, would improve both east to west and north to south connectivity for users routing via Sutton Heath Road and The Drift.</p> <p>Footpath Wansford 4 provides a connection between the westbound layby on the existing A47 and the footpaths running east to west along the northern bank of the River Nene, namely footpath Sutton 1 and footpath Wansford Permissive Nene Way 4. There is no requirement for pedestrians to cross the A47 at this point since there are no connecting routes for pedestrians on the north side of the A47. It is for this reason that WCH surveys were not undertaken at this location. It should be noted that the existing layby would be removed as part of the Scheme and footpath Wansford 4 would be diverted, to provide a connection between the existing footpaths running along the northern bank of the River Nene and the proposed cycle track running east to west and to the south of the new A47.</p>
		b) Do IPs have any information as to the extent of use of these junctions by WCHs.	

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>c) Paragraph 5.1.28 indicates that the survey period included a Bank Holiday. Does any party consider this effects way the consideration of the results and, if they do, could they explain why they take the view?</p>	<p>The WCH surveys were carried out between 7am and 7pm for seven consecutive days between Saturday 26 May and Friday 1 June 2018. The survey period coincided with the school half term holiday period and Monday 28 May was a Bank Holiday. The weather during the surveys was dry and bright.</p> <p>The majority of the study area is rural in nature and there are a limited number of local amenities located to the east of the A1, as shown on ES Figure 12.1 (<b>APP-078</b>). In view of this, it is envisaged that the majority of WCH activity captured by the surveys comprised trips undertaken for recreational purposes as opposed to trips undertaken for utility purposes.</p> <p>The collected usage information is expected to be representative of typical weekday and weekend day WCH activity in the vicinity of the Scheme. However, in reality, the usage figures could be slightly higher than typical levels given that the WCH surveys were undertaken during a school holiday period when the weather was dry and bright, so conducive to walking and cycling.</p>
1.11.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Peak hour flows</b></p> <p>a) Could Tables 7-3 to 7-8 of the TA please be redone with the routes (i) descriptions simplified, and (ii) shown on a map (figure)?</p> <p>For example, 'Nene Way Roundabout' 'A47 western approach' 'EB', when that simply means Nene Way roundabout east bound.</p>	<p>Tables 7-3 to 7-8 have been revised with simplified descriptive names in the updated TA (<b>TR010039/APP/7.3 Rev 2</b>) submitted at Deadline 2. Figure 7-2 in Section 7-2 details the location of the assessment links. For further clarity an additional table (Table 7-1) has been added with full definitions of the assessment links. The figure has also been updated with a numerical reference to simplify the definition of the locations.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>It should be noted that insertion of an additional table has changed the table reference numbers in the revised TA.</p>
		<p>b) Could these figures also be provided for the Wansford west roundabout on all directions of travel in all the scenarios cited in Tables 7-3 to 7-8.</p>	<p>Additional tables for the A47/A11 western roundabout peak hour traffic flows and queue lengths have been included in the VISSIM operational modelling Section 7.9 of the TA (<b>TR010039/APP/7.3 Rev 2</b>) which has been submitted at Deadline 2. VISSIM does not output any Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC) values. Therefore, RFC values have been included based on ARCADY analysis.</p> <p>See response to 1.11.6 for further details on the assessment of the A47/A11 western roundabout.</p>
1.11.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Journey time comparisons</b> a) Could the Applicant confirm that in Table 7-9 of the TA the decimal set out for each minute is 6 minutes in time?</p>	<p>Decimal minutes rounded to one decimal place have been used. Therefore 0.1 minutes represents 6 seconds (i.e. <math>60 * 0.1 = 6</math>).</p>
		<p>b) Could this please be re-presented in minutes and seconds.</p>	<p>Table 7-9 has been updated in the TA (<b>TR010039/APP/7.3 Rev 2</b>) which has been submitted at Deadline 2 to represent the journey times in minutes and second format (mm:ss).</p>
1.11.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Journey time comparisons</b> Could the Applicant please redo the journey comparisons set out in Table 7-9 for each and all of the following time periods:</p>	<p>The Applicant is unable to provide journey time comparisons for the time periods set out in the written question.</p> <p>However, journey time analysis in Table 7-9 of the TA</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question			Applicant's Response
		<u>No</u>	<u>Abbreviation</u>	<u>Description</u>	<p>(<b>TR010039/APP/7.3 Rev 2</b>) has been provided for the AM and PM peak hours (07:30 to 08:30 and 16:30 to 17:30) and an IP hour (13:00 to 14:00) time segments.</p> <p>This is based on the WTM SATURN model time period definitions as discussed in para 6.3.2 of the TA (<b>TR010039/APP/7.3 Rev 2</b>). The WTM SATURN model is only available for the two peak hours and the Inter-Peak. Therefore, it is not feasible to provide journey time results for other time periods.</p> <p>Please refer to <b>Annex N – Traffic Counts - Weekday average daily traffic profile for Wansford</b> (<b>TR010039/EXAM/9.7</b>), based on National Highways WebTRIS traffic counts on the A1 and A47. <b>Annex N - Traffic Counts AM and PM Shoulder Peak Ratios</b> (<b>TR010039/EXAM/9.7</b>) shows the ratio between the shoulder peak hour traffic flows to the modelled peak hour traffic flows.</p> <p>The traffic flow profile provides a representation of traffic across the model study area over an average weekday. Travel times in general increase with traffic flow, however this relationship is not linear. In lower flow conditions traffic speeds will tend towards free-flow conditions. The WTM modelled IP journey times included in the assessment will provide a representation of the time saving benefits of the Scheme in less congested conditions.</p>
1	AM1	AM Peak period 1 (07:00 to 08:00)			
2	AM2	AM Peak period 2 (08:00 to 09:00)			
3	AM3	AM Peak period 3 (09:00 to 10:00)			
4	IP	Inter-peak period (10:00 to 16:00) average hour			
5	PM1	PM1 Peak period 1 (16:00 to 17:00)			
6	PM2	PM2 Peak period 2 (17:00 to 18:00)			
7	PM3	PM3 Peak period 3 (18:00 to 19:00)			
8	EV	Evening period (19:00 to 22:00) average hour			
9	ON	Overnight period (22:00 to 07:00) average hour			
		These should be set out by route shown in Figure 7-1 and should be shown in minutes and seconds.			
1.11.6	The Applicant	<p><b>Roundabouts operation</b></p> <p>In relation to this question, the DM scenarios in the eastern part of the application site relate to the</p>			<p>It should be considered that Volume over Capacity (V/C) values, derived from SATURN, are equivalent to Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC) or Degree of Saturation (DoS)</p>

		<p>existing Nene Way roundabout and the DS scenarios (both) to the proposed Sutton Heath roundabout. In relation to the western part of the application site they relate to the Wansford east and Wansford west roundabouts.</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please undertake an assessment of the capacity of all three roundabouts within the Order Lands in the DM, DS opening year and DS design year scenarios. These should include the Degree of Saturation (DoS) figures and Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC). If any of these show DoS or RFC figures in excess of 0.85 can the Applicant explain how the proposal will meet the Scheme Objectives (paragraph 2.2.1 of the TA) and what mitigations would be put in place to reduce either to below 0.85, along with details of how those mitigations are to be secured.</p>	<p>values. The capacity assessment has therefore been undertaken on this basis for the Sutton Heath\Nene way roundabout and the A1/A47 eastern roundabout.</p> <p>A comparison of V/C and delay results, between DM and DS, for the Sutton Heath\Nene way roundabout and the A1/A47 eastern roundabout are available in Table 7.8 of the TA. These results are extracted from the Wansford SATURN model. However, to provide further discussion, these results have been separated in tables and sub-section in Section 7.6 of the updated TA (<b>TR010039/APP/7.3 Rev 2</b>).</p> <p>Discussion has been included where results are above the 85% threshold with regards to any mitigations.</p> <p>In summary, the Sutton Heath roundabout has arms over the 85% threshold in the 2040 DS AM peak scenario, however as these represent relative improvements to the DM situation no further mitigations are proposed.</p> <p>The analysis of the A47/A1 eastern roundabout shows a decrease in travel time savings in the PM peak DS scenario in the westbound direction. These congestion issues are principally caused by the constraints caused by the bridge over the A1 and the western roundabout. No further mitigations are proposed for the A47/A1 eastbound roundabout.</p> <p>The impact of the Scheme on the A47/A1 western roundabout and the local network in Wansford village has been assessed utilising the VISSIM model. VISSIM has been adopted to undertake a detailed assessment of the performance of the A47/A1 western roundabout. As discussed in Section 2.1, there are no Scheme</p>
--	--	--	---

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>improvements on the approach arms of the A47/A1 western roundabout. However, the allocation of two eastbound exit lanes improves the utilisation of the A47 eastbound approach lanes. Therefore, the VISSIM micro-simulation model has been considered as a better tool to assess the detailed benefits of the operational improvement of the A47 eastbound exit lanes at the junction.</p> <p>Para 7.2.3 discusses the application of VISSIM for the A47/A1 western roundabout and the local network in Wansford village. This paragraph has been updated to provide the additional details as discussed above.</p> <p>Only 2040 DM and DS are available from VISSIM. However, this section has been updated to include 2019 base year information as well as traffic flows and queue lengths VISSIM does not output any Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC) values. Therefore, RFC values have been included based on ARCADY analysis.</p> <p>Where excess delays and queues are present in the DS scenario they have been highlighted and discussed.</p> <p>Additional ARCADY results have been included to provide an assessment of RFC values.</p> <p>With regards to the mitigations related to the A47/A1 western roundabout, these are discussed in Section 8.2 of the TA (<b>TR010039/APP/7.3 Rev 2</b>). The Applicant's position on the A47/A1 western roundabout is outlined in 8.2.4:</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p><i>"The pre-existing issue at the A1/A47 roundabouts will be raised with the Highways England Operations team for consideration as a future improvement project during the identification and prioritization process for future roads periods."</i></p>
		<p>b) Could the Applicant please undertake queue length/ time analysis for all three roundabouts within the Order Lands in the DM, DS opening year and DS design year scenarios, for all time periods, ie those set out in the table within ExQ<b>Error! Reference source not found.</b>, for all arms.</p>	<p>As discussed above queue length and delay results have now been provided from the VISSIM operational modelling assessment as shown in section 7 of the TA (<b>TR010039/APP/7.3 Rev 2</b>).</p> <p>For the A47/A1 western roundabout additional ARCADY results have also been provided.</p> <p>Delay and V/C results have been provided for the SATURN assessments for the Sutton Heath\Nene way roundabout and the A1/A47 eastern roundabout as shown in section 7 of the TA (<b>TR010039/APP/7.3 Rev 2</b>).</p>
		<p>c) Where any roundabout is signalised or proposed to be signalised, an appropriate LinSIG analysis should be completed and submitted.</p>	<p>In the DS scenario no signalised junctions have been included as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>In the DM scenario there is a partial signalisation of the of the A1 / A47 eastern roundabout, which operates on the A47 eastbound approach arm in the AM peak.</p> <p>As the signalization of the junction is only on one inbound arm it is not considered suitable to undertake LINSIG analysis. Strategic traffic assignment SATURN analysis has instead been provided.</p> <p>Table 7-8 Section 7.6 of the TA (<b>TR010039/APP/7.3 Rev</b></p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>2) shows 2025 and 2040 V/C model results on the A47 eastbound approach arm in the AM peak. Analysis of this table shows that in the Do Something scenario, with the Scheme in place, V/C ratios are below the 85% threshold and delays have decreased (2025 AM peak delay DM 1.2 mins, DS 0.1 mins. 2040 AM peak delay DM 2.9 mins, DS 0.1 mins.)</p>
1.11.7	The Applicant	<p><b>Road Safety Audits</b> a) Could the Applicant please advise to what stage Road Safety Audits have been taken of the various parts of the Proposed Development?</p>	<p>A Stage 1 road safety audit was carried out on the entire Scheme over December 2020 and January 2021. Following on from this initial audit, in May 2021 the audit team were instructed to carry out a second road safety audit, as an addendum to the original audit, to cover specific design elements that had changed since the original audit.</p>
		b) If they have been undertaken, could they please be reported, along with the responses to date?	<p>The Road Safety Audit documents have been submitted at Deadline 2 (<b>TR010039/EXAM/9.11</b>).</p>
		c) If they have not been undertaken when are they to be undertaken?	<p>Please refer to response to 1.11.7 (a) and (b).</p>
1.11.8	The Applicant	<p><b>Wansford west roundabout – traffic</b> Table 7-9 of the TA indicates that the proposal would only result in a minimal time saving in the PM peak. It is said this is mainly due to delays at the exit from the Wansford East roundabout in the DS scenario which is caused by traffic blocking back across the bridge from the Wansford West roundabout.</p>	<p>The majority of the travel time benefits for Scheme are derived in the eastbound direction in the AM peak. Particularly for movements between the A1 and A47 where the provision of the Scheme A1 to A47 eastbound on-slip relieves congestion.</p> <p>It is not within the scope of the Scheme to provide a westbound A47 to A1 slip road. Although the Scheme slightly improves the operation of the western roundabout,</p>

		<p>Paragraph 4.7.14 of Case for the Scheme [AS022] states: "There is a pre-existing issue at the A1/A47 roundabouts (mainly the western roundabout)." This is acknowledged in paragraph 7.9.6 of the TA and paragraph 4.7.14 of Case for the Scheme [AS-022] continues: "... this 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> <p>How will the Proposed Development meet the Scheme Objectives (paragraph 2.2.1 of the TA), particularly that of providing a more free-flowing network, if improvements to the Wansford west roundabout are not secured as part of the Proposed Development, noting that it lies in the application site?</p>	<p>the analysis shows that congestion issues will remain.</p> <p>However, although the Scheme does not resolve the congestion issues in the westbound direction, which is the major movement in the PM peak, the modelling does show journey time savings across the A47 length of the Scheme. Although these are modest in comparison to the AM peak eastbound direction, they do represent reductions in journey time and therefore provide improvements with respect to a "more free-flowing network".</p> <p>The PM peak westbound journey time savings are greater in the 2025 opening year, than the 2040 design year. For instance, the A47 westbound to A1 south journey time improves by 6% in 2025 and 1% in 2040 (approx. 1 minute in 2025 and approx. 10 seconds in 2040). Similarly, the A47 westbound to A1 north journey time improves by 6% in 2025 and 1% in 2040 (approx. 30 seconds in 2025 and approx. 10 seconds in 2040).</p> <p>In addition, Table 7-10 in Section 7.7 of the TA (<b>TR010039/APP/7.3 Rev 2</b>) presents the overall average speeds of the SATURN simulation network. In both 2025 and 2040, there is a relative improvement in PM Do-Something speeds, within the simulation area, of 0.6% in 2025 and 3.9% in 2040.</p> <p>Overall, this indicates that the Scheme will have a positive impact in terms of improving the A47 corridor and the operation of the wider network.</p> <p>Lastly, Section 5 of the Case for Scheme (<b>AS-022</b>) details the economic appraisal.</p> <p>At level 1, with consideration of the effects of delays during</p>
--	--	---	---

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>construction, accident benefits, indirect taxation benefits, monetised environmental impacts and maintenance costs, the initial Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) is 3.2 which represents 'High' Value for Money (VfM).</p> <p>A large component of the Level 1 benefits results from travel time savings. (See Table 5-1. Consumer Commuting User Benefits £31.16m, Consumer Other User Benefits £25.99m, Consumer Business User Benefits £36.60m)</p>
1.11.9		<p><b>Proposed WCH facilities</b> Table 7-14 reference 5 of the TA indicates that the proposed new permissive bridleway would be substandard in width.</p> <p>a) Why, and to what extent (width and length), would it be substandard in width?</p>	<p>Table 5.16 of DMRB standard CD143 Designing for walking, cycling and horse-riding recommends a minimum width of 3.0m for a two-way horse-riding route and 2.0m for a single file route. Table E/1.2 also recommends a 0.5m clearance adjacent to a vertical feature greater than 1.2m in height to maintain the effective width of the route. In addition, paragraph 5.16.6 recommends that a separation width of 1.8m should be provided between the carriageway and the route, although, this recommendation is not a design requirement.</p> <p>However, DMRB is applicable to trunk road design. The proposed Sacrewell Farm access road will be a private means of access. It will also become the route of the diverted footpath Wansford Hereward Way Permissive 3.</p> <p>The width of the new permissive bridleway will be 2.0m wide throughout its length, including the section beneath the proposed A47 underbridge and no separation will be provided between the route and the access road.</p> <p>The proposed Sacrewell Farm access road will be a lightly</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>trafficked private means of access where vehicle speeds are anticipated to be very low, making it suitable for people to walk, cycle and horse ride in a safer environment. Therefore, given the sub-standard width of the new permissive bridleway, cyclists and equestrians may choose to use the carriageway of the access road per the existing Sacrewell Farm access road.</p>
		<p>b) What consideration has been given to ensuring that it is of standard width?</p>	<p>Please refer to the response 1.11.9 (a).</p>
		<p>c) If it has been considered, why has that been rejected?</p>	<p>Please refer to the response 1.11.9 (a).</p>
		<p>d) If it has not been considered, could the Applicant please give consideration to delivering this at a minimum of standard width.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response 1.11.9 (a).</p>
<p>1.11.10</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p><b>WCH routes</b>            Given the Wansford Nene Way Permissive 1, Wansford Annual Maintenance 113, Wansford Nene 4 and Wansford Hereward Way Permissive 3 are all permissive routes, and thus could be withdrawn, what measures are in place to ensure that appropriate WCH routes are available in perpetuity to ensure that the Proposed Development does not worsen accessibility or increase severance? (See paragraph 5.216 of the NPSNN.)</p>	<p>Wansford Nene Way Permissive 1 is a permissive footpath which passes under the A1 and is accessed from Peterborough Road in Wansford. Although this existing route is identified as a permissive footpath, there is some confusion as to its status. It was previously signposted as being available for cyclists and horse riders. It is currently signposted as the Nene Way, which is a long distance walking route, but it is regularly used by cyclists as evidenced in the WCH surveys. Since the surveys were undertaken, the gradients, width and surfacing of the section of the route between the A1 underpass and the Wansford picnic area have been improved. The shared use cycle track and the permissive bridleway to be</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>provided as part of the Scheme provide a connection to this existing WCH route.</p> <p>The permissive status of this route is a pre-existing issue and is not a result of the Scheme. The Applicant has no reason to believe that permission to use the route will be withdrawn. Works have recently been carried out to upgrade it to improve access for horse riders and cyclists, and those improvements, together with use of those facilities have not triggered an objection to such use or the closure of the route.</p> <p>At its western end, Wansford Annual Maintenance 113 will connect to the proposed new cycle track that will become a highway. The rest of this permissive route, which runs eastwards and connects to Wansford Nene Way Permissive 4, is not impacted by the Proposed Scheme and will remain as a permissive route. The Applicant has no reason to believe that permission to use the route will be withdrawn.</p> <p>Wansford Nene Way Permissive 4 is not impacted by the Proposed Scheme and will remain as a permissive route. The Applicant has no reason to believe that permission to use the route will be withdrawn.</p> <p>The new link to Sacrewell Farm will be a permissive route and should have the same rights as the existing route, which is currently available 24 hours a day for pedestrians. It will be closed at night for vehicles.</p> <p>The proposed Sacrewell Farm access road will be a</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			private means of access. It will also become the route of the diverted footpath Wansford Hereward Way Permissive 3 will comprise the diverted route adjacent to the new Sacrewell Farm access road.
1.11.11	The Applicant	<b>Accident data</b> Tables 7-16 and 7-17 and paragraph 7.12.9 of the TA all refer to an "analysis period". Could this please be precisely defined, preferably in years/ months.	The COBA-LT assessment considers impacts over a 60-year appraisal period from the Scheme opening year.
1.11.12	The Applicant	<b>Signage strategy</b> Paragraph 8.3.1 of the TA indicates that a signage strategy has been completed. Can this please be provided.	The Traffic Sign Layout Plans have been submitted at Deadline 2 ( <b>TR010039/EXAM/9.12</b> ).
1.11.13	The Applicant	<b>Outline Transport Management Plan</b> Could the Applicant please check this document, there appears to be some references of matters that may not be relevant – for example, the Norfolk Agricultural Show.	The OTMP ( <b>TR010039/APP/7.6 Rev 1</b> .) has been amended and submitted at Deadline 2.
1.11.14	The Applicant	<b>Sutton Heath Road</b> Could the Applicant please clarify what signage would be installed at the junction of Sutton Heath Road with the proposed new road from the proposed Sutton Heath roundabout to the south of the junction with Langley Bush Road.	Please refer to the Traffic Sign Layout Plan Sheet 5 of 7 ( <b>TR010039/EXAM/9.12</b> ).
1.11.15	The Applicant	<b>The Drift</b> a) Could the Applicant please clarify the proposals for the section of The Drift between the proposed turning head and the existing A47? Sheet 6 of	The section of the Drift between the proposed turning head and the existing A47 will become a "Bridleway". An annotation has been added to Sheet 6 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans ( <b>TR010039/APP/2.4 Rev 2</b> ) and a

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>the Rights of Way and Access Plan [AS008] indicates that it is to be "Highway to be Stopped Up"? It is possible that there may be an annotation for "New Shared Cycle Track", but unlike others (for example to the west of the northern extent) this is not annotated on top of the to be stopped up highway. If necessary, can the plan be re-annotated.</p>	<p>revised version of the drawing has been submitted at Deadline 2.</p>
		<p>b) If this is to be a Shared Cycle Track, then could the nature of any physical obstruction at either end be clarified (the indicator does not appear in the key to the Environmental Masterplan [AS021]).</p>	<p>The Drift is to remain accessible rather than closed and will allow for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.</p>
		<p>c) If it is to be a Shared Cycle Track, then could the Applicant please re-consider the northern junction, and the junction with the east/ west cycle track on the line of the A47 to the west, so as to avoid if possible:            (i) Any interruption of an obvious 'desire line'; and            (ii) Any need to travel on a carriageway used by motorised vehicles.</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered the cycle track / bridleway proposals at the junction of The Drift with the existing A47 and the Right of Way and Access Plans (TR010039/APP/2.4 Rev 2) have been amended accordingly and have been provided at Deadline 2.</p>
		<p>d) If it is to be a Shared Cycle Track, could clarity be provided as to who will be ultimately responsible for its maintenance and for maintenance of the associated verges?</p>	<p>The intention is that the maintenance of the proposed bridleway (previously shown as a shared use cycle track) will be undertaken by PCC. The Applicant expects that this will be confirmed in the SoCG with PCC.</p>
		<p>e) Could the Applicant respond to the suggestion</p>	<p>The reason for not retaining The Drift as a vehicular link</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>that The Drift should not be altered but rather be retained as an existing link from the proposed Sutton Heath Roundabout to the village of Sutton? In this regard, the response should provide technical and objective reasons if the suggestion is to be rejected, rather than asserting professional judgement.</p>	<p>was a result of engagement and discussions with Sutton Parish Council.</p> <p>Closing The Drift to vehicular traffic will improve future conditions for future WCH users.</p>
1.11.16	The Applicant	<p><b>Sacrewell underpass</b>            a) Could the Applicant please confirm whether this route is to be available at all times?</p>	<p>The new link to Sacrewell Farm will be a permissive route and would have the same rights as the existing route, which is currently available 24 hours a day for pedestrians. It will be closed at night for vehicles.</p> <p>The proposed Sacrewell Farm access road will be a private means of access. It will also become the route of the diverted footpath Wansford Hereward Way Permissive 3.</p>
		<p>b) Could the Applicant please confirm who would be responsible for the long-term maintenance of both the bridlepath and its verge, and how this is to be secured?</p>	<p>National Highways will be responsible for the new bridleway and verge within its land ownership boundary, with PCC responsible for the maintenance of the retained highway and verge within its boundary.</p> <p>There is no agreement to be secured as PCC maintains the local highway that the bridleway connects into.</p>
		<p>c) Given the Wansford Nene Way Permissive 1 and Wansford Hereward Way Permissive 3 are permissive routes, and thus could be withdrawn, what measures are in place to ensure that appropriate WCH routes are available in perpetuity?</p>	<p>An Applicant is not required to address all of the issues with the wider WCH network in the local area as part of its application, especially where the termini lie some distance from the Scheme: the improvement of the network in general is a matter for the local highway authority.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>The Applicant would not generally create links with highway status between two permissive paths. This is because if permissive rights were withdrawn from the remainder of the route in the future the highway cul-de-sacs would lead nowhere but would remain highways and could not be closed without obtaining a stopping up order.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the Applicant is continuing to explore its position regarding permissive routes 1 &amp; 3 in the Wansford area.</p>
1.11.17	The Applicant	<p><b>6, 8, 10 and 12 Great North Road, Thornhaugh</b>            a) Could the Applicant clarify whether the proposed private means of access (Work No 2) is to be physically separated from the carriageway of A1?</p>	<p>The proposed private means of access (Work No 2) is to be physically separated from the carriageway of A1.</p>
		<p>b) If so, could the Applicant please explain the nature of the physical separation between the western extent of this private means of access and the eastern extent of the A1?</p>	<p>Physical separation will include a Type N2 vehicle restraint system and an anti-glare fence. Please refer to the drawing in <b>Annex O – Separation between A1 and Great North Road Properties (TR010039/EXAM/9.7)</b></p>
		<p>c) If not, could the Applicant please undertake a safety audit of this?</p>	<p>This is not required, see response to 1.11.17 (a) and (b).</p>
		<p>d) Could the Applicant also explain:            (i) is it proposed that this private means of access would also provide access to the property on Windgate Way?</p>	<p>(i) No. The Windgate Way property access is not affected by the Scheme.            (ii) There is no proposal to change the turning arrangements for the properties as part of the Scheme. An additional turning head is provided for service vehicles as shown on the drawing in</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>(ii) what turning arrangements are to be made for each and all properties (a drawing would assist in demonstration)?</p> <p>(iii) who would be the ultimate owner of this private means of access?</p> <p>(iv) how is this private means of access to be secured so that all owners/ occupiers have rights to utilise this private means of access in perpetuity?</p>	<p><b>Annex O – Separation between A1 and Great North Road Properties (TR010039/EXAM/9.7).</b></p> <p>(iii) National Highways will be the owner of the private means of access.</p> <p>(iv) A new private means of access is to be provided – see Part 3 of Schedule 4 to the dDCO (<b>AS-010</b>).</p>
		<p>e) can the Applicant please explain why this is proposed to be a private means of access rather than a public highway given it is providing access to more than a single property and those properties have currently effectively direct access to the public highway?</p>	<p>The properties currently have a sub-standard access to the A1 which does not meet current design or safety standards.</p> <p>The proposed new north-south access road follows the line of the old Great North Road, and links in with an existing east-west access road (which leads to Riverford Organic Farmers and PGRO Applied Crop Research) and which is not a highway. The Applicant does not consider it is appropriate to create an isolated stretch of new highway which is remote from the remainder of the highway network with access to only a small number of properties.</p>
1.11.18	The Applicant	<p><b>Main Road, Upton</b></p> <p>Could the Applicant please set out precisely the details of the proposed works to Main Road in Upton between its junction with Sutton Heath Road and that with Church Walk.</p> <p>This should set out, as a minimum:</p> <p>(i) the resultant minimum width of the carriageway:</p>	<p>Please refer to the drawings in <b>Annex P - Main Road Improvements (TR010039/EXAM/9.7)</b>. The drawings show Proposed works to Main Road in Upton between its junction with Sutton Heath Road and that with Church Walk.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>(ii) the resultant width and length of passing places;</p> <p>(iii) the resultant frequency of separation for the passing places, both in terms of distance and intervisibility (ideally the precise locations should be identified);</p> <p>(iv) how the crossing of the watercourse is to be achieved; and</p> <p>(v) vehicle turning diagrams at the junctions at both ends of Main Road.</p> <p>The above should be justified against recognised standards and show cognisance that the highways may well be utilised by the largest vehicles permitted by the Road Vehicles (Authorisation of Special Types) (General) Order 2003. The analysis should not rely on alternative routes for vehicles unless they can be demonstrated and shown to be suitable with compliance with appropriate Traffic Regulation measures (either as existing or as proposed).</p>	
1.11.19	The Applicant	<p><b>Wansford west roundabout – cyclists</b></p> <p>Figure 12.2 [APP-078] indicates that the western A47/A1 roundabout is to be reconfigured, particularly, to deal with cyclists. However, the Case for the Scheme in paragraph 4.7.14 [AS022] indicates there is a pre-existing issue at the A1/A47 roundabouts which is to “be raised with the Highways England Operations team for consideration as a future improvement project”.</p>	<p>ES Figure 12.2 (<b>APP-078</b>) refers to a new cycle crossing on the A47 Western arm of the roundabout (and the A6118 southern arm). This is in line with the Rights of Way and Access Plans sheet 2 of 7 (<b>TR010039/APP/2.4 Rev 2</b>).</p> <p>The pre-existing issue referenced in the Case for the Scheme paragraph 4.7.14 (<b>AS-022</b>) is in reference to traffic flows and delays.</p> <p>The Applicant therefore does not believe this is inconsistent.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>These two items appear to be inconsistent.</p> <p>a) Could this please be resolved?</p>	
		<p>b) What evidence is there that the introduction of cycling facilities will not make congestion/ delays for other traffic worse?</p>	<p>The new crossings for cyclists on the A47 western arm and the A6118 southern arm of the roundabout will be uncontrolled, i.e. cyclists giving way to traffic. These proposed facilities are not likely to worsen congestion / delays for other traffic.</p>
		<p>c) Should separate facilities be provided for WCH?</p>	<p>See response to 1.11.19 (b).</p>
<p>1.11.20</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p><b>Cycle routes</b>            Figure 12.2 [APP078] indicates "New signage will be provided to direct cyclists from the A47/A1 western roundabout via Old North Road and Peterborough Road through Wansford, to the recently upgraded all users permissive route (Wansford Nene Way Permissive 1)".</p> <p>a) Given some locations for this would be outside the Order Lands how would this to be secured?</p>	<p>The intention is to agree this with PCC through the SoGC.</p>
		<p>b) Given this proposal is for a permissive route that could be withdrawn what measures are in place to ensure that appropriate WCH routes are available in perpetuity to ensure that the Proposed Development does not worsen accessibility or increase severance?</p>	<p>Please refer to response to 1.11.10.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.11.21	The Applicant	<p><b>Cycle route under A1</b></p> <p>The Applicant has indicated that upgrading has been undertaken to provide a cycle route under the A1 bridges. However, it would appear that to use the Wansford Nene Way Permissive 1 at its junction with Peterborough Road it is necessary to utilise a steep ramp, thus making it less desirable.</p> <p>The implication from a number of RRs that this route is not suitable, therefore unlikely to be used by cyclists and therefore represents an existing barrier to non-motorised users (see paragraph 5.205 of the NPSNN).</p> <p>a) Could the Applicant please address these concerns, particularly what reasonable endeavours have been utilised to lessen severance caused by the existing route?</p>	<p>The existing WCH route across the A1 is via Wansford Nene Way Permissive 1, a permissive footpath which passes under the A1 and is accessed from Peterborough Road in Wansford. Although this route is identified as a permissive footpath, there is some confusion as to its status. It was previously signposted as being available for cyclists and horse riders. It is currently signposted as the Nene Way, which is a long distance walking route, but it is regularly used by cyclists as evidenced in the WCH surveys. Since the surveys were undertaken, the gradients, width and surfacing of the section of the route between the A1 underpass and the Wansford picnic area have been improved as part of a Designated Funds scheme. The expectation is that usage of the improved route would have increased over the levels observed during the 2018 surveys. The shared use cycle track and the permissive bridleway to be provided as part of the Scheme provide a connection to this existing WCH route.</p> <p>The gradient of the ramped section of the existing route, namely the 50m section leading down from Peterborough Road, is less than ideal. The existing gradient reflects the challenging topography in that location, and it is not possible to improve the gradient as part of the Scheme. Notwithstanding this, the 50m section of the existing route would not be sufficient of a deterrent to dissuade walkers and cyclists from using the route and the proposed new east to west shared use cycle track and permissive bridleway for undertaking trips between Wansford and local destinations to the east.</p> <p>The permissive status of this route is a pre-existing issue</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>and is not a result of the Scheme. The Applicant has no reason to believe that permission to use the route will be withdrawn. Works have recently been carried out to upgrade it under the Designated Funds scheme mentioned above, to improve access for horse riders and cyclists, and those improvements, together with use of those facilities have not triggered an objection to such use of or the closure of the route.</p> <p>WCH surveys undertaken prior to the above improvement confirm that the route is used by cyclists. The expectation is that usage of the route by cyclists will have increased post the improvements.</p> <p>The existing route is required to provide vehicular access to the Anglian Water pumping station. It is constrained by an existing residential property and the proximity to the existing A47. There is therefore no reasonable opportunity to reduce the severity of the gradient and maintain the vehicular access.</p>
		<p>b) Given the Wansford Nene Way Permissive 1 is a permissive route, and thus could be withdrawn, what measures are in place to ensure that appropriate WCH routes are available in perpetuity?</p>	<p>Please refer to response in 1.11.10.</p>
	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p><b>Significant effects</b> Paragraph 12.12.5 of Chapter 12 of the ES [AS016] refers to a moderate adverse effect during construction and operation for those using Wansford Hereward Way Permissive 3 and Permissive 2 due</p>	<p>ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health paragraph 12.12.5 contained drafting errors and did not reflect the results of the assessment as reported in paragraphs 12.10.44 to 12.10.53 and summarised in Table 12-15. A revised version of ES Chapter 12 Population and human</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>to their diversion; and for cyclists due to the removal of cycle facilities at the A47/A1 roundabouts and the removal of the A47/ Upton Road/ Peterborough Road roundabout (cycle movements between Ailsworth and Upton).</p> <p>Table 12-15 identifies the former as slight adverse in Table 12-15 and the latter a very large beneficial effect and neither is identified as operational residual effects.</p> <p>Could the Applicant please clarify the effect it considers to be appropriate and explain what, if any, effects during operation would result.</p>	<p>health (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>) has been submitted at Deadline 2.</p> <p>With regard to the diversion of Wansford Hereward Way Permissive 3 and Permissive 2, the significance of the residual effect is different depending upon the approach direction for users, as reported in paragraphs 12.10.46 and 12.10.47 and summarised in Table 12-15 of ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>). For users approaching from Wansford, the residual effects are assessed as Moderate beneficial due to the small reduction in journey length and the provision of the permissive bridleway and A47 underbridge. However, for users approaching from the east, the residual effect is assessed as Slight adverse given that the journey length would increase.</p> <p>With regard to the permanent removal of existing cycle facilities at the A47/A1 roundabouts, the residual effect is assessed as Moderate adverse as reported in paragraph 12.10.45 and summarised in Table 12-15.</p> <p>With regard to the removal of the A47/Upton Road/Peterborough Road roundabout, the significance of the residual effect is different depending upon the trip being undertaken by cyclists, as reported in paragraphs 12.10.49 to 12.10.51 and summarised in Table 12-15 of ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>). For cyclists travelling between Ailsworth and Upton (and vice versa) the residual effect has been assessed as Moderate adverse due to the large increase in journey length. However, for cyclists</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>travelling between Southorpe and Ailsworth, the residual effect has been assessed as Large beneficial due to the large reduction in journey length.</p> <p>Paragraph 12.10.44 of ES Chapter 12 Population and human health (<b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 1</b>) states the following:</p> <p><i>“The Proposed Scheme would likely result in the diversion or temporary closure of some routes during construction, which would become permanent diversions and closures during operation of the Proposed Scheme.”</i></p> <p>Therefore, as the operational residual effects are already reported in Table 12-15, there is no need to repeat this information in Table 12-17.</p>
1.12	Water Environment and Flood risk		
1.12.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Road Drainage and the Water Environment Chapter</b> Chapter 13 of the ES [AS-017] the second page of Road Drainage and the Water Environment is incorrectly titled 'Chapter 13 – Road Assessment of Alternatives'. Could this please be amended.</p>	ES Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment ( <b>AS-017</b> ) will be amended and submitted at Deadline 3.
1.12.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Clarification</b> References are made in the ES to the 'A47 Wansford Sluice Extension culvert' and the 'Wittering Brook culvert'. Please can the Applicant confirm that they refer to the same works and if so, in the interests of clarity, going forward please can the</p>	The Applicant will use the correct reference going forward. The Applicant confirms that the reference name in ES Chapter 2 The Proposed Scheme ( <b>AS-012</b> ) is correct and is referring to the same structure which crosses the A47 at the downstream end of the Wittering Brook.

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		Applicant refer to it consistently (but see also ExQ <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b> should an alternative be utilised).	
1.12.3	The Applicant	<b>Clarification</b> Paragraph 4.1.5 of the Drainage Strategy Report [APP129] indicates that Appendix B to this document provides a record of an email exchange between PCC and the Applicant. However, this Appendix is effectively blank. Could this please be provided.	ES Appendix 13.2 Drainage Strategy Report ( <b>APP-129</b> ) will be amended and submitted at Deadline 3.
1.12.4	PCC EA	<b>Assessment criteria</b> a) Paragraph 13.4.9 of Chapter 13 of the ES [AS-017] indicates that the two way flow is below the HEWRAT assessment criteria. Are there any other similar criteria relating to roads with lesser flows against which potential pollution effects of the Proposed Development should have been assessed? b) If so, what are they and why are they applicable/non-applicable?	
1.12.5	PCC EA	<b>Assessment assumptions</b> a) Do the IPs, and particularly the EA and PCC, agree with the Applicant's assessment, set out in paragraphs 13.5.5 and 13.5.6 of Chapter 13 of the ES [AS017] that there is sufficient information to allow for a proper assessment in relation to the hydraulic properties and groundwater level ranges?	

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		b) If not, could you explain why you hold that view, and what additional information is necessary?	
1.12.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Hydraulic modelling</b> Does the publication by the EA on 20 July 2021 (and since updated) of revised climate change allowances in Flood Risk Assessments, including for peak fluvial flow rates and future peak rainfall intensity, have any implications for the consideration of the Proposed Development?</p>	<p>The application for a DCO was submitted on 5 July 2021. The Environment Agency issued updated guidance for peak river flow allowances which came into effect on 20 July 2021. Therefore, as the DCO application predates the changes coming into effect, no update is required.</p> <p>Please note that the latest climate change allowances for peak river flows in the 2080s for the Nene Management Catchment are 13% and 36% for the higher and upper scenarios. The equivalent allowances used in the flood risk assessments were 35% for the higher and 65% for the upper end. Therefore, the assessment represents a worst case.</p> <p>There is no change to the peak rainfall intensity allowance following the latest guidance.</p>
1.12.6	The Applicant PCC	<p><b>Hydraulic modelling</b> Paragraph 13.7.63 of Chapter 13 of the ES [AS017] indicates that Hydraulic modelling of the A1 Mill Stream culvert was undertaken using HY-8 v7.6 (Federal Highway Administration, 2020). It is stated in the Flood Risk Assessment [APP128] that this was agreed with PCC.</p> <p>Can the Applicant and PCC explain why they believe that this model is appropriate for hydraulic modelling of this crossing and what implications it has for the hydraulic modelling of Wittering Brook.</p>	<p>The A1 culvert assessment has been treated in isolation due to the potential proposed changes being minimal. HY-8 is a valid alternative to other software packages, and it was chosen as it provided a proportional approach to the assessment of the A1 culvert hydraulics.</p> <p>The A1 culvert is hydraulically separate from the Wittering Brook as it drains the Mill Brook via the Mill Pond and therefore was not required to be included within the ICM hydraulic model. There is considered to be no impact to the confidence in the Wittering Brook assessment as the hydrological estimates for the Wittering Brook account for</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			the entire hydrological catchment draining to the River Nene via the Wittering Brook.
1.12.7	EA The Applicant	<p><b>Water effects of Climate Change</b> Paragraphs 13.7.86ff of Chapter 13 of the ES [AS017] sets out the that the effects of the Proposed Development have been based on the location of the site in the East of England.</p> <p>a) Given the proximity to the East Midlands, could the EA explain if there are any implications that should be drawn from the data applicable to that area, particularly as some of the catchments are from that region?</p>	<p>The information in ES Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (<b>AS-017</b>) paragraph 13.7.86 was intended to provide a baseline to the local climatic conditions based on the most appropriate regional Met Office summary. No assessment has been undertaken against this information.</p> <p>For the assessment of flood risk, the Applicant has applied the Anglian climate change allowances uplift in accordance with the Environment Agency flood risk assessment guidance at the time (Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances, 2016).</p> <p>This is correct given the location of the development and has been agreed in consultation with PCC and the Environment Agency.</p>
		b) Could the Applicant please undertake a sensitivity assessment based on similar data relating to the East Midlands region?	Given the Applicant's response to part 1.12.7 (a) it is not appropriate to undertake a sensitivity assessment as the climate change allowances used in the Flood Risk Assessment are for the Anglian region which is defined based on catchments within the East of England and which includes the East Midlands.
1.12.8	The Applicant	<p><b>Fluvial flood risk</b> Paragraph 7.1.2 of the FRA [APP128] indicates that drainage surveys and information relating to connectivity of the drainage ditches west of Upton</p>	The drainage surveys are being undertaken in February 2022 and the information will be used to inform the detailed design.

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>Road was being collected.</p> <p>a) Has this been done?</p>	
		<p>b) If so, what are the results?</p>	<p>Please see response to 1.12.8 (a).</p> <p>The result of the drainage survey will be reviewed at detailed design stage.</p>
		<p>c) What are the implications for the Proposed Development?</p>	<p>Please see response to 1.12.13.</p>
		<p>d) If not, when are they to be done and when reported?</p>	<p>The existing drainage survey data is considered sufficient for the consenting stage of the Scheme.</p> <p>The result of the drainage survey will be reviewed at detailed design stage.</p>
1.12.9	The Applicant	<p><b>Wittering Brook Crossing</b></p> <p>a) Given that the whole of the A47 culvert is proposed to be replaced, can the Applicant explain if there is a particular reason why only culvert options were assessed rather than others, for example, a clear span bridge?</p>	<p>CIRIA C786 suggests a bridge option should be considered as it can potentially have less impact on the hydraulics and ecology of a watercourse. Control of the hydraulics was a specific benefit of restricting the opening size as PCC required that the water volume discharging into the River Nene was not increased. In order for the CIRIA benefits of a bridge to be realised the span would have to have been significantly larger and thus increased the discharge to the River Nene. With a restriction on the flow allowed to pass through the new structure, a culvert arrangement was the most suitable option.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		b) Could the Applicant please undertake an assessment based on a clear span bridge. This assessment should not be restricted to hydrological implications but should also include other aspects such as biodiversity and cultural heritage.	Please see response to 1.12.9 (a). Further environmental assessment of the clear span option would not be necessary.
		c) Paragraphs 13.8.28 and 13.9.34 of Chapter 13 of the ES [AS017] state that the new (replacement) culvert to be constructed at Wittering Brook (the Wansford Sluice Extension) would be approximately 60m long and 2.5m high, although the dimensions are given as 54m long and 2.45m high in paragraph 2.5.43 of Chapter 2 of the ES [AS013]. Please can the Applicant explain the discrepancy.	<p>The proposed A47 Wansford Sluice Extension (S04) is 54m long and the effective height is 2.45m allowing for 0.3m of sediment at the base of the culvert (see the Engineering Drawings and Sections (<b>TR010039/APP2.5 Rev 1</b>)).</p> <p>The hydraulic assessment reported in ES Appendix 13.1 Flood Risk Assessment (<b>APP-128</b>) and used in the assessment presented in ES Chapter 13 Road Drainage and Water Environment (<b>AS-017</b>) was based on a culvert of 60m length and 2.5m effective height. The documents will be updated and submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
		d) Please see also ExQ <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b>	This is noted.
1.12.11	The Applicant	<p><b>Structural integrity of Proposed Development</b></p> <p>Could the Applicant explain what constructional techniques will be employed to ensure that the structural integrity of the southern extent of the proposed embankment for the A47 is not affected by flood waters in a flood event or by scouring over time. The ExA notes that several RRs have referred to stability issues in relation to the current road.</p>	Scour assessments will be completed during the detailed design stage to establish what protection measures will be required. These will then be implemented if required. The final design will be agreed with PCC (for the Wittering Brook) and the Environment Agency (for the River Nene).

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.12.12	The Applicant	<p><b>A1 Culvert design</b>            ES Chapter 13 [AS017] paragraph 13.8.7 refers to the extension or replacement of the A1 Mill Stream culvert, ES Chapter 2 [AS013] paragraph 2.5.4 and other application documents, such as the EMP [AS027] and the dDCO [AS010], only refer to its extension.</p> <p>a) Please can the Applicant clarify which is correct?</p>	<p>It is proposed to extend the existing A1 culvert. ES Chapter 13 Road Drainage and Water Environment (<b>AS-017</b>) and ES Appendix 13.1 Flood Risk Assessment (<b>APP-128</b>) will be updated and submitted at Deadline 3 to remove reference to replacement.</p> <p>At the stage of undertaking the ES it became apparent that the existing culvert was capable of being extended and therefore the option of a replacement culvert was dismissed.</p>
		<p>b) In the event that both options are under consideration but neither have been assessed, please provide updated assessments and update other relevant documents, including the EMP and the dDCO.</p>	<p>The proposed solution is to extend the A1 culvert at the downstream face with the same cross-sectional area and capacity as the original culvert. Therefore, this will result in no change to culvert hydraulics and ensure no change in the volume or flow passing through the culvert and would not impact downstream flood risk.</p>
		<p>Paragraph 7.2.15 of the FRA [APP128] and paragraph 13.9.38 of Chapter 13 of the ES [AS017] indicate that design work had not been undertaken on the A1 Mill Stream culvert extension at the time of submission.</p> <p>c) Has this now been completed?</p>	<p>The design of the downstream culvert extension will be completed at the detailed design stage. At this stage, the proposed culvert extension will be assessed using a hydraulic model with outputs provided in the form of an update to the ES Appendix 13.1 Flood Risk Assessment (<b>APP-128</b>). Any assessment will be submitted for review to the Environment Agency and PCC.</p>
		<p>d) If not, when will this be done and how can the SoS and ExA be satisfied that the Proposed Development would be suitable?</p>	<p>Please see response to 1.12.12 (b).</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		e) If so, what are the results and what implications are there of this?	Please see response to 1.12.12 (b).
		f) Paragraph 13.9.39 states that any changes to the culvert would not result in an increase in flood risk to or from the Proposed Development (and stated that this shall be assessed by hydraulic modelling once a preliminary design is completed). Please can the Applicant identify the location in the application documents of any evidence or provide justification for this assertion.	ES Appendix 13.1 Flood Risk Assessment ( <b>APP-128</b> ) will be updated at Deadline 3 in line with the responses to parts 1.12.12 (a) and (b) above.
1.12.13	The Applicant	<p><b>Potential additional crossings under A1</b></p> <p>Paragraph 4.1.8 of the Drainage Strategy Report [APP128] indicates that it is not yet known whether additional culverts would be required passing beneath the proposed A47 between the new Sutton Heath roundabout and where the alignment ties into the existing A47 to the east, and that it will be determined at Stage 5 (detailed design) when further drainage surveys results are available.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant explain how the potential effects of any additional crossings (whether culverts or bridges) have informed the Applicant's worst case assessment.</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.1.8 of ES Appendix 13.2 Drainage strategy report (<b>APP-128</b>) refers to need to undertake drainage survey (Appendix C) to understand the local drainage ditch network. The intention of the drainage survey in this instance is to confirm whether there is a requirement for additional cross drain culverts under the existing and proposed A47 to maintain the connectivity in the existing local drainage ditch network.</p> <p>This would be required to ensure the Scheme is not subject to an increase in flood risk upstream but should also consider the impact on flood risk downstream. The mitigation of such a potential effect is considered in section 7.3 of the Flood Risk Assessment (<b>APP-128</b>) and ES Chapter 13 Road Drainage and Water Environment paragraph 13.9.31 and Table 13.8 (<b>AS-017</b>).</p> <p>An action has been added to Table 3.1 REAC of the EMP (<b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b>) at Deadline 2 to ensure that, if</p>



Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>required following drainage survey, additional cross drains would be sized for a 1 in 100 year storm event (with an allowance for climate change) to avoid an increase in flood risk upstream and downstream of the Scheme.</p>
1.12.14	The Applicant	<p><b>Construction discharges</b>            It is explained in paragraph 13.9.6 of Chapter 13 of the ES [AS017] that a temporary construction surface water drainage strategy, that would include measures to mitigate various potential impacts, would be included in the Second iteration of the EMP. An outline version of this strategy has not been submitted with the application documents. Please can the Applicant provide a copy to the Examination or identify the outline principles that would be followed.</p>	<p>An outline Water Management and Monitoring Plan (WMMP) will be produced at a later deadline.</p> <p>The purpose of the WMMP is to set out construction measures to prevent the risk of pollution to groundwater and surface water as well as avoiding any increase in flood risk. The document will set out the project roles and responsibilities for implementing the WMMP and the permitting and consent requirements set out in the DCO application documents. The WMMP will set out all the mitigation measures for the work activities within the scheme and will consider the principles of maximising the use of permanent drainage in the temporary works drainage design, the early construction of drainage works, the use of construction best practice measures to manage pollution and flood risk, emergency response planning for flood risk and pollution, staff training for environmental competencies, and development and implementation of surface water and groundwater monitoring.</p>
1.12.15	The Applicant EA	<p><b>Discharges to River Nene</b>            Paragraph 4.1.4 of the Drainage Strategy Report [APP129] indicates that there may be discharges from the existing layout to the River Nene which would be retained. When is it anticipated that this decision will be resolved, and does it have any implications for the drainage strategy?</p>	<p>The strategy would remain the same. It would strengthen the case for increased discharge rates if existing outfalls from the existing A47 carriageway could be determined by survey. If the survey does not highlight these, the proposed strategy will still be valid.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.12.16	PCC William Scott Abbott Trust	<p><b>Drainage Maintenance</b> Paragraph 4.6.1 of the Drainage Strategy Report [APP129] indicates that PCC and the owners of Sacrewell Farm would be maintaining the drainage for the majority of the side roads. Could PCC and the William Scott Abbott Trust confirm that they are content with this arrangement.</p>	
1.12.17	The Applicant	<p><b>Drainage Catchments</b> Paragraph 4.7.4 of the Drainage Strategy Report [APP129] indicates that the drainage catchments are shown on drawing HE551494-GTY-HDG000-DR-CD-30008 in Appendix D. However, this drawing is not provided in that Appendix. Could it please be provided?</p>	An amended ES Appendix 13.2 Drainage Strategy Report ( <b>APP-129</b> ) is to be submitted for Deadline 3 including Appendix D.
1.12.18	The Applicant	<p><b>Drainage Ponds</b> Paragraph 13.7.10 and elsewhere of Chapter 13 of the ES [AS017] explains that two new ponds will be created to mitigate the effects on ecological receptors of the loss of two existing ponds, and reference is made to two ponds in the EMP [AS027]. However, both ES Chapter 2 [AS013] and Appendix 13.2 (Drainage Strategy Report, paragraph 1.1.3) [APP129] refer to a single new pond. Please can the Applicant explain the inconsistency and set out any implications it has for relevant assessments in the ES and how the relevant provisions are to be secured?</p> <p>(The ExA notes that the dDCO only makes reference</p>	This was an error in ES Chapter 2 The Proposed Scheme ( <b>AS-012</b> ) and Appendix 13.2 Drainage Strategy Report ( <b>APP-129</b> ). The error in ES Chapter 2 has been corrected and the document was provided at Deadline 2 ( <b>TR010039/APP/6.1 Rev 2</b> ). ES Chapter 13 Road Drainage and the Water Environment ( <b>AS-017</b> ) and the EMP ( <b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b> ) are correct and the two ponds that are being removed are being replace by two wildlife ponds.

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		to the proposed five balancing ponds, not to these ponds.)	
1.12.19	The Applicant	<p><b>HEWRAT Assessment</b> Table 4.2 of the Drainage Strategy Report [APP129] does not include a "Q" catchment. This is referred to in paragraph 4.7.7. Could information as to where the "Q" catchment discharges and other relevant information (as otherwise set out in Table 4.2) please be provided?</p>	Catchment Q is remaining as per existing, it has been included and assessed within Network ABDEQ, as described in paragraph 4.7.7. Table 4.2 contains a typographical error and omits the letter "Q" from the Network "ABDE". Table 4.2 was taken from section 3.3 of ES Appendix 13.5 the Surface water quality assessment ( <b>APP-130</b> ). ES Appendix 13.2 Drainage Strategy Report ( <b>APP-129</b> ) will be provided at Deadline 3.
1.12.20	EA Anglian Water	<p><b>River Nene Water Quality</b> Does the Environment Agency or Anglian Water have any comments to make about the proximity of the outfalls to the River Nene and the extraction points therefrom in relation to the quality of water being extracted in both the construction and operational periods? (See also ExQ 1.12.18).</p>	
1.12.21	The Applicant Anglian Water	<p><b>Water main from River Nene extraction</b> a) Could the Applicant please set out on a plan the course of the water main through the Order Lands from the pumping station to Rutland Water.</p>	The plan in <b>Annex Q - Water main from River Nene extraction (TR010039/EXAM/9.7)</b> shows the course of the water main through the order lands from the pumping station and it's route north for approximately 1.9km. The Applicant does not have any information further north than this.
		b) Could the Applicant and Anglian Water please confirm their agreement or otherwise in relation to the effects of the Proposed Development on this element of infrastructure and measures to	Discussions with Anglian Water are ongoing in this respect with a view to confirming protection measures in the SoCG.

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		protect it.	
1.12.22	EA PCC The Applicant	<p><b>Climate Change Allowances</b> It has been noted that the Applicant has utilised different allowances for climate change within the design. For example, in paragraph 13.9.32 of Chapter 13 of the ES [AS017], different climate change allowances are used where existing drainage is being adapted and where carriageway widening or realignment occurs, and further different allowances in paragraph 13.9.34 for the sizing of the Wittering Brook watercourse culvert, and in paragraph 13.9.36 for the size of compensatory floodplain volume.</p>	
		<p>a) Do the EA and PCC as LLFA consider that this approach is appropriate? b) If not, what approach should be followed, providing information to support the allowance(s) of climate change advocated?</p>	
		c) Does the Applicant have any comments to make as to why different allowances have been utilised?	<p>The Applicant has applied the correct design criteria to the different water elements of the Scheme. The highway drainage design uses climate change allowances set out in DMRB CG501 to determine correct design capacities for the highway network. See paragraph 4.1.6 of the ES Appendix 13.2 Drainage Strategy Report (<b>APP-129</b>) which confirms that the 40% upper end climate change allowance for peak rainfall intensity is accommodated within the drainage attenuation design and freeboard.</p> <p>The flood works design of the A47 Wansford Sluice uses a</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>peak river flow increase of 65% for s climate change based on the upper end scenario for the 2080s in the Anglian region (2016). The design of the flood compensatory storage is based on peak river flow increase of 35% for climate change based on the higher central scenario. These climate change allowances are based on the Environment Agency flood risk assessment guidance at the time (Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances, 2016) and agreed with the PCC and the Environment Agency during consultation.</p>
		<p>d) Does the publication by the EA on 20 July 2021 (and since updated) of revised climate change allowances in Flood Risk Assessments for peak fluvial flow rates and future peak rainfall intensity have any implications for this matter?</p>	<p>The Applicant has applied the Anglian climate change allowances uplift in accordance with the Environment Agency flood risk assessment guidance at the time (Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances, 2016). The new 2021 guidance whilst not required here has split allowances by river basin management catchments. For comparison, the Anglian Basin 2016 climate change allowance for the 2080 upper end estimate is 65% however, the latest Nene Management Catchment allowance is 36%. Therefore, ES Chapter 13 Road Drainage and Water Environment (<b>AS-017</b>) presents a conservative estimate for flood risk and subsequent flood compensation requirements.</p>
1.12.23	The Applicant	<p><b>Groundwater</b> In paragraph 13.9.45 of Chapter 13 of the ES [AS017] the Applicant has indicated that where filter drains are not suitable that they will be lined "with an impermeable barrier".</p>	<p>Filter drains differ from carrier drains in that they allow the road drainage to pass through a filter media, which is a primary form of treatment. The drainage design assumes no losses of road drainage to the surrounding ground through filter drains, and therefore the inclusion of an impermeable barrier does not affect the drainage design.</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		a) Does this make them not filter drains but rather carrier drains and thus should be considered as such and appropriate solutions to deal with discharges put in place should this be the eventual solution?	Where groundwater conditions allow, no impermeable barrier will be necessary.
		b) Has this been assessed? If so, can this be provided; if not, can this please be undertaken?	Filter drains have been assessed, both for risks to groundwater (ES Appendix 13.4 Groundwater assessment ( <b>APP-131</b> )) and risks to the ultimate surface water receptor (ES Appendix 13.3 Surface water quality assessment ( <b>APP-130</b> )). The required mitigation of the inclusion of impermeable barriers to protect shallow groundwater does not affect the assessment to surface water receptors.
1.12.24	The Applicant	<p><b>Groundwater</b></p> <p>It is stated in paragraph 13.9.47 of Chapter 13 of the ES [AS017] that permanent road drainage requirements and the “subsequent zone of influence” must be confirmed by supplementary ground investigations, and that water features surveys shall be undertaken to confirm springs within the zone of influence. It is not indicated when these will be undertaken.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant indicate when these will be carried out and whether the results and any updated assessments as necessary will be provided to the Examination.</p>	Updated zone of influence calculations are dependent on additional information to be collected during the supplementary ground investigation. The zone of influence and water features surveys are therefore to be undertaken at detailed design stage.
1.12.25	The Applicant	<p><b>Post-consent approvals</b></p> <p>PCC in their RR [RR036] set out a number of</p>	The information requirements will be secured by Requirement 4 of the dDCO ( <b>AS-010</b> ) and the progressive

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>matters on which they consider information is required prior to the commencement of any phase of the Proposed Development. These include a condition survey of Mill Stream and Wittering Brook, the temporary drainage strategy, details of any further ground investigation, and a full and up to date surface water drainage strategy for the operational phase. Please can the Applicant indicate if and where these are secured in the dDCO.</p>	<p>changes to the EMP (<b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b>) during the course of the examination.</p>
1.12.26	The Applicant	<p><b>Monitoring</b> Paragraph 13.11.1 of Chapter 13 of the ES [AS017] indicate that monitoring of surface water and groundwater is part of the essential mitigation to ensure construction works in, or near to, the watercourses do not have a significant effect.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant explain what action would be taken in the event that water level and quality monitoring of surface water and groundwater indicated that remedial action is required?</p>	<p>Detailed monitoring requirements will be set out in the Second Iteration of the EMP (<b>TR010039/APP/7.5 Rev 2</b>). The mitigation measures will be set out in Annex B.7 Water Management and Monitoring Plan (WMMP) of the EMP and would include a pollution incident plan. Other actions may be included in the WMMP based on the findings of the supplementary GI and water features survey undertaken during detailed design.</p> <p>See also response to 1.12.14.</p>
1.12.26	The Applicant	<p><b>Decarbonising Transport</b></p> <p>a) Do the Government's policy statements 'Decarbonising transport: a better, greener Britain' and 'Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener' have any implications for the water environment assessment?</p>	<p>Please see responses 1.1.14, 1.2.15, 1.9.11, and 1.10.12 above. It is considered that the implications will be positive but further research will be required to accurately predict the implications.</p>
		<p>b) If so, what would be the resultant effects?</p>	<p>Please refer to response to 1.12.26 (a).</p>

Question number	Doc ref & question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.12.27	The Applicant EA PCC	<b>Draft Anglian River Basin Management Plan</b> a) Does the Draft Anglian River Basin Management Plan published by the Environment Agency have any implications for the consideration of this Proposed Development?	There is no change to the WFD chemical or ecological status and there are no implications that need to be considered.
		b) If so, how should this be considered?	Please refer to response to 1.12.27 (a).
1.12.28	The Applicant EA PCC	<b>Draft Flood Risk Management Plan for Anglian River Basin</b> a) Does the Draft Flood Risk Management Plan for Anglian River Basin published by the Environment Agency have any implications for the consideration of this Proposed Development?	The Draft Flood Risk Management Plan for the Anglian River Basin is not available and has been requested from the Environment Agency to understand if there are any implications that need considering.
		b) If so, how should this be considered?	Please refer to response to 1.12.28 (a).