

A47 Wansford to Sutton Dualling

Scheme Number: TR010039

Volume 9 **9.18 Applicant's Comments on Deadline 2** **Submissions**

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

Planning Act 2008

March 2022

Deadline 3

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

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

**9.18 APPLICANT'S COMMENTS ON DEADLINE 2
SUBMISSIONS**

Rule Number	Rule 8(1)(c)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010039
Application Document Reference	TR010039/EXAM/9.18
BIM Document Reference	PCF STAGE 4
Author	A47 Wansford to Sutton Dualling Project Team, National Highways

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	March 2022	Deadline 3

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	4
2	FIGHT FOR UPTON (REP2-082) COMMENTS ON ANY SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED BY DEADLINE 1.....	5
3	ROBERT W REID (REP2-081) RESPONSES TO EXQ1	6

1 INTRODUCTION

- 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) comments on certain submissions received by Deadline 2.

2 FIGHT FOR UPTON (REP2-082) COMMENTS ON ANY SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED BY DEADLINE 1

Reference	Submission	Applicant's Response
REP2-082	<p>Submission ID: 8099</p> <p>Upton village does not accept that we were consulted.</p> <p>The joint submission by Wansford and Sutton Parish councils did not have input or the knowledge of many if any Upton residents. Upton did not get involved in the statutory consultation because none of the route options involved severing the Upton Road and therefore they were unaffected by the plans.</p> <p>In July 2020 the Upton residents became aware via a rumour that their main access was to be closed. The decision was made at this point and any, so called consultations, after that date were not consultations so much as a statement of fact that this was the plan and we would have to accept it.</p> <p>The Common Response E page 13 states there was not a significant objection to the proposals.</p> <p>Upton village completely dispute this, Highways England are very aware that the village is very unhappy with the proposal to severe our road and disconnect the village from Sutton and Castor & Ailsworth.</p>	<p>The Applicant has consulted residents of Upton both informally and formally throughout the development of the Scheme. Details of consultation are set out in the Consultation Report (APP-023) and its Annexes (APP-025-APP-038).</p> <p>Please also refer to Common Responses C and F of the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (REP1-010).</p>

3 ROBERT W REID (REP2-081) RESPONSES TO EXQ1

Reference	Submission	Applicant's Response
REP2-081 1	<p>We have a small 30 acre farm [REDACTED] in the scheme [REDACTED]. In the early part of the drafting of the routes then Highways England preferred route was alongside the River Nene and to the south side of the existing A47. This was the worst possible route for the environment and possibly geotechnical risks due to the amount of road on the floodplain, at the time we were told on numerous occasions, due to the burial barrow it is not possible to go near or enter the schedule monument. This was an arable field until 2006 when it was put into set-a-side land, which made me question the existence of this barrow, there is no physical evidence on the surface and totally unknown locally including local history experts. What we did find out was Historic England are above Highways England in status and in statute and this makes it very difficult for road engineers to even consider this type of land.</p>	<p>Please refer to Common Response H of the Applicant's Response to the Relevant Representations (REP1-010). A route through the Scheduled Monument was discounted, for the reasons set out previously by the Applicant and confirmed in Historic England's Written Representation (REP2-074).</p>
2	<p>Locals have tried to enter into conversations with Historic England but have been ignored. When the second team took over the project at Highways England there was a vast improvement in consultation and in the addressing of concerns, and the proposed route was announced with a lot more support from its previous route, however Historic England still did not yield leaving the route very close to the floodplain and a compromised WCHER route, our compromise was a dirty water pond and we also agreed that it makes sense to use the bridge and old track for non driver use.</p> <p>As the scheme still requires the loss of some floodplain it is my understanding it needs to be replaced and this requires additional land alteration on a CWS as no other areas are suitable all because Historic England claim it will affect a burial barrow.</p>	<p>Please refer to response to part 1 above.</p> <p>The Scheme encroaches slightly on the Scheduled Monument in order to reduce the land required for flood compensation. This compromise was reached with Historic England on the basis of the reasonable balance of impacts versus benefits.</p>
3	Do believe its wrong to re engineer this land and also compromise the	Please refer to response to part 1 above.

Reference	Submission	Applicant's Response
	<p>scheme on possible costs and the environment. After numerous letters and having written to the CEO of Historic England they yielded just a little, but we know from the results of the geo-physic survey it is not a burial barrow, its 97% more likely to be a round house with a ring ditch and fire pit, which i hasten to add are quite numerous in the fields in this area.</p>	<p>Known features of the Scheduled Monument have been identified to date through aerial photography, magnetometry and surface artefact collection. No intrusive works have been undertaken to verify these sources. In the results of the intrusive works undertaken for the Scheme, a significant number of features were identified in trenching that had not been previously indicated, including burials. This suggests that the area indicated has the potential to contain as-yet unidentified features.</p> <p>The southern-most feature of the Scheduled Monument may or may not be a barrow. Referral to it as such historically has been a short-hand expression to aid discussion. The features noted in the Geophysical survey of the Scheduled Monument (APP-089) shows a round, double-ditched feature with a pit-like feature at the center and another in in the western quarter of the inner ditch. This is consistent with known examples of both roundhouses and barrows. The pit-like features may be hearths or structural remains or they may be primary and secondary burials. The interpretive text of the geophysical survey report (section 4.5) characterises this feature as a "probable barrow". The apparent layout is more consistent with a double-ditched barrow than a roundhouse due to inconclusive evidence of post-holes inside the central space and lack of a clear entranceway. It is also possible that the feature is something else entirely such as a henge-like ritual enclosure.</p>
4	<p>Can the planning inspectorate ask Historic England to justify their actions and if they would consider to allow the final design to give more room to allow National Highways to keep more of the scheme off the floodplain, possibly saving a 300 year old oak, less disturbance in</p>	<p>Historic England have been consulted as part of the DCO by the Applicant and PINS. They have provided a Written Representation (REP2-074) which sets that their view that the Scheduled Monument has high heritage value, is of</p>

Reference	Submission	Applicant's Response
	the CWS land and a road that does less damage to the environment, and be on more stable ground.	national importance, and therefore physical impacts and impact upon the setting of the asset should be avoided as far as possible.