

A47 Wansford to Sutton Dualling

Scheme Number: TR010039

Volume 9

9.22 Applicant's Further Response to Actions from Hearings

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

Planning Act 2008

April 2022

Deadline 5

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

A47 Wansford to Sutton
Development Consent Order 202[x]

**9.22 APPLICANT'S FURTHER RESPONSE TO
ACTIONS FROM HEARINGS**

Rule Number	Rule 8(1)(c)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010039
Application Document Reference	TR010039/EXAM/9.22
BIM Document Reference	PCF STAGE 4
Author	A47 Wansford to Sutton Project Team, National Highways

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	April 2022	Deadline 5

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	4
1.1	Purpose of this Document	4
2	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO OUTSTANDING ACTIONS FROM ORAL SUBMISSIONS AND DEADLINE 5 COMMITMENTS - ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 2 - ENVIRONMENT	5
3	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO OUTSTANDING ACTIONS FROM ORAL SUBMISSIONS AND DEADLINE 5 COMMITMENTS - ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 3 – TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT AND SOCIO-ECONOMICS	11
4	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO OUTSTANDING ACTIONS FROM ORAL SUBMISSIONS AND DEADLINE 5 COMMITMENTS – COMPULSORY ACQUISITION HEARING	21
5	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO OUTSTANDING ACTIONS FROM ORAL SUBMISSIONS AND DEADLINE 5 COMMITMENTS – ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 4 – DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER	22

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) further responses to Action Points from the Hearings

1.1.3

2 APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO OUTSTANDING ACTIONS FROM ORAL SUBMISSIONS AND DEADLINE 5 COMMITMENTS - ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 2 - ENVIRONMENT

Action Point no.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response
12	Clarify extent of flooding compensation area and depth, providing greater detail on the Environmental Masterplan	<p>ISH2 4.1 Further details on the dimensions (including cross section) of the flood compensation storage area will be provided at Deadline 5.</p> <p>ISH2 4.4 The Applicant noted this as an action to clarify if the flood compensation area was shown on the Environmental Masterplan. The Applicant believed it could be seen hatched in the bottom right of the page, but would provide an update at Deadline 5 with a zoomed-in section/inset if required. An updated version of the Environmental Masterplan will be provided at Deadline 5 (TR010039/APP/6.8 Rev 2).</p>	<p>A drawing showing the flood compensation area with a cross section has been provided at Deadline 5 – please refer to Annex A – Flood Compensation Area - Plan and Cross Section (TR010039/EXAM/9.23).</p> <p>It is noted that in response to EXQ1.5.5 the Applicant stated that the flood compensation storage volume required was approximately 700 cubic meters. The reduced volume requirement of 560 cubic meters shown in this attachment is as a result of design refinement during Stage 3 and prior to DCO submission and is as stated in the Flood Risk Assessment (REP3-014). Further refinement at the Detailed Design stage will be undertaken following the receipt of more detailed topographical information.</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan has been updated and provided at Deadline 5 (TR010039/APP/6.8 Rev 2).</p>

Action Point no.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response
16	Provide details of when Upton Drift watercourse surveys were completed/ will be completed.	ISH2 4.8 The surveys indicated on the Sheet 5 of 7 of the Drainage and Surface Water Plan (REP2-006) are to inform the Stage 5 detailed design only. The surveys are not required to inform the assessments associated with this Application. It is anticipated that there will only be negligible increases to the existing drainage on the Upton Drift. The Applicant will provide pre and post development drainage area and runoff calculations to show negligible impact at Deadline 5.	The Applicant has provided pre and post development drainage area and runoff calculations showing negligible impact at Deadline 5 – please refer to Annex B – Upton Drift Drainage (TR010039/EXAM/9.23) .
17	Provide a copy of the outline water management and monitoring plan	ISH2 4.10 The Applicant agreed to submit the Outline Water Management Plan for Deadline 5.	<p>As the Applicant's intention was to develop this document as part of the Second Iteration of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (currently REP2-027) the Applicant is currently collating the information required to inform the document. More detail as to the contents of the Outline Water Management Plan will be provided at or before Deadline 7.</p> <p>The draft structure of the Outline Water Management Plan is set out below:</p> <p>1 Introduction (to include)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of this Document • Purpose of this Outline Water management and monitoring plan. • Structure and Scope of the Outline Water management and monitoring plan. • Scheme description <p>2 Project team roles and responsibilities (to include)</p>

Action Point no.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site roles and responsibilities <p>3 Consents and permissions</p> <p>4 Mitigation Measures (to include)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction General Mitigation Measures Emergency response planning Climate Change Resilience Planning Environmental Competencies Training and site inductions Toolbox talks and induction supporting materials
24	Updated Report to inform Habitat Regulations Assessment	<p>ISH2 5.13</p> <p>The Applicant has previously submitted a revised Habitats Regulation Assessment report but a number of items were missing.</p> <p>This firstly concerned Rutland Water, and the section on hydraulically connected information. The revised report needs a small section included on this. Other things that have been missed out are: range of visual disturbance; effect of Nene Wash RAMSAR site; updated for visual disturbances; and relation to water abstraction and de-watering clarification.</p> <p>The Applicant stated that it is the understanding that this had been scoped out and hence not specifically discussed, but the Applicant agreed with the ExA's <i>[Examining Authority's]</i> request to review all this and will update the document accordingly.</p>	The Report to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment has been updated and provided at Deadline 5 (TR010039/APP/6.9 Rev 2).


Action Point no.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response
		The updated Report to Inform the Habitats Regulations Assessment (currently REP3-016) will be provided at Deadline 5.	
25	Further information on 'worst case' scenario relating to carbon emissions	<p>ISH2 6.2 ExA next point related to the construction period, which has been currently set at two years, and the potential issues concerning overrun.</p> <p>ExA would like to know what analysis has been done on this issue, and the environmental effects that have been assessed if an overrun does occur. This is because there has been a significant number of overruns in previous projects, and would like to ensure that the effects have been properly assessed.</p> <p>Applicant stated it will confirm the time period required in writing but have indicated that before this would be around 18 months. In terms of overrun, Applicant has confirmed that it will be discussed and then confirm the reasonable worst case scenarios effects by Deadline 5.</p>	<p>It is not anticipated that a longer construction period from the 16 months reported in Environmental Statement Chapter 14 Climate (APP-052) would change the outcome of the assessment, both for the impact of the scheme on climate change and the impact of climate change on the Scheme. This is primarily as the greenhouse gas (GHG) assessment of construction emissions was not based on a temporal assessment.</p> <p>The GHG assessment to quantify emissions from the construction phase of the project was based on data from a bill of quantities on the proposed design at Stage 3. Estimates of carbon emissions (tCO₂e) were made to assess the emissions from the production of materials, their transport to site, and plant and construction emissions. This quantified the total emissions from the construction phase and the assessment would not change based on the duration of the construction period.</p> <p>With regards to the impact of climate change during the construction phase, Environmental Statement Chapter 14 (APP-052) states: <i>"The Proposed Scheme may be subject to weather extremes (as opposed to extreme weather events) during construction. However, it is not anticipated that verifiable climate change will occur between the time of design assessment and the end of the construction period (approximately 16 months). Construction works are</i></p>

Action Point no.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response
			<p><i>therefore not considered to be vulnerable to climate change, thus no associated mitigation, other than what will be reasonable site practice (e.g. reviewing weather conditions before commencing work, providing appropriate Personal Protective Equipment, provision of shade and water on-site etc.) at the time of design finalisation, is considered to be necessary."</i></p> <p>Changes in climate are generally assessed over long-term periods (usually a long-term average over a 30 year period). With this in mind, should the construction duration be extended, it would still be concluded that verifiable climate change would not be anticipated to impact the scheme's construction.</p> <p>The Applicant has acknowledged the ExA point regarding the potential environmental effects of construction beyond a 24-month period, especially in regard to Air Quality. The Applicant is therefore currently considering the potential effects of construction beyond a 24-month period in-line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) guidance.</p>
26	More detailed assessment relating to potential undergrounding of overhead line to south of main line	<p>ISH2 8.1 The Applicant agreed to provide an update on discussions regarding the proposed diversion with WPD [<i>Western Power Distribution</i>] by Deadline 5.</p>	<p>The Applicant has had further discussions with WPD. As the route of their asset is within the flood plain, WPD will not place it below ground. The combination of electricity and water is not acceptable to WPD from a safety perspective including when their staff are resolving any issues. This is due to potential increased hazard when/if faults develop within damp/ wet ground, or when ground is flooded.</p>

Action Point no.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response
			As a result of those discussions, the Applicant does not propose to consider the potential to underground the overhead line further.
27	Further information on worst case for project construction duration given potential difficulties and geotechnical issues	ISH2 6.2 As per Action Point 25.	Please see the Applicant's Response to Action Point 25 above.

3 APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO OUTSTANDING ACTIONS FROM ORAL SUBMISSIONS AND DEADLINE 5 COMMITMENTS - ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 3 – TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT AND SOCIO-ECONOMICS

Action Point No.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response
28	Information on extent (or limitation) of works to that effectively applied for, its particular justification as to why substantial works to the Wansford west roundabout is 'out of scope'.	<p>ISH3 3.1</p> <p>The ExA noted that in its Deadline 3 submissions, the Applicant commented that works for Wansford West were outside the scope of the project. The ExA asked if the Applicant could direct him to the published document which specifically limits works to effectively what had been applied for and not dealing with the Wansford west junction.</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that it was not aware of any public document and would need to come back to the ExA in writing. The Applicant noted that such document may not exist, but that it would confirm to the ExA in writing by Deadline 5.</p>	<p>Out of scope in context means simply that it does not form part of the Scheme for which the Applicant has applied for development consent, and the Applicant has submitted the Application for the Scheme which it considers to be appropriate and cost effective for this stretch of road. Plainly, there may be other improvements and upgrades in the immediate area which the Applicant might have included within the Scheme, but it has brought forward the Scheme for which it seeks development consent.</p> <p>There are no public documents that specifically limit the Scheme to not include works to the Wansford western roundabout and give reasons for it not being included in the Scheme, although none include the works to the Wansford western roundabout.</p> <p>The Road Investment Strategy East Area Scheme Assessment Report A47 Wansford to Sutton (Sept 2018) (AS-030) did not include the Wansford western roundabout as shown on the Scheme Location Plan (Figure 3-3) below taken from the document.</p>

Action Point No.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response
			<p>Figure 3-3: Scheme Location Plan</p> 
29	Information to show how the Wansford traffic model was validated in the light of real-life observations, including confirmation against DfT criteria.	<p>ISH3 3.5</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that it would provide the ExA with a note on the calibration of the model by Deadline 5 as well as the DfT TAG criteria so that the ExA could compare.</p>	<p>A Technical Note addressing this matter has been submitted at Deadline 5 – please refer to Annex C to this document - <i>Wansford Traffic Model Calibration and Peterborough Road Sensitivity Test Technical Note (TR010039/EXAM/9.23)</i>.</p>
30	Accident data relating to A1/	<p>ISH2 3.4</p> <p>The Applicant agreed that, as part of the same note</p>	<p>Please see Annex D - A1 Northbound weaving collision analysis (TR010039/EXAM/9.23).</p>

Action Point No.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response
	Peterborough Road junction and information on current weaving distances between junctions on road such of A1 in this vicinity.	explaining the process, it would confirm the length, which would include the ideal weaving lengths for a new junction by Deadline 5.	<p>In accordance with DMRB CD 122, the weaving length requirement for rural all-purpose roads between a grade separated junction and an at-grade junction is 1km.</p> <p>The existing weaving length between the entry point of Peterborough Road and the notional diverge taper for the A1/A47 diverge is 340m.</p>
34	Further consideration to Public Rights of Way in southwestern corner of Order Lands and crossing of A1	<p>ISH2 3.9</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that it had made extensive efforts to track down the landowner (including door knocking) but had been unsuccessful. The Applicant outlined that the landowner had been absent for a number of years. The route had been identified as permissive and as the Nene Way. The Applicant discussed that there was evidence of use of the route by cyclists, and that the British Horse Society had informed the Applicant that there was historic and current use which would continue in the future.</p> <p>The Applicant also discussed that it had improved the part of the route to the east of the A1 to make it more suitable for all users, and the route had also been signed for use by pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. These steps did not trigger any action by the landowner to close the route, and that this is the type of action that can often trigger a closure. The ramp itself also provides vehicular access to an</p>	The Applicant has no further representations to make, however see also the response to ISH3 Point 3.10 below.

Action Point No.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response
		<p>Anglian Water pumping station, which is available 24/7. There was no evidence to suggest the route was not open and would not be open in the future.</p> <p>WPC discussed that everything except the concrete ramp was owned by the Applicant. The perception locally was that the ramp itself was owned by Anglian Water. WPC did not have any documentary evidence to prove that this was the case, and it did not think it had ever been registered, but that was how Anglian Water had responded to questions previously.</p> <p>Mr Robert Reid, the owner of land situated near Old Station House confirmed that the permissive route ran to the end of his land. He has owned the land for 32 years, and the permissive route was there long before he lived there. The original track went up and then along the A47 before dropping down and it comes up where the T20 tree is.</p>	
No Action Point	No Action Point	<p>ISH2 3.10</p> <p>The ExA referenced the Road Safety Audit (REP2-040) at page 23. The ExA discussed that page 23 of REP2-040 stated that "no cyclists are permitted to travel east along the A47 past the West roundabout" which meant that the Applicant is not intending that they would travel south along the permitted footpath. The Applicant confirmed that it would provide written legal submissions in relation to this point by Deadline</p>	Please refer to Annex E – Legal Submission in Response to ISH2.

Action Point No.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response
		<p>5. The ExA directed the Applicant to deal with paragraph 5.205 of the NPS NN in its reply and noted that paragraph 3.22 dealt with the existing position.</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that it would provide written legal submissions in relation to this point by Deadline 5.</p>	
36	Further explanation of choice of roundabout in eastern section rather than other junction options	<p>ISH3 3.11 The Applicant confirmed in its Written Response within the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Hearings (REP4-018):</p> <p><i>A Grade Separated Junction was considered during the Option Identification phase for the Scheme. Please refer to Figure 11-3 of the Scheme Assessment Report 2018 (AS-030).</i></p> <p><i>The option was assessed with regards to operational performance (journey time savings), scheme costs, scheme benefits resulting from reduction of accidents, transport economic efficiency, monetised costs and benefits, and Value for Money.</i></p> <p><i>As referred in Section 20.1.3 of the same report, this concluded that the additional benefits gained by grade separation would not justify the significant additional costs and for that reason was not assessed further.</i></p>	No further response is required.

Action Point No.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response																								
37	Further consideration of Langley Bush Road between The Drift (in Upton) and Sutton Heath Road in relation to its suitability for Heavy Goods Vehicles including large agricultural vehicles	<p>ISH3 3.13 – 3.15</p> <p>The Applicant agreed to respond in writing in relation to the split of HGV or types of traffic on Langley Bush Road.</p> <p>Please also see Written Responses to 3.13 – 3.15 within the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Hearings (REP4-018).</p>	<p>It is assumed that all traffic currently using Upton Road would now use the Upton Drift, Langley Bush Road, and Sutton Heath Road to access the A47.</p> <p>Traffic counts for Upton Road were undertaken on Tuesday 8th October 2019 (07:00-19:00). The vehicle category descriptions are taken from the COBA manual, the extract of which is included in Annex F – COBA Manual Vehicle Category Descriptions. (TR010039/EXAM/9.23). Total two way traffic from this survey is summarised as follows:</p> <p>Upton Road</p> <table><tr><th>Vehicle Type</th><th>Daily Total</th><th>% of total</th></tr><tr><td>Cars</td><td>258</td><td>77</td></tr><tr><td>LGV</td><td>51</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>OGV1</td><td>12</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>OGV2</td><td>5</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>PSV</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>M/B</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Cycle</td><td>8</td><td>2</td></tr></table> <p>Traffic counts for Sutton Heath Road were undertaken on Tuesday 8th to Thursday 10th October 2019 (24hr). Average Total two way traffic from this survey can be summarised as follows:</p> <p>Sutton Heath Road</p>	Vehicle Type	Daily Total	% of total	Cars	258	77	LGV	51	15	OGV1	12	4	OGV2	5	1	PSV	2	1	M/B	0	0	Cycle	8	2
Vehicle Type	Daily Total	% of total																									
Cars	258	77																									
LGV	51	15																									
OGV1	12	4																									
OGV2	5	1																									
PSV	2	1																									
M/B	0	0																									
Cycle	8	2																									

Action Point No.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response																														
			<table><tr><th>Vehicle Type</th><th>Daily Total (Av)</th><th>% of total</th></tr><tr><td>Cars</td><td>1577</td><td>84</td></tr><tr><td>LGV</td><td>213</td><td>11</td></tr><tr><td>OGV1</td><td>33</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>OGV2</td><td>27</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>PSV</td><td>5</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>M/B</td><td>8</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Cycle</td><td>7</td><td>0</td></tr></table> <p>There is no traffic survey data available for Langley Bush Road between the junction of Sutton Heath Road and the Upton Drift. The traffic model has therefore been interrogated to gain an understanding of the proportion of Sutton Heath Road traffic that uses Langley Bush Road. These results can be found in Annex G – Langley Bush Road traffic from SATURN model base year (2015) (TR010039/EXAM/9.23). Based on these results, approximately 60% of HGV traffic using Sutton Heath Road uses Langley Bush Road. This equates to the following:</p> <p>Estimate for Langley Bush Road</p> <table><tr><th>Vehicle Type</th><th>Daily Total (Est)</th></tr><tr><td>OGV1</td><td>20</td></tr><tr><td>OGV2</td><td>16</td></tr></table> <p>Adding all the surveyed Upton Road traffic to the estimated Langley Bush Road traffic would provide the following HGV numbers. (Whilst the Upton Road survey</p>	Vehicle Type	Daily Total (Av)	% of total	Cars	1577	84	LGV	213	11	OGV1	33	2	OGV2	27	1	PSV	5	0	M/B	8	0	Cycle	7	0	Vehicle Type	Daily Total (Est)	OGV1	20	OGV2	16
Vehicle Type	Daily Total (Av)	% of total																															
Cars	1577	84																															
LGV	213	11																															
OGV1	33	2																															
OGV2	27	1																															
PSV	5	0																															
M/B	8	0																															
Cycle	7	0																															
Vehicle Type	Daily Total (Est)																																
OGV1	20																																
OGV2	16																																

Action Point No.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response						
			<p>data is based on a 12 hour period (07:00-19:00) this is not considered to affect this assessment):</p> <p>Estimate for Langley Bush Road + Upton road:</p> <table><tr><th>Vehicle Type</th><th>Daily Total (Est)</th></tr><tr><td>OGV1</td><td>32</td></tr><tr><td>OGV2</td><td>21</td></tr></table> <p>In addition to the assessment above, data from Peterborough city Council (refer to REP4-040)) indicates the following percentages of HGV on local roads in the area as follows:</p> <p>Langley Bush Road, Helpston: 2.4% Walcot Road East, near Ufford: 1.9% High Filed Road, West of Langley Bush Road: 2.9%</p> <p>These percentages generally align to the above percentages of HGV traffic expected to use Langley Bush Road between the junction of Sutton Heath Road and the Upton Drift.</p> <p>Peterborough City Council have confirmed to National Highways that Langley Bush Road is in keeping with all other similar roads in the area, and suitable for the level of HGV traffic anticipated to use it.</p>	Vehicle Type	Daily Total (Est)	OGV1	32	OGV2	21
Vehicle Type	Daily Total (Est)								
OGV1	32								
OGV2	21								
No set Action Point	No Action Point	<p>ISH3 3.23</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that it would provide additional research on the safety of signal controlled roundabouts.</p>	<p>The background to the provision of this information was in response to a statement that 'the signalled junction will be much safer than an overloaded roundabout' as part of Written Representation from Wansford Parish Council</p>						

Action Point No.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response
			<p>(REP2-072).</p> <p>The Applicant responded to explain the greater risk of injury and resultant injury severity associated with collisions on signalised crossroads compared to roundabouts.</p> <p>Some references were also provided within the Applicant's Response to Written Representations (REP3-026) to a research paper from Belgium and an informational guide from the United States of America which supported the view that injuries associated with collisions at roundabouts were less severe than at signalised junctions. These documents are provided at Annex H – Roundabout Safety Supporting Documents (TR010039/EXAM/9.23).</p> <p>There is limited research from the United Kingdom.</p> <p>However, further research in Europe by Rune Elvik Institute of Transport Economics, Gaustadalleen 21, 0349 Oslo, Norway "Road safety effects of roundabouts: A meta-analysis" (Annex I (TR010039/EXAM/9.23)) found converting junctions to roundabouts led to a 65% reduction in fatal and 40% reduction in injury collisions.</p>
38	Further consideration of junction arrangements at northern end of	<p>ISH3 3.24</p> <p>The concerns raised regarding convex mirrors are understood, and the Applicant no longer proposes the use of convex mirrors to mitigate this concern.</p>	<p>Consideration of an alternative mitigation solution to this issue is ongoing. Key factors are anticipated vehicle speeds and junction usage. Further engagement with Sacrewell Farm will also be undertaken. The alternative solution will be presented at or before Deadline 7.</p>

Action Point No.	Action Point	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response
	new Sacrewell Farm underpass.	<p>An alternative mitigation solution to this problem is being investigated. An update will be provided at Deadline 5.</p> <p>Further Road Safety Audits will be undertaken at detailed design, completion of construction, and post-opening in accordance with DMRB GG119 – Road Safety Audit.</p>	

4 APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO OUTSTANDING ACTIONS FROM ORAL SUBMISSIONS AND DEADLINE 5 COMMITMENTS – COMPULSORY ACQUISITION HEARING

Action no.	Action	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response
None			

5 APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO OUTSTANDING ACTIONS FROM ORAL SUBMISSIONS AND DEADLINE 5 COMMITMENTS – ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 4 – DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER

Action no.	Action	Details from Oral Hearings and Commitments	Applicant's Response
None			