

APPLICATION BY: Highways England for an Order Granting Development Consent for the A47 Wansford to Sutton scheme

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REF: TR010039

Response by Peterborough City Council to Examiners Questions – 2 – Deadline 5 - 20th April 2022

Ex2	Question to:	Question:	PCC Response
2.2	Biodiversity, ecology, and natural environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))		
2.2.1.	PCC	Standing advice On 14 January 2022 Natural England and the Forestry Commission updated their standing advice in respect of protected species and ancient woodland, ancient trees, and veteran trees. Could the Applicant, NE and PCC please make any comments they feel appropriate in light of these revisions.	All new standing advice should be complied with. This may involve updating ongoing survey requirements, mitigation and compensation methodology and ongoing management requirements. PCC will always use the most up to date official guidance when assessing applicant compliance with guidance.
2.4	Cultural Heritage		
2.4.1.	The Applicant PCC	Heritage assets In its responses to ExQ1.4.3 [REP2-067] PCC has noted a number of discrepancies as to the identification of heritage assets. Could the Applicant please discuss this with PCC and make any necessary changes to the documentation.	This is still under discussion with the applicant. The applicant responded to this in the document [REP3-027] and advised that a full cross-reference can be provided if requested.
2.4.2	The Applicant HBMCE PCC	Milestone adjacent to A47 (WAN05) In the REAC Reference CH4 it is indicated that a milestone has been identified on the north verge of the A47 slightly to the east of the petrol filling station. The Applicant indicates that its proposal is to remove/reinstall this. It then states: "The asset will then be	a) The asset should be considered to meet the criteria to be placed on Peterborough's Local List and consequently a non-designated heritage asset for the purposes of the examination.

		<p>proposed to be listed to Grade II for or local listing as appropriate". While appreciating that formal listing needs to go through the normal procedures, could the Applicant, HBMCE and PCC: a) Indicate what status that they consider the asset should be given in the Examination? b) Set out their views as to the effect of the Proposed Development on the significance of the asset?</p>	<p>b) The impact of the proposals is dependent on two factors, where the asset will be relocated to and the proposed restoration works.</p> <p>The significance of the milestone is intrinsically linked with the road, which has been upgraded many times over the course of its history. The dualling however is more a substantive change than any previously for this section, with regard scale, realignment and splitting of carriageways.</p> <p>Although the motorisation of the road has for all intents and purposes precluded foot traffic where the milestone would be more readily appreciated, its location is historic and on a crossable road where it can be appreciated by both direction of travel.</p> <p>The loss of the appreciation by westbound traffic will be detrimental impact to the significance of the asset, however as noted previously and by its omission from the first site walkover, it is not particularly appreciated currently. This limits the extent of the harm from the loss of appreciation from westbound traffic.</p> <p>The proposed restoration of the milestone is supported in principal and although no further information has been provided regarding the works, PCC is content for this to be dealt with via condition provided that PCC have a clear role in assessing the suitability of the works. This element of the proposal therefore has the potential to be of benefit to the significance of the asset.</p> <p>Provided that the milestone was returned to the northside of the eastbound carriageway in a translated location with suitable restoration, it would be considered that there would on balance be no detrimental impact to the significance of the asset.</p>
--	--	---	---

			Conversely. If there proposed location was not acceptable and/or the restoration were not carried out, the impact would be considered at the lower end of less than substantial harm. If the milestone is removed from site the impact would be greater and PCC would require that a Level 3 Historic Building Recording be conducted on the milestone and that it is handed over to them, to be relocated within the district.
2.9	Noise and Vibration		
2.9.1	PCC	Definitions/ Specification Could PCC please provide definitions and further information as to the terms “TSM” and “CASC+” in respect of road surfacing?	‘TSM’ refers to Thin Surface Material with a proprietary mix of asphalt material. CASC+ refers to Cambridgeshire Surfacing Material – this is the preferred material for use on higher classification roads. Both have negative textures, so less noisy compared with Hot Rolled Asphalt.
2.12	Water environment and flood risk		
2.12.3.	PCC	Post-consent approvals In the Applicant’s response to ExQ1.12.25 [REP2-035] it is stated that information sought by PCC relating to prior-consent matters, including a condition survey of Mill Stream and Whittering 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 will be secured by Requirement 4. Is PCC content with the arrangements as set out?	The response sets out that the requested information will be secured by Requirement 4 of the dDCO (AS-010) and the progressive changes to the EMP during the course of the examination. Therefore, PCC is content with this arrangement.