

Our Reference: CLA.D1.WQ1
Your Reference: TR010044

A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet Road Improvement Scheme

Response to The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (WQ1) Issued on Wednesday 21 July 2021

Submitted as a joint response by Cambridgeshire County Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

Q1.1. General and Cross-topic Questions		
Q1.1.1 General and Cross-topic		
Q1.1.1.1	Applicant	<p>Decarbonising Transport</p> <p>The Government recently published “<i>Decarbonising Transport</i>” document in response to the UK’s 6th Carbon Budget (2033-2037). What are the implications of “<i>Decarbonising Transport</i>” for the Proposed Development, including in terms of the Environmental Impact Assessment?</p>
<p>We see nothing in Decarbonising Transport that would signal a move away from the Proposed Scheme or the approach taken in the ES regarding operational emissions. Decarbonising Transport does make some commitments around investment in ultra-rapid charge point infrastructure on the strategic road network, and we would welcome clarification from the applicant as to whether the Scheme will benefit from such provision.</p>		
Q1.1.1.3	Applicant Interested Parties Other Persons	<p>National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>Explain giving reasons, if you believe that aspects of the application need to be updated in light of the revised National Planning Policy Framework published on 20 July 2021.</p>
<p>NPPF para 183 and 184 requires the planning decision to ensure that the site is “<i>safe development</i>” and “<i>suitable for its proposed use</i>” taking into account any risks arising from land contamination. The draft DCO suggests that land contamination remediation would only be considered where “<i>Contaminated Land</i>” is found as defined under Part 2A of the EPA 1990. The level at which Contaminated Land is determined under Part 2A EPA is at a much higher risk level than “<i>Safe Development</i>” under the NPPF and the Councils suggest this is altered to ensure that if contamination is encountered, the land is remediated to a “safe” level.</p> <p>Furthermore, the NPPF in para 104 d and e states:</p> <p><i>“Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any</i></p>		

adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places.”

The lack of sufficient detail in respect of the environmental impacts of the scheme is extensively accounted for in the written representations made by the Cambridgeshire Authorities. Some of the key areas of concern are in relation to ecology. It is not possible to determine whether an acceptable level of mitigation has been secured as shown in the First Iteration EMP due to incomplete baseline survey for the following ecological receptors: Protected Road Verge (grassland of county importance), arable field margins (priority habitat), unimproved neutral grassland (potential priority lowland meadow habitat), aquatic habitat, terrestrial invertebrates, aquatic invertebrates, and bats There is also a lack of clarity on the assessment undertaken by Highways England in relation to biodiversity net gain.

Each of the highlighted factors above contribute to potential adverse impacts which have not been taken into account as part of preparation of the application. As a consequence, because of the limited information provided in respect of these matters, it is considered that the overall scheme design may not contribute to making high quality places as the NPPF requires.

Q1.2. Air Quality

Q1.2.1 Effects on human and ecological receptors

Q1.2.1.1	Local Authorities Public Health England	<p>Effects on receptors</p> <p>ES [APP-074, paragraphs 5.9.38 – 5.9.40] states that the Proposed Development would have no significant adverse effects on human health or designated habitats sites during either construction or operational phases of the scheme. Do LAs and PHE agree with this conclusion? Explain with reasons.</p>
----------	--	---

Generally, the methodology used in preparing the assessment is satisfactory and broadly aligns with the proposal outline in the initial scoping request, however there are a number of areas which have still not been included within this chapter that were specifically requested in the Councils’ scoping opinion response (2 May 2019), and or included in the initial scoping request submitted by the Applicant, namely:

- Access to work and training.
- Social cohesion and neighbourhoods.
- Climate change.
- The risk of suicide during both during the construction and operational phases.

Section 12.2.36, Chapter 12: Population and Human Health” of the Environmental Statement (**APP-081**) “local strategies” has mentioned the Bedfordshire Health and wellbeing strategy and the Health and Wellbeing Board, there is no mention of the Cambridgeshire Board or Strategy.

Section 12.3.22 contains the data sources used in the assessment, there is no mention of Cambridgeshire data or local Joint Strategic Needs Assessments (JSNAs) being used, these should be used and referenced in the assessment of impacts on Human Health, specifically the “Cambridgeshire Core Data Set”¹ and the “Cambridgeshire Transport and Health JSNA”².

The Applicant should have considered if the assessment of “impacts on any feeder PRowS between destinations, within 1km of the DCO site boundary” is appropriate considering that it is recommended to include walking and cycling as part of active travel to work and therefore distances travelled by NMU greater than 1km are not unusual, therefore consideration should have been given to extend the boundary to 5km, or consideration given to identifying relevant employment and leisure destination within 5 km of the DCO boundary, this was requested at the scoping request stage but doesn’t seem to have be addressed or a justification for scoping it out given.

The level of commitment to implementing the mitigation measures in Table 2-1 in Chapter 2 (**APP-071**), should be given. In addition, there appear to be no embedded mitigation measures proposed to address any impacts of the impacts on human health listed in section 12.3.15.

Section 12.9.5 states that “the existing A428 between Caxton Gibbet junction and the Cambridge Road junction will experience closures for 43 months between August 2022 and March 2026”. It is not clear that there has been any assessment on the impact the diversion routes will have on villages, local residents and access to emergency services following the night closures of existing A428. Chapter 12 does not contain a map or a reference to other documents of these diversion/alternative routes which would be helpful. Specifically, the impact of night time closures on access to Cambridge University Hospital Trust (Addenbrookes) which is the Regional Trauma Centre requires clarification.

From a public health perspective, the Councils do not believe that the Applicant’s conclusion that the Proposed Development would have no significant adverse effects on human health or designated habitats sites during either construction or operational phases of the scheme has been adequately demonstrated.

The health chapter of the ES (APP-081) states at paragraph 12.9.99 “During the operation of the Scheme, Chapter 11, Noise and Vibration of the Environmental Statement [TR010044/APP/6.1] identifies likely significant adverse noise effects at a number of sensitive locations” and at paragraph 12.9.100 “Therefore, the operational effect of the Scheme in terms of noise and vibration as a determinant of human health will result in a negative

¹ https://cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/CP_JSNA_CDS_DRAFT_2020-FINAL_PUBLISHED20200706.pdf

² <https://cambridgeshireinsight.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Transport-and-Health-JSNA-2015.pdf>

health outcome for the people living and working in the properties identified above in section 12.9.99 [of Chapter 12 of the ES (APP-081)]". Therefore, it is not possible for the Applicant to conclude that the Proposed Development would have no significant adverse effects on human health during operational phases of the scheme. The ES has not quantified if this impact due to noise is significant or not, just that it is a negative impact, whereas the document has identified moderate-adverse significant impacts on recreational users or the River Great Ouse and to users of PROW 73/17 due to closure during construction.

Specifically, the Eltisley Manor should be looked at in depth as any impacts are likely to be disproportionately felt by the occupiers of this facility due to the health nature of the residents.

Section 12.9.38 refers to the survey of footpath use the sample period chosen is not representative of normal usage i.e., during covid in a period of increases in cases in between formal lock down restrictions, in addition only 3 days were chosen. The assessment has not referenced any times of the day the survey was undertaken – a snapshot of the results should be included within chapter 12.

The benefit of using a Health Impact Methodology within the production of the Health Chapter of the EIA is that it enables the consideration the effects of the wider determinants of health on not only the physical environment but also the social environment. It is also known that these wider determinants are not distributed equally among populations (e.g., those people living in areas of deprivation tend to have poorer health outcomes). Therefore, the Chapter 12 should have included:

- An appraisal of the potential positive and negative health and well-being impacts of the proposed development on any planned new communities and the adjacent existing communities in the study area.
- Highlight any potential differential distribution effects of health impacts among groups within the population by asking 'who is affected?' for the impacts identified.
- Suggest actions / mitigations that aim to minimise any potential negative health impacts and maximise potential positive health impacts, referencing where possible the most affected vulnerable group(s).

It is recommended that the Applicant assesses the potential "after uses" for the borrow pits, in terms of them being available for recreation either as blue or green space.

With regard to the operational phase of the development, it is agreed that the proposed A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvements will not have a significant adverse impact in terms of air quality on human health within the Cambridgeshire districts with regard to the modelled outputs. These are based upon data within the transport assessment, therefore if any changes are made to the traffic data the potential impact of these changes on air quality will need to be demonstrated.

Whilst the proposals are predicted to lead to improvements in air quality for a number of residents, it is noted that some small increases in the annual average concentration of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) are predicted at a limited number of locations representative of sensitive residential receptors within the districts. The largest modelled increase within Huntingdonshire is predicted to be 0.8µg/m³ and 1.1µg/m³ within South Cambs. All modelled residential receptors are predicted to remain well below the relevant air quality objectives for NO₂ and the predicted impact is classed as non-significant.

The construction dust risk potential is considered 'large' due to the large scale of the works proposed, however the general air quality/dust mitigation measures proposed within the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (EMP) are appropriate, but will require confirmation through review and agreement of the Second Iteration EMP prior to construction works commencing to ensure all reasonable mitigation measures are utilised during the construction phase, whilst reflecting the scale, nature and location of the proposed construction activities.

Q1.2.1.3

Applicant

Future vehicle fleet

The ES [APP-161] explains that the methodology used by the Applicant to undertake the Air Quality assessment. For clarity, does the methodology followed account for the phasing out of new petrol and diesel vehicles as described in the Government's Road to Zero Strategy, 2018 and Transport Decarbonisation Plan, 2021? If so, how?

From a carbon perspective, the Councils are supportive of the application of the precautionary approach to taking account of the pace of decarbonisation of road transport.

Q1.2.1.4

Applicant
Local Authorities
Public Health England

Dust control

With specific regard to the control of construction dust, are LAs and PHE satisfied with the measures proposed in the first iteration EMP and the level of detail that will be secured in the dDCO through the First Iteration EMP [APP-234, Annex A, Tables A-1, A-2, A-3].

Good general dust control measures. Specific dust monitoring requirements will be drawn up in the Second Iteration EMP.

The general air quality/dust mitigation measures proposed within the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan (EMP) are appropriate, but as highlighted earlier will require confirmation through review and agreement of the Second Iteration EMP prior to construction works commencing to ensure all reasonable mitigation measures are utilised during the construction phase, whilst reflecting the scale, nature and location of the proposed construction activities.

Q1.3. Biodiversity and Ecological Conservation		
Q1.3.1 General		
Q1.3.1.1	Applicant Natural England Environment Agency Local Authorities	<p>Protecting and improving biodiversity</p> <p>Have all reasonable opportunities for protecting and improving biodiversity been taken, in line with the policy requirements in the NPS NN (paragraphs 5.20-5.38)?</p>
<p>No. There has been lots of survey work and ecological mitigation proposed as part of the scheme but unfortunately, much more could have been achieved. Early survey work was undertaken from 2016-2018, but gaps in information were not addressed in the following years for some ecological receptors. In addition, given the lack of comprehensive information, it is still not possible to determine the full impact of the scheme on ecology receptors.</p> <p>From a landscape perspective the routing of the new road has managed to avoid the majority of the woodland blocks but there are missed opportunities for creating biodiversity rich habitats characteristic of the local area and resilient to climate change; and does not adequately avoid / mitigate / compensate for the loss of Priority habitats such as arable field margins, hedgerows and standing open water.</p> <p>The design of the scheme has been based on incomplete baseline (ecological) survey work or assessment. The assessment is based on insufficient information about the design of the scheme, including lighting and design of bat underpasses and WFD enhancements of the watercourses. This is further compounded by inaccuracies in the assessment, such as wrongly assuming 18 ponds will be created, enhancements of 2 existing GCN ponds, lack of consideration of impact to connectivity of the hedgerow network and that the Protected Road Verge is located outside of the scheme limit.</p> <p>Whilst work has been undertaken to incorporate ecology into the Environmental Masterplan / LEMP, there are outstanding impacts that could have been easily mitigated / compensated, and potentially provided benefits within the scheme. For example, using species-rich grassland mixes and woodland / hedgerow mixes that include species characteristic of the local area would have greatly enhanced the scheme and better mitigated impact to habitats of local-county importance.</p> <p>While protection of the existing biodiversity interest (e.g. arable field margins) and restoration of the temporary site compounds, soil storage areas and borrow-pits could have off-set many of the residual impact & provide enhancement to habitats (arable field margins, neutral grassland, ponds) and species (farmland birds, terrestrial & aquatic invertebrates, Great Crested Newt, reptiles), particularly those that could never be mitigated within close proximity to a road scheme.</p> <p>There will be increased lack of connectivity within the landscape due to the loss of 87 of the 93 hedgerows and the barrier of a new road across existing habitats without enhancements such as green bridges. which would contribute to connectivity of the ecological network. This represents a huge missed</p>		

opportunity to increase net biodiversity gain and contribute to healthy, well-functioning, resilient ecological networks (Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services, Natural Environmental White Paper (NPS NN Section 5.20)³).

Given the above, it is a clear demonstration that the reported 20.5% net gain in biodiversity value is not a true reflection of the current scheme. This is due to a poor quality BNG calculator being used, instead of Defra's BNG model.

Q1.3.1.3	Applicant	<p>Surveys</p> <p>The EA makes reference to updating ecological surveys as the scheme progresses [RR036]; NE also refers to various updated surveys [RR-076]. Do you intend to undertake any specific updates to ecological surveys to provide up-to-date information as the scheme progresses? If so, which and when; if not, why not?</p>
----------	-----------	--

The Councils support further surveys to provide evidence of the impact on the Barbastelle bat population in Eversden and Wimpole SAC (if requested by Natural England). HE has provided a Joint Position Statement on matters relating to Habitats Regulations Assessment and mitigation.

Protected Road Verge S8 (Brockley Road) should be considered in the assessment (see Q1.3.1). The results of a recent Wildlife Trust survey will be available early September.

The aquatic surveys were conducted in a particularly dry year (2018) and so are not representative of average conditions for fish and aquatic invertebrates. We would support further surveys to provide evidence of species present.

For information the Councils' response on ecological surveys is set out in section 7 of our Written Representation.

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/biodiversity-2020-a-strategy-for-england-s-wildlife-and-ecosystem-services>

Q1.3.2 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)		
Q1.3.2.1	Applicant Natural England	<p>Metric for calculating BNG</p> <p>The Applicant has calculated that the Proposed Development would deliver 20.5% BNG using the HE metric. The BNG is primarily due to the creation of new woodland and grassland habitats, together with the creation of wetland habitats, and restoration works to sections of watercourses [APP-077, paragraph 8.10].</p> <p>a) Applicant, what would the BNG score be using the DEFRA 2.0 metric?</p> <p>b) NE, in your RR you have stated that DEFRA 2.0 is your preferred metric because it considers habitat condition and other key criteria [RR-076, paragraph 2.12.9]. Provide further explanation.</p> <p>c) The ExA is aware of the more recent NE Biodiversity Metric 3.0. In light of this, can NE confirm that DEFRA 2.0 metric is still the preferred metric to calculate the BNG on the Proposed Development, or update your position?</p> <p>d) NE and Applicant, explain the differences between the three Metrics in temporal, qualitative and quantitative terms, and how the measure of BNG would change?</p>
<p>We consider that the net gain calculations would be more accurate using the DEFRA 2.0 metric. The DEFRA 3.0 metric was launched early July 2021, and the Councils note that Natural England may take the lead role in this decision but could be part of this discussion.</p> <p>The HE Calculator does not appear to have been through the same scrutiny as the DEFRA Metric. It is based on a pilot Warwickshire Model (2012), but with no apparent separation of linear and regional biodiversity. There is no estimation of future habitat condition (all is assumed to be poor), and there is no separation of pre-construction habitat types.</p> <p>For example, all dense scrub is represented by the same distinctiveness and condition score. However, different areas of the same broad habitat can have different condition scores. Similarly, different geographical locations across the UK will have different distinctiveness scores from the model which was designed to assess Warwickshire habitats. Cambridgeshire habitats are different to those of Warwickshire.</p>		
Q1.3.3 Hedgerows		

Q1.3.3.1	Applicant	<p>Clarification on net loss</p> <p>a) A net loss of hedgerows within the Order Limits is shown in Table 8-9, but a net gain in Table 8-10 – which is it [APP-077]?</p> <p>b) Provide clarification on any other related inconsistencies in the ES.</p>
<p>The Councils note that 87 of the 93 hedgerows will be fully/partly lost to the scheme, including hedgerows of district/county importance. Appendix 8.19 shows that 0.82 km of hedgerow will be permanently lost due to the scheme (please note that the figures are listed in a column headed “Area (ha)”; whereas hedges should be measured in km, therefore we assume these are km). Natural England will take the lead role in this discussion.</p>		
<p>Q1.3.4 European Designated Sites</p>		
Q1.3.4.2	Applicant Natural England	<p>Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC</p> <p>NE does not consider there is sufficient information available in the NSER [APP-233] to rule out likely significant effects with regard to the Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC Barbastelle bat population [RR-076, paragraph 3.5.1].</p> <p>a) Applicant, are you intending to undertake the assessments and bat surveys requested by NE? When will these be completed, and submitted to the Examination?</p> <p>b) NE, in the absence of information on the home range of the maternity colonies, main foraging area and flight lines as well as the seasonal changes in habitat use in the SAC Barbastelle bat population, can sufficient mitigation measures be proposed to conclude that the Proposed Development will not adversely affect the integrity of the site?</p>
<p>As in Q1.3.1.3, we support further surveys to provide evidence of the impact on the Barbastelle bat population in Eversden and Wimpole SAC (if requested by Natural England).</p>		
Q1.3.4.3	Applicant Natural England Local Authorities	<p>ADDITIONAL QUESTION</p> <p>Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC</p>

		<p>a) Can the Applicant provide any evidence of recent tracking or surveys of Barbastelle Bats from the Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC that they have undertaken?</p> <p>b) Can the Applicant, NE and relevant LAs provide any evidence to support the assertion that the Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC is functionally linked to other identified Barbastelle Bat roosts in the area? Please describe the functional linkages.</p>
<p>There is an indicative functionally linked habitat around Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC identified in SCDC's Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Draft (July 2021). This shows hedgerow adjacent to the proposed route which falls within the SAC's 10 km wider conservation area (Natural England) which would be negatively impacted.</p>		
<p>Q1.3.5 Habitat Fragmentation</p>		
<p>Q1.3.5.1</p>	<p>The Applicant Natural England Local Authorities</p>	<p>Adequacy of mitigation measures</p> <p>The Proposed Development includes a four-lane highway, three grade separated junctions and associated works; the existing A428 would be retained and de-trunked. Roads are barriers to the movement of various terrestrial and aquatic species, and the scheme proposes various measures, such as underpasses and culverts, to mitigate this, which are partially referenced in the Schedule of Mitigation [APP-235, Table 4]. Habitat creation and restoration are also proposed.</p> <p>a) NE and LAs, with reference to the habitats to be lost and gained in the area [APP-077, Table 8-9], is the provision of certain types of habitat particularly important to biodiversity in this area, and if so which types?</p> <p>b) With reference to the habitats to be lost and gained in the area [APP-077, Table 8-9], would there be an increase or reduction of such habitats as a result of the proposed mitigation?</p> <p>c) NE and LAs, Would the design, number and location of underpasses and culverts be sufficient to prevent aquatic and terrestrial habitat fragmentation?</p> <p>d) Applicant, why are only some of these measures referenced in the Schedule of Mitigation [APP-235], and then only in limited terms (e.g. mammal ledges)?</p> <p>e) NE and LAs, would the size and locations of the proposed habitats be sufficient to create or link to existing functional habitats and so support biodiversity?</p>

A) Table 8-9 & particularly important habitat within this area

Table 8-9 doesn't provide habitat lost / gains for all habitats impacted by the scheme. It doesn't include unimproved neutral grassland. It also doesn't include dense/ continuous scrub, scattered scrub, parkland and scattered trees (broadland), swamp (reedbeds), standing water (ponds) and bare ground habitats identified in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Appendix 8-19, 6.3 ES).

The provision of woodland and hedgerows are particularly important within the largely sterile, intensive agricultural landscape of Cambridgeshire. Huntingdonshire supports clusters of ancient woodland, but they are often fragmented and poorly connected to other woodland habitat ([Natural Cambridgeshire \(2018\) A Natural Future for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough](#), page 7). Therefore, the proposed new woodlands and hedgerows have the potential to help strengthen connectivity with remnant areas of woodland habitats along the route. Albeit there will still be severance across the scheme.

Natural Cambridgeshire's vision for the route of the scheme is flower-rich field margins, lanes and hedgerows help wildlife move across the landscape and colonise new areas ([Natural Cambridgeshire \(2018\) A Natural Future for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough](#), page 7). Table 8-9 doesn't differentiate between high quality, flower-rich habitat within cultivated land (e.g. arable field margins) and semi-improved grassland (species-rich grassland) and the wider low-quality grassland / arable field habitats. Therefore, it is unclear whether flower-rich margins / hedgerows / wildlife corridor will be delivered.

B) Table 8-9 - increase or reduction of such habitats as a result of the proposed mitigation?

For the habitats that are contained within Table 8-9:

Woodland (priority habitat) – there will be an overall increase in areas of broad-leaved woodland habitat. However, the proposed habitat will be lower quality than some the woodland lost to the scheme as a result of the proposed planting mix, which does not include key characteristic of woodland surveyed. It will not mitigate impact to woodland of district importance.

Hedgerow (priority) – there will be an overall increase in area of intact hedgerow. However, the proposed habitat will be lower quality than hedgerows lost to the scheme as a result of the proposed planting mix, which does not include reflect local character. It will not mitigate impact to hedgerows of district-county importance. In addition, the proposed mitigation does not mitigate the severance of hedgerow connectivity across the road.

Neutral grassland (semi-improved) – there will be a there will be an overall increase in area of neutral grassland (semi-improved). However, this will mainly comprise species-poor open grassland that doesn't contain wildflowers and it therefore lower quality that neutral grassland lost to the scheme as a result of the proposed planting mix, which is not characteristic of the local area. In addition, creation of semi-improved neutral grassland will not mitigate the loss of unimproved neutral grassland.

Arable Field Margin (priority habitat) – it is not possible to determine the loss/gains of this habitat because it has not been included within Table 8-9. It is assumed arable field margin has been included within the cultivated / disturbed land figures and therefore it's not possible to separate out the losses of this habitat from the areas of intensive agricultural land.

C. Underpasses sufficient to prevent terrestrial habitat fragmentation?

A Great Crested Newt European Protected Species mitigation licence will be required from Natural England or the applicant should apply to the District Level Licensing scheme. This is not referred to in the applicant's Biodiversity Pre-Commencement Plan (Feb 2021).

We would expect an outline lighting strategy to be submitted or evidence that there will be no lighting of hedgerows or tree belts as there must be certainty of likely impacts on bats (European Protected Species). There is an indicative functionally linked habitat around Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC identified in the SCDC's Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Draft (July 2021)⁴. This shows hedgerow adjacent to the proposed route which falls within the SAC's 10 km wider conservation area (Natural England) which would be negatively impacted.

Eight underpasses are shown as mitigation measures for otters and badgers in the applicant's Environmental Statement, Chapter 8: Biodiversity (and bats are mentioned in the text and in the Environmental Masterplan). However, there do not appear to be any plans to install underpasses that are a suitable height for bats, or green bridges, which may be a better alternative. There is scientific evidence that underpasses have the potential to reduce the number of bats killed by traffic and increase the permeability of roads for bats to maintain connectivity across the landscape, but they must be **built on pre-construction commuting routes** (Berthinussen A, Altringham J (2012) Do Bat Gantries and Underpasses Help Bats Cross Roads Safely? PLoS ONE 7(6): e38775⁵). We would expect evidence that bat underpasses are being constructed in appropriate locations.

The Environmental Masterplan cites 'creation of habitat to encourage bat movement under the viaduct and along the River Great Ouse'. These measures are not specified.

C. Culverts sufficient to prevent aquatic habitat fragmentation?

Insufficient evidence has been provided to determine the appropriateness of the culverts to prevent aquatic habitat fragmentation. Neither the number of watercourses to be culverted, nor the severance of the watercourses or any proposed mitigation has been discussed within the biodiversity assessment (Chapter 8, 6.3 ES). The Schedule of Mitigation (document 6.9) does not include any mitigation measures for severance of watercourses / drains for aquatic species.

Some of the watercourses are already impeded and identified as poor quality around existing culverts. These will be enhanced as part of the scheme. This will help to off-set the impact of new culverts, if the connectivity of the overall watercourse is improved. However, no details are provided to demonstrate whether these measures are sufficient to mitigate fragmentation.

E. Size and location of proposed habitats

Please see responses to A, B and C above.

Q1.4. Climate Change and Carbon Emissions

⁴ <https://www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/media/2316/gcsp-biodiversity-planning-doc.pdf>

⁵ <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0038775>

Q1.4.1 Emissions		
Q1.4.1.1	Applicant	<p>Emissions</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the impacts of the Proposed Development, in the context of overall UK emissions, would not materially affect the UK Government meeting its legally binding carbon reduction targets [APP-083, paragraphs 14.9.17–14.9.28].</p> <p>a) What is the cumulative effect of the Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2) schemes in terms of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions?</p> <p>b) What is / would be the cumulative impact of the various Road Investment Strategies on UK Carbon budgets?</p> <p>c) What consideration has been given to the likely future operational emissions over the lifetime of the Proposed Development?</p> <p>d) What is the likely effect of the Proposed Development on the 6th Carbon budget (2033-2037) and on future carbon budgets up to 2050?</p> <p>e) Have all reasonable opportunities to limit carbon emissions during construction and operation been taken?</p>
<p>A) No comment.</p> <p>B) No comment.</p> <p>C) We are supportive of the applicant taking a precautionary approach to assessing the impact of road transport decarbonisation on the operational emissions of the scheme.</p> <p>D) The Scheme will result in an increase in carbon emissions, both during the construction phase and during the schemes operational phase. Table 14-9 of the climate change chapter of the Environment Statement (ES-APP-083) indicates construction stage emissions of 208,380 tCO_{2e}. Operational emissions in the year of opening are shown to rise by 35,280 tCO_{2e} from the do minimum scenarios to the do something scenario. This increase is due to the increase in vehicle kilometres travelled as a result of the scheme (ES-APP-083 paragraph 14.9.12).</p> <p>While it is noted that the Environment Statement (ES – APP-083, paragraph 14.2.5) was drafted prior to the adoption of the Sixth Carbon Budget by Government, the scheme will be in operation during the period covered by that budget, and as such its impacts do need to be considered against it. Reference is made in the ES to the emissions associated with the operational phase only representing less than 0.117% of the total emissions allowed for in the budget period. While these emissions appear small when presented against a national budget, they still represent an increase in emissions.</p>		

E) We would welcome greater detail on how the assessment of construction stage emissions has been reached. Table 14-9 (Environment Statement, APP-083, page 24) includes a breakdown of emissions by construction activity. At 11,600 tCO_{2e} per km of road, it is noted that the calculation of emissions associated with the Scheme fall below the average benchmark of 19,090 t CO_{2e} to 35,900 tCO_{2e} per km of road (APP-083, paragraphs 14.7-8), which is to be welcomed. However, in the absence of any further detail as to how this has been achieved it is difficult to verify the figures included in the ES. We recognise that this is a level of detail that is yet to be included in the first iteration of the EMP, and would recommend that the next iteration includes further detail and commitments to the measures that will be taken to reduce the embodied carbon associated with materials used for the construction of the Scheme in order that the figures referenced in the ES can be achieved. In addition, it is imperative that the quality of construction materials used is not diminished for short-term cost savings and that the materials selected have demonstrable suitability for tolerance to higher and rapidly fluctuating temperatures. Notwithstanding, the request for further information the Council would like to voice its support for the re-use of materials arising from demolition of the existing infrastructure and maximisation of sourcing construction materials from local borrow pits to minimise the emissions from lorry movements transporting materials in the construction phase.

Regarding operational emissions, Decarbonising Transport makes commitments around investment in ultra-rapid charge point infrastructure on the strategic road network, and we would welcome clarification as to whether the Scheme will benefit from such provision in order to support decarbonisation of transport.

Q1.4.2 Climate Change Adaptation

Q1.4.2.1	Applicant	<p>Resilience Are you satisfied that the Proposed Development is sufficiently resilient to climate change adaptation, in line with NPS NN (paragraphs 4.36-4.47)? Explain with reasons.</p>
----------	-----------	--

Requests have been made via written representations and the Local Impact Report to alter some of the species mix to improve climate resilience of planting strategies.

Q1.6. Construction methods and effects

Q1.6.1 Approach to construction and proposed programme

Q1.6.1.1	Applicant	<p>Approach to construction</p> <p>The ES states that construction will take place in six stages. Should tie-in works and detrunking be included in the stages of construction and in the construction programme. Explain with reasons.</p>
<p>The Councils consider that tie-in works, and detrunking and handover should be included but will review the Applicant’s response to this question. Tie-in works can involve the use of noisy plant and equipment and there are some proposed tie-in works that are close to noise sensitive residential receptors (within Huntingdonshire). This work should be regulated in the same way as other construction work.</p>		
<p>Q1.6.2 Borrow pits, construction compounds, waste management</p>		
	Bedford Borough Council	<p>Borrow pits</p> <p>BBC, you have expressed concerns about the level of detail about the borrow pits, how they will be worked and restored, and about the first iteration EMP [RR-008a]. What further detail do you think should be provided for Examination, and secured in the dDCO?</p>
<p>The Councils note that this question is addressed to Bedford Borough Council but would like to represent on this topic.</p> <p><u>Restoration and aftercare – compliance with relevant policy</u></p> <p>The Borrow Pits Excavation and Restoration Report (“BPERR”) refers to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (“MWLP”) Policy 7 (Borrow Pits). Policy 7 refers to Policy 19 (Restoration and Aftercare) but the BPERR does not. The Councils would expect the restoration scheme for each borrow pit to comply with the aims of Policy 19:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Phasing schedule – although to comply with Policy 7 the borrow pits must be restored within the same timescale as the project they serve, there may be scope to do so sooner depending on what part of the project they are linked to. b) Reflect strategic and local objectives for countryside enhancement and green infrastructure. The Councils understand that borrow pits will be restored to agricultural land and the Councils request further justification for why countryside enhancement and green infrastructure has not been considered appropriate. c) Contribute to flood risk management if feasible. The Councils request further detail from the Applicant as to whether this policy aim has been considered. d) Demonstrate biodiversity net gain – The Councils request further detail from the Applicant as to how the restoration proposals contribute to biodiversity net gain. 		

- e) Protect geodiversity (not applicable)
- f) Incorporate amenity uses (probably not appropriate)

Policy 19 is clear that “Where it is determined that restoring the land to agricultural use is the most suitable option (in whole or in part), then the land must be restored to the same or better agricultural land quality as it was pre-development”. [Highways England have provided the ALC grades in the BPE&RRR – both Caxton Gibbet BPs are Grade 2 so Highways England need to demonstrate how this will be matched or bettered in the restoration.]

In addition, the Councils consider that policy 20 (biodiversity and geodiversity) of the MWLP is not met. The proposed restoration of borrow pits does not adequately mitigate or compensate for adverse impacts to biodiversity.

5 years aftercare is standard for agricultural restoration. According to the PPG on Minerals⁶:

“Aftercare conditions are required to ensure that, following site restoration, the land is brought up to the required standard which enables it to be used for the intended afteruse.” Amongst other things *“The mineral planning authority should seek to ensure that the operator provides:*

- *an outline strategy of commitments for the 5 year aftercare period (or longer if agreed between the applicant and the mineral planning authority);*
- and*
- *at the start of aftercare, and in each year of the aftercare period, a review of the previous years’ management and a detailed programme for the forthcoming year...*

“The outline strategy should broadly outline the steps to be carried out in the aftercare period and their timing within the overall programme. These should include, as appropriate:

- *timing and pattern of vegetation establishment;*
- *cultivation practices;*
- *secondary treatments;*
- *drainage;*
- *management of soil, fertility, weeds etc;*
- *irrigation and watering.*

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/minerals>

A map should accompany the outline strategy, identifying clearly all areas subject to aftercare management, with separate demarcation of areas according to differences in the year of aftercare and proposed management. Where a choice of options is retained this should be made clear together with criteria to be followed in choosing between them.”

“The detailed programme should:

- elaborate on the outline strategy for work to be carried out in the forthcoming year;*
- confirm that steps already specified in detail in the outline strategy will be carried out as originally intended;*
- include any modifications to original proposals eg due to differences between actual and anticipated site conditions.”*

The Councils require these principles to be applied to borrow pit restoration and presented to the Examination. These should be secured as a requirement of the dDCO. The Councils require to be satisfied that borrow pit restoration is deliverable and clarity on the party responsible for the borrow pits during the 5 year aftercare period.

Borrow pits – biodiversity matters

The Councils are unable to determine the impact of the proposed scheme on biodiversity associated with the borrow-pits due to inconsistencies and lack of information provided by the Applicant.

1. The borrow pits were excluded from the Biodiversity Net Gain assessment for the overall A428 improvement scheme, so it cannot be determined whether there will be no net loss / net gain in biodiversity (habitats) as part of the proposed borrow-pits.
2. The proposed restoration of the borrow pits sites 3 & 4 is unclear at this stage. The Environmental Masterplan shows the areas are being restored to agriculture. The General Arrangement Plan shows the areas to be restored to open grassland, but it is understood open grassland is “*mainly on embankments and cutting slopes and areas with poor access*” (mix LE1.6, paragraph 1.10.7, page 128, First Iteration EMP). There is no reference to the proposed restoration of the borrow pits within the First Iteration EMP. Therefore, we cannot be sure if the sites will be restored to arable (current state?) or to open grassland, which would affect its capacity to deliver no net loss in biodiversity value.

The Scheme has failed to demonstrate that the mitigation hierarchy (avoid, minimise, and where this is not possible compensate impacts) has been followed and the Councils are concerned it will result in the following impacts:

3. Borrow pit site 4 will result in the loss of Great Crested Newt habitat. The Applicant has not demonstrated that the Scheme will have no adverse impact on the favourable conservation status of a European Protected Species. Highways England state that a District Level Licence will be sought, if this is the case, a DLL certificate should have been supplied as part of the application (as set out in Defra’s 2021 guidance [Developers: how to join the district level licensing scheme for GCNs](#)). This has not been provided and therefore, given the high demand on DLL in Cambridgeshire and limited supply of compensatory habitat, we have no confidence that this scheme is eligible or can be delivered through DLL

scheme. The alternative option is for Highways England to incorporate GCN mitigation within the scheme design and secure a traditional GCN development licence – however, no GCN mitigation has been incorporated as part of the submitted documents.

4. Borrow pit sites 3 and 4 will result in the active removal of deadwood and hedgerows/tree groups, which contain elm. Elm is a key feature of woodland / hedgerows across the scheme design and has been identified as supporting terrestrial invertebrates / assemblages of county importance (associated with deadwood and elm). New native hedgerows and scrub is proposed but elm has not been included as a key component. Therefore, the Scheme will result in a loss of habitat with key local characteristics and impact to terrestrial invertebrates of county importance.
5. It is noted that some impacts to ecology cannot be avoided, however, many residual impacts to habitats and species both associated with the borrow-pits themselves and the wider scheme could have been compensated through a well design restoration scheme for the borrow-pit design (sites 3 & 4). Instead, the borrow pits have been designed for future aspirations of the landowner. A well-designed agricultural scheme could deliver both ecological mitigation and be returned to the landowner, with covenants to manage it for biodiversity. For example
 - a. If the site is to be restored to grassland, the loss of Great Crested Newt terrestrial habitat could be compensated through selection of an appropriate grassland mix, and management of the site for GCNs (e.g. creation of tussocky grassland using wildflower meadow mix).
 - b. Alternatively, if the site is to be restored to arable, the loss of Great Crested Newt terrestrial habitat could be compensated through the incorporation of arable field margins.
 - c. Loss of deadwood habitat could be compensated through the repositioning of the deadwood within the perimeters of the borrow-pits adjacent to other habitats (e.g. trees / shrub / woodland)
 - d. Loss of hedgerows / trees can be compensated through the planting of hedgerows and trees that are characteristic of the local area and resilient to climate change. This should incorporate elm species, which support the locally / county important terrestrial invertebrates, and be extended around the perimeter of the borrow pit sites.
 - e. The incorporation of biodiversity rich habitats would also help to deliver no net loss in biodiversity value as part of the scheme.
 - f. The above restoration scheme, if adequately managed for biodiversity, could potentially off-set wider residual impacts to the scheme - neutral grassland / arable field margins (priority habitat), farmland birds, terrestrial invertebrates, reptiles and Great Crested Newt.

The Councils request that outline restoration proposals addressing these points are submitted to the Examination and secured through the dDCO.

Any infilled borrow pit must not cause any land contamination or pollution of groundwater or surface water. Therefore the composition of material proposed to be used as infill must be agreed prior to use.

Q1.6.2.2	Applicant Local Authorities	<p>Construction compounds</p> <p>Should the maximum heights for any hoarding that may be required be secured in the Construction compound management plan, and the dDCO [APP-234, Annex K]</p>
----------	--------------------------------	---

<p>Yes, the Councils would like to see the maximum heights of hoarding secured as suggested.</p>		
<p>Q1.6.3 Environmental Management Plan</p>		
<p>Q1.6.3.1</p>	<p>Applicant Local Authorities</p>	<p>Pre-commencement works plan a) Pre-commencement works plan is a certified document in Schedule 10 of the dDCO [APP-025]. When will this be submitted to Examination? If this is to be prepared on a later date, can you submit a draft or outline for consideration in the Examination? b) Have local authorities seen a draft or outline of the pre-commencement works plan?</p>
<p>Cambridgeshire County Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, and Huntingdonshire District Council have not seen a copy of, or discussed the pre-commencement works plan with the Applicant.</p>		
<p>Q1.6.3.3</p>	<p>Applicant Local Authorities</p>	<p>Roles and responsibilities Provide a list of roles that are named in the EMP, CTMP or any other certified document, that would specifically be appointed for mitigating the effects of the Proposed Development. Provide a brief description of duties and reporting lines. Refer to related questions in <i>Draft Development Consent Order</i>.</p>
<p>These points are to be discussed with Highways England.</p>		
<p>Q1.7. Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)</p>		
<p>Q1.7.1 General</p>		

Q1.7.1.2	Discharging Authorities	<p>Discharging Requirements and Conditions</p> <p>All discharging authorities to check the Schedules in the dDCO for accuracy and provide the ExA with suggested corrections and amendments.</p>
<p>The Councils are reviewing the draft DCO and discussing its terms with Highways England. Representations may be made on this point in due course.</p>		
<p>Q1.7.3 Articles</p>		
Q1.7.3.2	<p>Environment Agency Internal drainage boards Lead local flood defence authorities Natural England</p>	<p>Article 3 – Disapplication of legislative provisions</p> <p>Do you have any concerns regarding the disapplication of consents under Article 3? Explain with reasons.</p>
<p>Please refer to 14.3 of the Council's Written Representation. Cambridgeshire County Council would like to discuss the disapplication of section 23 of the Land Drainage Act with the Applicant as we prefer to retain the consenting role as LLFA.</p>		
Q1.7.3.4	<p>Applicant Local Highway Authorities</p>	<p>Article 5 – Maintenance of authorised development, and Article 13 – Construction and maintenance of new, altered or diverted streets and other structures</p> <p>a) Applicant, are there any other instances, other than those identified in Article 13, where an agreement made under this Order would constitute the exception referred to in Article 5.</p> <p>b) LHAs, comment on the provision in Article 13 in relation to maintenance of new, altered or diverted streets and other structures.</p>

Article 13(3) of the draft DCO (**APP-025**) appears to be a repeat of article 13(2), as footpaths, cycle tracks and bridleways are all highways. CCC considers it likely that this article is intended to address non-motorised user (NMU) routes that share a surface with private vehicular means of access. For reference, the equivalent article in the A14 DCO reads: “(3) Subject to paragraphs (6), (7) and (8), where a footpath, cycle track or bridleway is altered or diverted under this Order *along a vehicular private means of access*, the altered or diverted part of the highway must, when completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the highway authority and unless otherwise agreed in writing, be maintained (including any culverts or other structures laid under that part of the highway) by and at the expense of the person or persons with the benefit of the vehicular private means of access”. The issue of NMU routes running over private accessways does not appear to be addressed elsewhere in the draft DCO (**APP-025**), and therefore this appears to be an error of drafting. CCC therefore objects to the wording of this article and wishes to clarify that any PROW that is diverted or created on the route of a private vehicular means of access must be maintained by and at the expense of the person or persons with the benefit of the private vehicular means of access.

It is welcomed that article 13 parts 7, 8 and 9 explicitly outline the areas of future responsibility for different parts of bridge structures. Notwithstanding this, CCC objects to the wording of article 13 subsection 9. It is unreasonable for CCC to assume maintenance responsibility for the surface of a shared private vehicular access that also carries public foot, equestrian or cycle traffic, given that liability for a vehicular surface is far higher than that for a NMU route. It is requested that this section of the draft DCO (**APP-025**) is re-worded so that the surface of the shared private vehicular access is maintained by the persons with the benefit of that vehicular access or by the Applicant. The latter position is the case in the A14 DCO where article 11(8) provides: “In the case of a bridge constructed under this Order to carry a private right of way (whether or not it also carries a footpath, cycle track or bridleway), the surface of the street and the structure of the bridge must be maintained by and at the expense of the undertaker”.

Q1.7.3.5	Applicant Local Authorities	<p>Article 6 – Application of the 1990 Act</p> <p>a) Applicant, list the instances where the temporary construction works will be delivered under Article 6, identifying the relevant local authorities and effected landowners.</p> <p>b) LAs, comment on reasonableness of Article 6(3), in particular “any temporary works constructed <i>under this Order may be retained permanently</i>”, and highlight any concerns.</p>
----------	--------------------------------	--

The Councils have no concerns at this stage but will review the Applicant’s response so we can understand the issue fully.

Q1.7.3.6	Applicant Local Authorities	<p>Article 7 – Planning permission</p> <p>a) Applicant, should (1) appear at the start of the first line?</p> <p>b) LPAs and Applicant, are there any extant Planning Permissions issued pursuant to the 1990 Act within the Order Limits that will be relevant under Article 7(2)?</p>
----------	--------------------------------	--

<p>The Councils do not believe there are any relevant extant permissions, so far as they are aware from considering records within the time available.</p>		
<p>Q1.7.3.7</p>	<p>Applicant Local Authorities</p>	<p>Article 9(1) – Limits of deviation a) The Applicant proposes differing maximum limits of deviation, depending on the works number, represented by coloured shading on each works plan. Why has the Applicant not proposed a consistent, specific maximum distance limit of horizontal deviation in the dDCO (as has been adopted for vertical limits of deviation)? b) Do Local Authorities consider the approach taken to be acceptable? If not, explain why.</p>
<p>CCC as LHA makes a number of submissions in relation to the Applicant’s approach to the limits of deviation at sections 3.15 to 3.24 of the Councils’ Written Representation drawing from lessons learned from the A14 scheme and reference is made to those by way of response.</p>		
<p>Q1.7.3.10</p>	<p>Applicant Local Highway Authorities</p>	<p>Article 13 – Construction and maintenance of new, altered or diverted streets and other structures a) Applicant, explain the meaning of “from its completion”; what would determine “completion” of any highways that would be constructed under this Order? Where is this described, and where in the dDCO is the meaning of ‘completion’ secured? b) LHAs, do you have any concerns with the provisions in Article 13?</p>
<p>Cambridgeshire County Council as local Highway Authority (LHA) has a number of concerns with Article 13. Unfortunately, the Applicant did not share this drafting with the Council before the submission. In principle, the LHA requires a formal, agreed process of handover covering any new assets, or detrunked assets. This should include the agreement in writing of any design where the LHA will be adopting a new asset and an agreed process for this including inspections, road safety audits, and handover on a date agreed with the Applicant. It is essential to make sure that acceptable designs and standard are agreed, used and complied with on any adoptable assets to minimise any future maintenance costs or impacts. Cambridgeshire County Council as LHA requires certain amendments to the draft DCO to ensure that new roads and de-trunked roads are not vested in the Council as LHA as a matter of law until the Highway Authority has certified that it is satisfied with the construction and condition of the new road / de-trunked road. The</p>		

Council has recently shared its suggested amendments with the Applicant and hopes to be able to present an agreed set of amendments to the Examination in due course. These amendments will need to be supplemented by a legal agreement between the Council as Highway Authority and the Applicant to provide for the detailed implementation of the provisions, for example as to advance notice that a local road is due to be complete or that de-trunking is due to occur and to agree between the parties the relevant standards to apply. We set out below some further detail on the nature of the amendments that will be sought to the draft DCO.

Article 13 of the draft DCO offers no detail on the processes related to certifying that the works completed by the undertaker are to the satisfaction of the LHA. This is a crucial element of the LHA's interaction with the scheme. From experience of the delivery phase of the A14 improvement works it is notable that the absence of an agreed process for certification of new local highways caused delays in the transfer of some of the completed new highway assets to CCC, until such time that a process was agreed between CCC and the A14 Integrated Delivery Team. CCC requires that a formal process is agreed for the certification by the LHA that new and amended local highways are satisfactorily completed and are suitable for adoption.

Article 13 of the draft DCO also makes no reference to the transfer of new highway asset data to the LHA. This element of the works is essential to enabling the LHA to accurately record new highway assets, to understand and manage the new maintenance burden it has inherited, and to comply with statutory requirements regarding the documentation and publication of highway network information. Further details are required on the timeline within which CCC can expect to receive asset data for transferred infrastructure, and a commitment to provide this information. The LHA requires express provision in the draft DCO (**APP-025**) on this matter, which can be supplemented by detail set out in the agreement between the LHA and the Applicant.

Article 13(3) of the draft DCO appears to be a repeat of article 13(2), as footpaths, cycle tracks and bridleways are all highways. The LHA considers it likely that this article is intended to address NMU routes that share a surface with private vehicular means of access. For reference, the equivalent article in the A14 DCO reads: *“(3) Subject to paragraphs (6), (7) and (8), where a footpath, cycle track or bridleway is altered or diverted under this Order along a vehicular private means of access, the altered or diverted part of the highway must, when completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the highway authority and unless otherwise agreed in writing, be maintained (including any culverts or other structures laid under that part of the highway) by and at the expense of the person or persons with the benefit of the vehicular private means of access”*. The issue of NMU routes running over private accessways does not appear to be addressed elsewhere in the draft DCO, and therefore this appears to be an error of drafting. The LHA seeks the correction of the wording of this article.

It is welcomed that article 13 parts 7, 8 and 9 explicitly outline the areas of future responsibility for different parts of bridge structures. Notwithstanding this, CCC objects to the wording of article 13 subsection 9. It is unreasonable for CCC to assume maintenance responsibility for the surface of a shared private vehicular access that also carries public foot, equestrian or cycle traffic, given that liability for a vehicular surface is far higher than that for a non-motorised user (NMU) route. It is requested that this section of the draft DCO is re-worded so that the surface of the shared private vehicular access is maintained by the persons with the benefit of that vehicular access or by the Applicant. The latter position is the case in the A14 DCO where article 11(8) provides: *“In the case of a bridge constructed under this Order to carry a private right of way (whether or not it also carries a footpath, cycle track or*

bridleway), the surface of the street and the structure of the bridge must be maintained by and at the expense of the undertaker". Such an amendment would accord with the position in other recent Highways England DCOs.

Q1.7.3.11

Applicant
Local Highway
Authorities
Local Authorities

Article 14 – Classification of roads, etc.

- a) Applicant, explain the meaning of “*completed and open for traffic*”; what would determine the roads described in the dDCO are “completed” and ‘open for traffic’? Where is this described, and where in the dDCO is the meaning of “completed” and “open for traffic” secured?
- b) Should “authorised vehicle” be defined in Article 2? Explain giving reasons, and provide suitable wording.
- c) LHAs and LPAs, do you have any concerns with the provisions in Article 14?

The draft DCO (**APP-025**) at article 14(8) states that “the roads described in Part 8 (roads to be de-trunked) of Schedule 3 are to cease to be trunk roads” on a date determined by the Applicant. This article does not include any reference to the prior agreement of the LHA regarding the timing of the de-trunking, or that the de-trunked road and related infrastructure is in an acceptable condition at the proposed point of de-trunking. It is also unclear whether the Applicant intends to de-trunk all of the road at once, or in sections. This has the potential to place a significant burden on the LHA with insufficient notice. CCC requires article 14(8) be amended to provide that de-trunking will not take effect until the LHA’s consent is signified. As part of that a formal de-trunking process should be outlined by the Applicant for agreement with the LHA, including a Handover Plan that includes, but is not limited to:

- the assets that make up the road to be de-trunked;
- the expected condition of highway assets upon de-trunking;
- the maintenance activities to be taken between the making of the Order and the de-trunking date;
- the timeline for works to be undertaken prior to de-trunking; and
- the extent of highway and location of boundaries of the road to be de-trunked.

Advanced understanding of such a plan is essential to CCC in planning its future maintenance activities and funding requirements. Furthermore, agreeing such a plan at an early stage is central to ensuring that the eventual handover of the de-trunked road proceeds efficiently and on time. In respect of the de-trunking of the old A14 (now the A1307), a de-trunking Handover Plan was not agreed at an early stage and the lack of clarity that ensued over this matter resulted in the de-trunking date being repeatedly delayed.

Article 14(7) Classification - Certification process for PROW - cross referencing of works - CCC notes that this provision sets out how NMU routes are to come into being. CCC questions why this delivery mechanism is set out in the article dealing with classification of streets, particularly as Schedule 3 Part 7 lists all NMUs to be created. Wherever it sits in the DCO, this provision needs to refer to Schedule 4 Part 2 where a substitute is to be provided and the LHA requests that the Applicant explains the interaction between Art.14(7) (and Schedule 3 Part 7) and Art. 18(2) (and Schedule 4 Part 2). The LHA needs absolute clarity as to what works are going to be delivered. Further, CCC objects to the lack of a certification clause enabling sign-off by the LHA to their reasonable satisfaction before an asset is handed over to become their responsibility.

Article 14(7) Classification - Timing and implementation mechanism for new/amended PROW - CCC experience with the A14 is that works are completed at very different times. Therefore, unless it is intended for nothing to be opened until the whole scheme is certified as complete, the wording should be accordingly amended.

Article 14(7) – Incorrect reference - It is the Local Highway Authority that is responsible for highways, not the Local Planning Authority. The wording needs to be corrected to 'street authority'.

The Council has recently shared its suggested amendments with the Applicant in relation to article 14 and hopes to be able to present an agreed set of amendments to the Examination in due course.

Q1.7.3.13	Local Highway Authorities	<p>Article 20 – Clearways, prohibitions and restrictions</p> <p>Are LHAs in agreement with the intended role and powers of a Traffic Officer? If not, explain why.</p>
Yes.		
Q1.7.3.14	Cambridgeshire County Council	<p>Traffic Manager responsibilities</p> <p>CCC describe the Traffic Manager responsibilities in the dDCO as being unacceptable [RR-013], provide more detail, including appropriate referencing and any suggested amendments.</p>
<p>CCC operates a permit scheme for roadworks and streetworks. It is requested that the undertaker in the DCO is required to submit permit applications to CCC to enable CCC to effectively co-ordinate its network in addition to the DCO process and subsequent construction.</p>		

<p>Should CCC need to administer any TTROs on CCC's network to facilitate the undertaker's work then CCC would request that the Applicant meets these costs.</p> <p>17(6) needs to be revised to a longer period, with rejection in the event of no response, not acceptance.</p>		
Q1.7.3.15	<p>Applicant Local Authorities Affected Persons</p>	<p>Article 22(4) – Protective work to buildings</p> <p>Is 14 days adequate notice for the undertaker to serve notice on the owners and occupiers of the building of its intention of carrying out protective works under this article, specifying the works proposed to be carried out?</p>
<p>No. A longer period would be more appropriate.</p>		
Q1.7.3.17	<p>Local Authorities Affected Persons National Farmers Union Applicant</p>	<p>Article 23 - Authority to survey and investigate the land</p> <p>a) Comment on the provision in Article 23(1) for the undertaker to, for the purposes of the construction, operation or maintenance of the authorised development, enter any land which is adjacent to, but outside the Order limits.</p> <p>b) In Article 23(2), is 14 days adequate notice for the undertaker to enter land and place equipment for the purposes of survey or investigation? Applicant to comment.</p>
<p>The Councils have no comment at this time but reserve the right to do so in future responses.</p>		
Q1.7.3.23	<p>Applicant Local Highway Authorities</p>	<p>Article 55 – Traffic regulation</p> <p>Who will determine the date of "<i>opening of the authorised development for public use</i>" referred to in Article 55(3) and (7), and how? Where is this set out and secured? Traffic Authorities to comment?</p>

<p>The 'authorised development' comprises all development authorised in the draft Order, not just the development set out in Schedule 1. Different aspects of the authorised development will be open for public use at different times and so this phrase is ambiguous. The LHA invites the Applicant to clarify how these provisions will function and to provide draft revised drafting accordingly.</p>		
<p>Q1.7.5 Requirements</p>		
<p>Q1.7.5.3</p>	<p>Applicant</p>	<p>Requirement 11 – Traffic management</p> <p>The ExA is concerned about the use of the phrase 'substantially in accordance' in Requirement 11. Does this indicate that there could be changes to outline CTMP after Examination, and before commencement? Comment or revise.</p>
<p>CCC has some outstanding concerns with the outline CTMP which are being discussed with Highways England. CCC also requests prior approval of the final CTMP where it applies to CCC's network pursuant to Requirement 11 rather than simply being consulted.</p>		
<p>Q1.7.5.4</p>	<p>Applicant Local Authorities</p>	<p>Requirement 12 – Detailed design</p> <p>a) Should this secure the Engineering sections?</p> <p>b) Should this include requirement for design principles and detailed design proposals for structural elements of the Proposed Development, such as bridges, viaduct, gantries, and underpasses, and other fixtures, such as street lighting, signages and railings?</p> <p>c) NPS NN states that design should be an integral consideration from the outset of a proposal, and Applicant should demonstrate how the design process was conducted and how the proposed design evolved. Should this requirement secure such a design development process for elements that are not yet in the Application material?</p> <p>d) LPAs, are there local design policies that would be relevant for the design development process, and design outcomes, particularly in areas that will affect conservation areas and sensitive landscapes? Should the EMP and Requirement 12 make reference to these local design policies? Applicant to comment.</p>

Within the development plans of the Cambridgeshire Authorities are design principles in relation to the protection and enhancement of the built and natural environment that should be considered as part of the design principles of development. Policy NH/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018⁷ requires that development is only permitted where it respects and retains or enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape and of the individual National Character Area in which it is located. Policy LP 31 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 2019⁸ sets out the Council's approach to protecting existing trees, woodlands, hedges and hedgerows particularly those of visual, historic or nature conservation value, from the impacts of development and to halt the loss of trees in Huntingdonshire.

To assist in retaining the distinctive nature of the South Cambridgeshire landscape the Council provides more detailed guidance about landscape character areas in the District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)⁹ and the Landscape in New Developments SPD¹⁰ to ensure that development respects both the distinctiveness of these National Character Areas and the more detailed local landscapes.

Policy LP 12 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan sets out the Council's approach to achieving high standards of design in relation to an area's character and identity. In addition, The Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD (2017)¹¹ sets out important design principles to help create successful new development. Its aim is to influence and raise the quality of design and layout of new development in Huntingdonshire, by providing practical advice to all those involved in the design and planning process on what the Council considers to be good, environmentally friendly and sensitive design. The Design Guide SPD is to be used alongside the Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Assessment SPD (2007)¹² (or successor documents) which details the typical townscape features of the towns, their structural traits, characteristic architectural styles and the locally used materials.

It is considered that the Applicant should consider the principles set out in the above policies as part of the EMP.

The Councils agree that there should be a requirement for design principles and detailed design proposals for structural elements of the proposed development and that this should be an integral consideration from the outset of the proposal. The EMP and Requirement 12 should refer to local design policies and planning documents including policies LP 11 Design Context and LP 12 Design Implementation of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036, the Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape SPD 2017, the Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD 2017 or successor documents. LP 5 Flood Risk, LP6 Waste Water Management, LP34 Heritage Assets and their Settings, LP37 Ground Contamination and Groundwater Pollution, LP 30 Biodiversity and geodiversity and LP 31 Trees, Woodland, Hedges and Hedgerows of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 should also be taken into account as a minimum to address any impacts that design may contribute towards.

⁷ <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/media/17793/south-cambridgeshire-adopted-local-plan-2018.pdf>

⁸ <https://huntingdonshire.gov.uk/media/3872/190516-final-adopted-local-plan-to-2036.pdf>

⁹ <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/planning/local-plan-and-neighbourhood-planning/district-design-guide-spd/>

¹⁰ <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/media/6688/adopted-landscape-spd.pdf>

¹¹ <https://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/media/2573/huntingdonshire-design-guide-2017.pdf>

¹² <https://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/media/1240/landscape-guide.pdf>

<p>Q1.7.5.4 a) We strongly support the securing of Engineering Sections within Requirement 12</p> <p>Q1.7.5.4 b) We strongly support the inclusion of these details in Requirement 12.</p> <p>Q1.7.5.4 d) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Huntingdonshire District Council has the SPDs Landscape and Townscape Assessment, and Design Guide, and - South Cambridgeshire District Council has the District Design Guide and Landscape Character Assessment 2021 that should be referenced in the EMP and Requirement 12. The Councils make detailed comments in relation to highway design at section 4 of their Written Representation and refers to these comments by way of response.</p>		
Q1.7.5.6	Applicant Local Authorities	<p>Requirement 19 – Construction hours Requirement 19(2) provide widely drawn exceptions to defined construction hours, in particular (k), (m), and (n), which could enable general construction activities. Provide justification. Local Authorities to comment.</p>
<p>There seem to be two different versions of the construction hours in the Application. The Councils have some concerns about the exceptions, in particular (n). We will review the Applicant’s response.</p>		

Q1.9. Flood Risk		
Q1.9.2 Interactions between different sources of flooding		
Q1.9.2.1	Applicant Environment Agency Local Authorities	Grade separated junctions Has there been an assessment of the interactions between groundwater and surface water at the three grade separated junctions, the various underpasses and culverts, and, any geographical low points?
<p>There are some areas along the course of the new dual carriageway where groundwater has been encountered in initial ground investigations at areas where cuttings and grade separated junctions are proposed, such as the Cambridge Road junction. The wording used in the report is as follows and is the same for all cuttings where groundwater is encountered to be a potential issue:</p> <p><i>“The ground investigation records (exploratory holes WS236 and WS237) contained in the Ground Investigation Report, Appendix 9.1 of Volume 3 of the Environmental Statement [TR010044/APP/6.3] indicate the presence of ground water in the location of the cutting in this catchment. Management of this will be considered during the detailed design stage after the groundwater level has been established. Groundwater monitoring is currently being undertaken for the Scheme.”</i></p> <p>No information has been provided with regards to how to manage this at this stage, deferring to the detailed design. CCC would welcome further information on anticipated action by Highways England once the results of the groundwater monitoring are available. CCC also refers to sections 4.10 and 14.3 of the Written Representation.</p>		
Q1.9.4 Climate Change resilience		

<p>Q1.9.4.2</p>	<p>Environment Agency Cambridgeshire County Council Bedford Borough Council Central Bedfordshire Council</p>	<p>Flood Risk and Pollution Control</p> <p>a) With reference to the Exception Test, does the FRA demonstrate that the project will be safe for its lifetime, without increasing flood risk elsewhere (NPS NN, paragraphs 5.90 5.115)?</p> <p>b) Will the users of the Proposed Development remain safe in time of flood, even when climate change is considered?</p> <p>c) Will the River Great Ouse replacement floodplain storage be adequate, including with regard to the ongoing quarry restoration works?</p> <p>d) Have all sources of flooding been adequately considered in this assessment, including in-combination effects and the likely effects of climate change?</p> <p>e) Have all reasonable opportunities been taken to reduce overall flood risk as part of the Proposed Development?</p> <p>f) Are the proposed pollution control mechanisms sufficient to protect the environment, including with regard to Climate Change?</p>
<p>CCC refers to section 14 of its Written Representation.</p>		
<p>Q1.10. Good Design</p>		
<p>Q1.10.1 Visual appearance and design principles</p>		
<p>Q1.10.1.1</p>	<p>Applicant</p>	<p>Visual appearance</p> <p>a) When is it proposed to produce design proposals for structural elements of the Proposed Development, such as bridges, viaduct, gantries, and underpasses, and other fixtures, such as street lighting, signages and railings?</p> <p>b) Is it likely to be submitted to Examination?</p> <p>c) How can the ExA advise the SoS on matters relating to visual appearance, in particular scale, height, massing, alignment, and materials in the absence of this information (NPS NN, paragraphs 4.28 – 4.35)?</p>

Whilst noted that this question is not directed specifically to the local authorities, it is the view of the Cambridgeshire Authorities that these details should be provided to ensure that the impacts of the development are considered holistically.

Q1.10.1.2

Applicant
Local Authorities

Design principles for the Proposed Development

The ExA has seen the alternatives considered for different types of bridges in the ES [APP072, Table 3-3], and finds that the accompanying design appraisal is an early stage assessment of structural typologies, and only for one structural element (bridges) in the Proposed Development. We understand that the Applicant cannot provide detailed design proposals at this stage, however, would it be reasonable to set out design principles (other than HE’s design principles [APP-071, Section 2.2]) for Examination, and to be secured in the dDCO? [NPS NN paragraph 4.28 – 4.35]

There is limited design detail that has been submitted to confirm the extent and height of proposed safety barriers and approaches to the bridge and overbridge crossfall. All bridges should be built to accommodate all NMU users, including equestrians who require higher parapets for safety.

Within the development plans of the Cambridgeshire Authorities are design principles in relation to the protection and enhancement of the built and natural environment that should be considered as part of the design principles of the development. Policy NH/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018¹³ requires that development is only permitted where it respects and retains, or enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the local landscape and of the individual National Character Area in which is it located. Policy LP 31 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 2019¹⁴ sets out the Council’s approach to protecting existing trees, woodlands, hedges and hedgerows particularly those of visual, historic or nature conservation value, from the impacts of development and to halt the loss of trees in Huntingdonshire.

It is considered that in places more could be done to help integrate the proposed A428 into the host landscape. There is concern that in places the development boundary (or order limits) lies too close to the road proposed A428 corridor and does not allow for sufficient mitigation to be implemented. This is particularly where there is considerable infrastructure, such as viaducts, bridges and roundabouts, to be integrated into the landscape. The arboricultural plans (Tree Constraints Plan and Tree Protection Plans) (APP-183 – APP-187) within the Environmental Statement do not show the location of trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order where they fall within or adjacent to the DCO area. In addition, these plans do not propose a sufficient level of protection to nearby trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders. While the proposals show basic tree protection measures, these are not considered to be sufficiently robust given the scale of the nearby works.

¹³ <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/media/17793/south-cambridgeshire-adopted-local-plan-2018.pdf>

¹⁴ <https://huntingdonshire.gov.uk/media/3872/190516-final-adopted-local-plan-to-2036.pdf>

The Councils agree that there should be a requirement to set out design principles and that this should have been an integral consideration from the outset of the proposal. Reference should be made by the Applicant to local design policies and planning documents including policies LP 11 Design Context and LP 12 Design Implementation of Huntingdonshire’s Local Plan to 2036, the Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape SPD 2007¹⁵, the Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD 2017¹⁶ or successor documents. LP 5 Flood Risk, LP6 Waste Water Management, LP34 Heritage Assets and their Settings, LP37 Ground Contamination and Groundwater Pollution, LP 30 Biodiversity and Geodiversity and LP 31 Trees, Woodland, Hedges and Hedgerows of Huntingdonshire’s Local Plan to 2036 should also be taken into account as a minimum to address any impacts that design may contribute towards.

Design principles for all of the bridges and other permanent structures would enable a) Local Authorities and the Secretary of State to ensure “beautiful” design is achieved, and b) the proper assessment of Landscape and Visual Impacts. For example, as noted in the assessment of options for the Wintringham Brook pedestrian bridge [APP072, Table 3-3], features such as bow arch bridges and cable stay bridges may have a far wider visual impact than suspension or span bridges. This concern is compounded particularly by large structural elements in sensitive landscapes, such as the proposed crossing of the River Great Ouse and the East Coast Mainline, in which the exact height and location of any large vertical features would be hard to predict. Matters such as material, colour and mass will also influence how well the proposed features are assimilated into the landscape.

Q1.10.1.3	Applicant	<p>ADDITIONAL QUESTION</p> <p>Assessment of good design</p> <p>What further information will be provided to enable the ExA to assess the Proposed Development against policy requirements in Chapter 12 of the NPPF for high quality, beautiful and sustainable places, in the NPS NN paragraph 4.29 to produce sustainable infrastructure sensitive to place, efficient in the use of natural resources and energy used in their construction, matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetics as far as possible, and in the NPS NN paragraph 4.34 to demonstrate good design in terms of siting and design measures relative to existing landscape and historical character and function, landscape permeability, landform and vegetation.</p>
-----------	-----------	--

The Councils refer to section 4 of their Written Representation and the concerns raised re highway design.

¹⁵ <https://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/media/1240/landscape-guide.pdf>

¹⁶ <https://www.huntingdonshire.gov.uk/media/2573/huntingdonshire-design-guide-2017.pdf>

As set out above, the Councils consider that the ExA will need information on the design principles employed by the Applicant and in order to understand 'sensitive to place' the Applicant should set how regard has been had to local design policies and planning documents including policies LP 11 Design Context and LP 12 Design Implementation of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036, the Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape SPD 2017, the Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD 2017 or successor documents. LP 5 Flood Risk, LP6 Waste Water Management, LP34 Heritage Assets and their Settings, LP37 Ground Contamination and Groundwater Pollution, LP 30 Biodiversity and Geodiversity and LP 31 Trees, Woodland, Hedges and Hedgerows of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 should also be taken into account as a minimum to address any impacts that design may contribute towards.

Q1.10.2 Design development process

Q1.10.2.1

Applicant
Local Authorities

Design development process

- a) What will be the design development process for the structural elements of the Proposed Development described above? How will biodiversity, cultural heritage noise and landscape mitigation be addressed?
- b) Which parties will be consulted?
- c) Would it be reasonable to set out design development process for Examination, and for it to be secured in the dDCO?

The details required in respect of environmental matters including noise, air quality, biodiversity, cultural heritage, and landscape/trees are set out in detail within the Written Representation.

The Councils strongly support setting out design development process for examination, including stages at which local authorities will be consulted as a part of an iterative design process.

Additional landscape mitigation may be needed depending on the types of structural elements designed. There should be capacity within the DCO for the second iteration EMP to respond to any additional needs arising from the detailed design of structural elements. Please see response to Q1.13.2.1.

Q1.10.2.2	Applicant Local Authorities	Design Review
		<p>a) Has the Proposed Development been for independent design review? Do you intend to take it for independent design review? Provide details. (NPS NN, Paragraph 4.33, footnote 63)</p> <p>b) LAs to comment.</p>
<p>The Councils are unaware of any independent design review but would support this.</p>		
<p>Q1.11. Highways – network and structures</p>		
<p>Q1.11.1 Transport Modelling</p>		
Q1.11.1.1	Applicant Local Highway Authorities	<p>Involvement of LHAs</p> <p>Various LA Adequacy of Consultation Responses and associated RRs refer to the input to date of LHAs in the modelling undertaken by the Applicant.</p> <p>a) How have existing LHA traffic and transport models informed the modelling undertaken by the Applicant?</p> <p>b) How have LHAs been involved in the checking of modelling undertaken by the Applicant?</p> <p>c) Do LHAs agree with the methodology adopted by the Applicant in demonstrating the effects of the Proposed Development, particularly on the local highway network? If not, why not?</p>
<p>a) Elements of coding from CCC’s strategic model were shared with the modellers undertaking the modelling. It is unclear what use has been made of this information as the key information relating to the Greater Cambridge Partnership Cambourne to Cambridge scheme has not been used in the development of the model. The Councils understand that the scheme was considered to be too uncertain by the Applicant. The Councils disagree with this conclusion as the scheme is included the City Deal funding and Section 106 funds that have been collected from developments in Cambourne and Cambridge.</p>		

- b) CCC have had a number of presentations from HE and their consultants regarding the modelling undertaken but CCC have not been actively engaged with HE in the development of the model just the review of the modelling that has been developed.

CCC were made aware of the development of individual junction models that were to be included in the TA at a meeting with HE in September 2020. CCC requested sight of these models as soon as possible to enable the inputs and the impact on the local road network to be reviewed and agreed. The models were not shared with CCC till after submission of the DCO meaning that there has been very little engagement in relation to the development local junction models.

- c) CCC were provided with an extract of the stage 3 strategic model that covers Cambridgeshire. CCC undertook a review of this modelling and presented a number of issues relating to the model and the assumptions underpinning this modelling to HE which were discussed and subject to some specific concerns (see section 2 of the Written Representation) the strategic model was found to be sound for use in the assessment of the impacts of the scheme

CCC undertook a review of the local junction models which have been developed in different software packages (including Junctions 9, LinSig and VISSIM) depending on the type or location of junction being tested.

In all the junction models there are discrepancies in the input data which could have an impact on the operation of the models for example geometric data has been taken from AutoCAD drawings and does not take account of lane markings on site that impact the entry widths or length of flare. The VISSIM models all apply the guidance set out by TfL which is designed to model traffic in congested city streets and is therefore not really applicable to the proposed scheme. The result is that most of the junctions overestimate the capacity at junctions and underestimate the level of delay that is likely to be experienced.

All the junction models use traffic data that is taken straight from the Strategic model. This is not industry standard practice and is therefore not agreed as the strategic model is not validated to local turning movements. The methodology used in the junction assessments indicates that if the traffic data is correct then most of the junctions are bigger than they need to be to cater for the proposed levels of traffic in 2040.

These issues need to be addressed so that CCC can have confidence that the impact on the local road network is accurate and that the junctions proposed are appropriate for the level of traffic predicted to use them, this is especially important for areas where CCC are expected to adopt the road and maintain it post completion of the scheme.

CCC also refers to section 2 of the Written Representation.

<p>Q1.11.1.2</p>	<p>Local Highway Authorities Applicant</p>	<p>Methodology, inputs and outputs</p> <p>Paragraph 5.203 of the NPS NN explains that the Applicant should have regard to policies set out in local plans and 5.204 states that the Applicant should consult relevant LHAs and LPAs, as appropriate on the assessment of transport impacts. S16 The Traffic Management Act 2004, places a Network Management Duty (NMD) on local traffic authorities, or a strategic highways company (the network management authority), so far as is reasonably practicable, to ensure the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority’s road network and facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority.</p> <p>a) Do LHAs have any concerns with the data used to underpin the modelling undertaken? If so, please explain your reasoning.</p> <p>b) If further transport modelling is considered necessary, please explain why and where this is needed?</p> <p>c) Do LHAs consider the Proposed Development accords with requirements of the NMD in all regards? Explain with reasons.</p> <p>d) Applicant to comment.</p>
<p>a) CCC are concerned with the use of flows from the strategic transport model in the local operational junction models without any consideration given to validation against the traffic data collected. The methodology used in the development of the local junction models does not follow industry standard best practice and therefore needs to be redone to give confidence that the proposed design can accommodate the traffic flows predicted without adverse impact on the local road network. Updated modelling is also necessary to ensure that CCC are not taking on infrastructure that is larger than required as this would have cost implications for CCC whilst also meaning that the Scheme might attract motor traffic onto the road network which would be against policy requirements to reduce car traffic.</p> <p>The strategic modelling undertaken indicates that some sections of road (particularly in St Neots) will see significant increases in traffic as a direct result of the Scheme but these areas have not been assessed by HE in either the TA or TAA as they sit outside the red line of the Scheme. As a result, CCC are not able to ascertain if the junctions in these areas can accommodate the predicted increase in traffic. CCC therefore request updated modelling to account for these potential impacts of the Scheme.</p> <p>b) CCC requires the junction modelling to be redone with the geometries corrected to take account of on street markings and using future year traffic flows that follow industry standard methods and are based on validated base year models this will allow the impact on the local road network and the size of new infrastructure that is to be transferred to CCC to be properly understood, proportionate and agreed.</p>		

<p>Q1.11.1.4</p>	<p>Cambridgeshire County Council</p>	<p>Cambridgeshire traffic impacts RR-013, received from CCC, makes specific to reference to further information being needed to understand the impacts of the scheme on the local road network in St Neots, at Girton Interchange, Coton and 'others'. Please provide more detail to explain what additional information is required, where and why.</p>
<p>a) Without prejudice to CCC's primary position that local data should have been modelled, greater information is needed as to how the data from the strategic model was converted into traffic input data especially for the VISSIM models. CCC have requested this information but have been informed that this data is not in a format that can be shared and that we have been provided with all the information we require to undertake this work for ourselves. However, there are a number of ways that this data could have been processed so undertaking the work for ourselves might give different results. CCC considers that the duplication of work is an unnecessary use of public money.</p> <p>b) CCC require modelling of the junctions on the Great North Road St Neots between Nelson Road and the Wyboston junction to be assessed to ensure that they can accommodate the predicted 24% increase in traffic that results as traffic reroutes to access the detrunked A428 instead of travelling East through St Neots. CCC also require the assessment of the impact of the scheme on the junctions on Cambridge Road St Neots from Station Road to the existing junction with the A428 to again ensure that these junctions can accommodate the predicted increase in traffic as a result of rerouting from other routes to access both the old and new road at the Cambridge Road junction.</p> <p>c) The junction coding used a Girton does not reflect the as built design and therefore, CCC require the coding to be revised to accurately reflect the as built design, this is required as the lack of capacity in the junction as coded could be causing traffic in the model to reroute which might give an unrealistic picture of the impact of the scheme.</p> <p>d) The strategic model shows very little traffic using M11 Junction 13 to access the M11 in the base year, instead traffic is routing through Coton to access the M11 at Junction 12. Examination of count data collected in the area by CCC, Developers and HE indicates that this does not happen in reality and that this is due to congestion on the M11. Because this anomaly occurs in the base year it carries through to the future years which means that the rerouting grows as growth is added. CCC require the modelling of this area to be amended to reflect the traffic patterns that were present in the base year. Failing this CCC require the traffic through the village of Coton to be monitored to prove that the predicted levels of traffic does not occur.</p> <p>e) Examination of the transport schemes included in the modelling indicates that none of the Greater Cambridge Partnership scheme have been included in the strategic model. CCC are of the opinion that these scheme (especially Cambourne to Cambridge (C2C)) should be included in the model as they are part of the GCP work funded by the city deal. The inclusion of C2C is particularly important as both schemes operate in the same corridor. It is interesting to note that the modelling for C2C does include the A428 scheme as it was considered important to understand the impact that each scheme has on the other.</p>		

Q1.11.1.5	Applicant	<p>COVID-19</p> <p>The Strategy for Dealing with the Uncertain Outcomes Arising from COVID-19 document [APP-257, paragraph 1.3.8], explains that in order to consider the potential impacts of COVID-19, sensitivity testing is intended to occur following acceptance of the DCO application.</p> <p>a) When will the Applicant provide this information to the ExA and other interested parties to consider?</p> <p>b) What are the implications of the likely outcomes of the sensitivity testing to the conclusions drawn in the ES?</p>
<p>The developments included in the uncertainty log were taken from the 2018 local authority data, the validity of this data was tested via a sensitivity test that made use of the 2020 data and this work concluded that there was very little difference in the performance of the highway networks and therefore it was agreed that the use of the 2018 uncertainty log in terms of planning data was acceptable.</p>		
<p>Q1.11.2 Road layout, junctions and bridges</p>		
Q1.11.2.1	Applicant Local Authorities	<p>Road design and layout</p> <p>The ExA notes that ES [APP-072] provides an overview of alternatives considered and further details about the selection of the preferred option.</p> <p>a) Applicant, provide further information how the proposed highway layouts incorporated feedback from Local Authorities and stakeholders?</p> <p>b) Local Authorities to comment how feedback has shaped the proposals, or not been taken on board.</p>
<p>Cambridgeshire County Council has been discussing the design of highway layouts with the Applicant. CCC's interest in the size of the bridges is to see if they will be suitable to replace the current extraordinary load route. CCC has maintained that it would like to see roads that it will be adopting designed and built to standards agreed with the Council, principally DMRB. The discussion with the Applicant has not resulted in any changes to the design, so support in principle remains outstanding. Further, without the modelling of the local roads agreed, all discussion has been caveated that the proposed flows need to be understood before the design can be agreed. Discussion on the detailed design has started with the Applicant, and CCC is keen to ensure that any changes are covered by the DCO as the drafting is clear that the scheme to be built should be in accordance with the drawings. The Council has requested Protective Provisions covering Highway assets, adoption and other matters but these have not featured in the dDCO.</p>		

Q1.11.3 Signage and lighting		
Q1.11.3.1	Applicant Local Authorities	<p>Gantries and signage</p> <p>a) Confirm the likely timescale for submission of detailed signing proposals, including gantries, to the examination.</p> <p>b) If the Applicant is not intending to provide this detail as part of the Examination, how can the ExA be satisfied that specific matters relating to design and visual impact (NPS NN paragraphs 4.28 to 4.35), matters raised in RRs, including [RR-001], relating to signage and highway safety, would be considered?</p> <p>c) Local Authorities to comment.</p> <p>(See related questions in <i>Good Design</i>)</p>
<p>Please refer to the Council's comments on design matters in their Written Representation and responses to these written questions. We will review the Applicant's response.</p>		
Q1.11.3.2	Applicant Local Authorities	<p>Lighting arrangements</p> <p>a) Confirm the likely timescale for submission of lighting proposals to the Examination.</p> <p>b) If the Applicant is not intending to provide this detail to the Examination, how can the ExA be satisfied that the Proposed Development would not have adverse significant effects regarding artificial lighting?</p> <p>c) Local Authorities to comment.</p> <p>(See related questions in <i>Landscape and Visual Effects</i>)</p>
<p>Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority with responsibility for adopting new assets would like to agree the design of streetlighting, so that it can be adopted and maintained by our PFI contractor. It is noted that a written scheme of proposed lighting is proposed in Requirement 17 'prior to the development being brought into use'. This would be better provided prior to commencement and as part of the design, so that it can be agreed with the LHA and standards and processes applied to ensure the easy adoption of new assets, instead of after it has been built. It would be helpful to understand the lighting impacts of the development as part of the application and secure a commitment from the applicant to use Cambridgeshire's</p>		

street lighting specification on any roads to be adopted by the Council. CCC considers that it should approve the written scheme of proposed lighting pursuant to Requirement 17 rather than being consulted only.

As set out in Section 7.1.5 of the Written Representation, the Environmental Statement (**APP-077**) does not provide clear evidence that the increase in artificial light across the scheme will not impact commuting and foraging bats.

Q1.11.4 Operational effects beyond the extent of the proposed scheme		
Q1.11.4.1	Applicant Local Highway Authorities	<p>M11 Junction 13</p> <p>The TA Annex [APP-243, Section 3.9] provide analysis of the above Junction and associated roads, explaining that the location is known to suffer severe congestion and would experience additional congestion as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>a) Have any proposals for improvements at this junction been progressed since the time of the consultation and application for the Proposed Development?</p> <p>b) What are the indicative timescales for improvements at the location?</p> <p>c) How confident can the ExA be, with reference to what is secured in the dDCO, that improvement works will be undertaken at this location in future?</p>
Please refer to section 2 of our Written Representation.		

Q1.11.5 De-trunking proposals and new local highway infrastructure

<p>Q1.11.5.1</p>	<p>The Applicant Local Highway Authorities</p>	<p>De-trunking proposals</p> <p>The Case for the Scheme document [APP-240, paragraph 1.1.3 g], refers to existing safety and maintenance issues along the existing A428. The ExA have visited the route intended to be de-trunked and would request further information as detailed below:</p> <p>a) Please explain what these maintenance issues are. Has the detail of current and proposed asset condition been shared with LHAs? If not, explain with reasons.</p> <p>b) What certainty do LHAs currently have with regard the intended condition of those highway assets that will be their responsibility in future, particularly at the point of handover?</p> <p>c) Will the identified 'maintenance issues' be resolved prior to handover to LHAs and how will this be secured?</p> <p>d) At the point of LHA adoption, how will any outstanding required maintenance be funded and secured?</p>
<p>a) Cambridgeshire County Council as Highway Authority has attended two meetings with the Applicant to discuss de-trunking. No detail of the asset condition has been shared with the Council.</p> <p>b) and c) There is no certainty about the intended condition of the assets to be handed over, or how the maintenance issues will be resolved. The Council would welcome further discussion with the applicant on this matter and will be seeking any de-trunked road to be brought up to current and agreed standards, and handed over in a suitable condition that the Council has a proportionate and appropriate maintenance cost and the applicant retains liability for an appropriate period, and not requiring changes to the road. This should be secured through the DCO and a legal agreement.</p> <p>d) This is unclear at this point. The Council cannot accept an asset with an unquantified liability or requiring disproportionate or inappropriate expenditure.</p> <p>The Councils understand that the de-trunked route is the applicant's preferred route for cyclists between Caxton Gibbet and Caxton Gibbet due to the reduction in traffic. The Councils would like to see more information demonstrating that this route will be safe for cyclists.</p>		

Q1.11.5.2	Local Highway Authorities Applicant	<p>Speed limits</p> <p>It was apparent at the time of USI1 [EV-001] that both the existing local and strategic highway network in the area has differing speed limits. ES [APP-071, paragraphs 2.5.101 and 2.5.102] refer to proposed speed limits of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>a) If applicable, do the existing and proposed speed limits of those sections of highway intended to be de-trunked and other sections to be made the responsibility of LHAs meet locally adopted speed limit policies? Explain with reasons.</p> <p>b) How would any necessary amendments be secured?</p>
Please refer to our Written Representations.		
Q1.11.6 Non-motorised users		
Q1.11.6.1	Applicant Local Highway Authorities Interested Parties	<p>Providing opportunities for NMUs</p> <p>a) To what extent does the Proposed Development comply with the NPS NN paragraphs 3.3, 3.17, 5.205 and 5.216, and any other relevant policies, which relate to providing opportunities for walking and mitigating impacts for non-motorised users?</p> <p>b) To what extent have pre-existing severance issues, within the extent of the proposed scheme, been addressed as part of the Proposed Development?</p>
<p>The Councils refer to section 6 of their Written Representation in addition to the points made below.</p> <p>Policy LP 16 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036¹⁷ sets out the expected approach for new development in the District in relation to Sustainable Travel. It is considered that there are a number of instances within Huntingdonshire where the proposed development may not meet policy LP16. Whilst it is acknowledged the policy is geared towards planned development it does state 'all new development' and therefore is pertinent in assessing the A428 development proposal.</p>		

¹⁷ <https://huntingdonshire.gov.uk/media/3872/190516-final-adopted-local-plan-to-2036.pdf>

In considering whether the A428 proposals meet Policy LP16 of the Local Plan, we have looked at each element of the policy in turn.

a) *opportunities are maximised for the use of sustainable travel modes*

It is noted that the proposals seek to maintain the existing public rights of network where possible. It is concerning, however, that the proposals fail to maximise the opportunities for use of sustainable modes. For example, routes that had previously been indicated as shared use paths in earlier iterations of the design are now downgraded to paths or removed. This is detailed in comments in this section in relation to the specific points on each affected route. In addition, the Councils are concerned that due to the design of routes not meeting the appropriate standards that this could deter some users and as such does not maximise the opportunities.

b) *its likely transport impacts have been assessed, and appropriate mitigation measures will be delivered, in accordance with National Planning Practice Guidance*

CCC, as Local Highway Authority, has assessed the submitted Transport Strategy and related documents. It is understood that there are aspects of the transport impacts that present concerns for NMU and public rights of way. For example, at the new roundabout junctions at Cambridge Road St Neots, suitable crossings have not been designed into the scheme; and traffic levels and speeds are expected to rise in parts of the surrounding network, impacting on the ability of non-motorised users to cross or use busy sections safely, e.g. Toseland Road. It is considered that, as a consequence, elements of the proposals do not accord with National Planning Practice Guidance or LP Policy LP16.

c) *safe physical access from the public highway can be achieved, including the rights of way network where appropriate*

As noted above there are aspects of the scheme design that are cause for concern in relation to safe access of the public highway network, as detailed elsewhere in this joint response. The revisions set out will overcome these concerns and ensure that this aspect of LP Policy LP16 is complied with.

d) *any potential impacts on the strategic road network have been addressed in line with Department for Transport Circular 02/2013 and advice from early engagement with Highways England*

There is currently concern that the impacts have not been appropriately addressed.

e) *there are no severe residual cumulative impacts.*

<p>The Councils are concerned that the level of severity of residual cumulative impacts may be incorrectly assessed in the Environmental Statement and would urge the applicant to revisit this.</p>		
<p>Q1.11.6.2</p>	<p>Local Highway Authorities Interested Parties</p>	<p>WCHAR Survey data The TA [APP-242, Section 2.21] explains that no new pedestrian, cyclist or equestrian usage data has been collected since July and August, 2016. Do LHAs and IPs consider that the information provided gives an acceptable and up to date picture of current usage by walkers, cyclists and horse-riders of the local road and PRow network?</p>
<p>Anecdotally, the PRow network is considerably busier under Covid and whilst usage has dropped it is still higher than pre-covid. The Councils note that considerable development at Wintringham Park has occurred since 2016, resulting in a degree of change that may require additional assessment.</p>		
<p>Q1.11.6.5</p>	<p>Applicant Interested Parties</p>	<p>Clarification of other known NMU routes a) The ES [APP-071, paragraph 2.5.97] refers to other existing routes requiring modification to maintain connectivity. Confirm the net increase or decrease in length of each route as a result of the proposed modification in kilometres. b) Do IPs consider any other existing routes should be considered for modification? If so, why?</p>
<p>a) The existing route is 0.93km, and the new route is 1.02km, resulting in a net increase of 0.09km. b) We are not aware of any other informal/permissive routes would be affected by the DCO and therefore require some modification.</p>		
<p>Please refer to the Councils Written Representation, section 6.</p>		
<p>Q1.11.7 Construction traffic impacts</p>		

Q1.11.7.2	Local Highway Authorities	<p>Outline CTMP Consultation</p> <p>Are LHAs content with the scope and content of the outline CTMP [APP-244]? Please provide reasons for any concerns with any aspect of it.</p>
<p>Please refer to the Council's Written Representation, section 5.</p>		
Q1.11.7.5	Local Authorities	<p>Cumulative Effects</p> <p>The ES [APP-084, paragraph 15.3.22] states that full details of the other development projects included within the traffic model (covering developments in Bedford, Central Bedfordshire, Huntingdonshire, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire) and the factors applied during the modelling process, are presented within the TA [APP-241] [APP-242]. Confirm whether or not you are satisfied with the shortlist of projects that have been considered.</p>
<p>The list of developments included is reasonable but it does not include Cambourne to Cambridge. This should be treated with equal status to the proposed scheme that is subject to the DCO and, therefore, should be included in the view of CCC.</p> <p>The failure to include this scheme in the assessment could have one of two impacts: either the value of the DCO scheme is underplayed as Cambourne to Cambridge may encourage more traffic to use the proposed scheme to then access the proposed HQPT route in to Cambridge; alternatively the impact of the scheme on Dry Drayton, Madingley and Coton may be over-estimated as some of the traffic shown in the model could have transferred to the Cambourne to Cambridge at Cambourne.</p> <p>At the very least this scheme should have been treated as a sensitivity test.</p>		

<p>Q1.11.7.9</p>	<p>Applicant Local Highway Authorities</p>	<p>Frequency and timing of construction HGVs</p> <p>At USI1 [EV-001], the ExA observed, as stated in various RRs, many permitted construction routes appear to be residential in nature, particularly in and around St Neots.</p> <p>a) When does the Applicant intend to provide detail regarding the likely timing and frequency of HGVs using permitted routes?</p> <p>b) If the Applicant does not intend to provide this information for the Examination how can the ExA be satisfied of the assessment of adverse effects and mitigation of construction traffic?</p> <p>c) LHAs to comment</p>
<p>The modelling of construction traffic has made use of the strategic Saturn model. This model does not include a separate use class for HGV2 (articulated vehicles) which potentially minimises the impact of construction traffic on key receptors.</p> <p>While the routes that can be used by construction traffic within the model has been restricted through the imposition of “significant time penalties” on traffic using restricted routes there have been no restrictions put on non-construction traffic, i.e. traffic that currently uses or is predicted to use the A428 in the future years. This traffic has been allowed to freely reroute through the model this means that the impact of the differing phases of construction appears to be spread over a wide area. With increased levels of traffic indicated through most settlements in Cambridgeshire for the whole period of construction.</p> <p>The Councils will review in detail the Applicant’s Deadline 1 response to this question. We have concerns around the routing, volume, and control of construction traffic.</p>		
<p>Q1.11.7.10</p>	<p>Cambridgeshire County Council Huntingdonshire District Council South Cambridgeshire District Council</p>	<p>Local Highway Impacts</p> <p>Clarify and expand on the bullet points raised in your RRs when submitting your LIRs.</p>

Noted. The Councils will do so when submitting their Local Impact Report.

Q1.12. Historic Environment		
Q1.12.1 Methodology		
Q1.12.1.1	The Applicant Local Authorities Historic England	<p>Methodology and mitigation</p> <p>The construction of the Proposed Development would result in significant adverse effects on designated heritage assets and archaeological remains, including from the Iron Age and Roman times [APP-075].</p> <p>a) In light of the residual adverse effects to the historic environment, are parties and Applicant satisfied that the Proposed Development meets the policy requirements regarding sustaining and enhancing the historic environment in the NPS NN (paragraphs 5.120-5.144)?</p> <p>b) Is the proposed mitigation in the ES adequate, given the residual adverse effects [APP075, paragraphs 6.9.286 and 6.9.287]?</p>
<p>a) No.</p> <p>Although we will be able to agree to proposed methods of investigation and areas for excavation that will allow the conservation of the significance of heritage assets (by making an appropriate record of them) there are some archaeological sites that will not benefit from appropriate mitigation as we consider it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sites that are not agreed in terms of the area (“limits of excavation”) for mitigation = 14/30 <p>(this had been 15/31 sites, but High Hayden Farm was dropped by agreement - 12th Aug 21).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sites that are not agreed in terms of strategy = 12/30. <p>We do not approve the relatively low level of sample investigation proposed for the 31 sites across the scheme in Categories 2 and 3. For example, 10% of all linears is proposed as opposed to the Local Authority requirement of 10% of field system ditches and a minimum of 25% of settlement related ditches/enclosures, terminal ends in addition. CCC’s archaeological mitigation requirements are given in the Joint Authorities’ Archaeological Brief (updated and reissued 23/08/21).</p> <p>We responded to the July 2020 consultation on changes to the scheme design by advising on areas where a modification to the Orders Limits would avoid and protect archaeological sites, including areas at the principal compound in Urban and Civic’s Wintringham Park development area, around Site</p>		

18 (Fields 74) and in Borrow Pit 3 (Site 37) northwest of Caxton Gibbet roundabout. We received no response to these advised modifications of the route. With particular regard to Site 18, a major Iron Age and Roman site, only the northern part of the principle Iron Age enclosure boundary remains within in the scheme in association with unenclosed contemporary evidence. Despite effort to protect it via a change to the Orders Limits, this part of the site has instead been removed from the mitigation strategy altogether. We do not feel that this is a justified response nor proportionate to its importance or the impact of the scheme. This approach fails to meet the policy at 5.140 of the NSPNN.

“5.140 Where the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset’s significance is justified, the Secretary of State should require the applicant to record and advance understanding of the significance of the heritage asset before it is lost (wholly or in part). The extent of the requirement should be proportionate to the importance and the impact. Applicants should be required to deposit copies of the reports with the relevant Historic Environment Record. They should also be required to deposit the archive generated in a local museum or other public depository willing to receive it.”

While the scale of appropriate investigation proportionate to the importance and the impact can be debated, CCC object to the omission of known, interpretable archaeological content that will be destroyed within the Scheme boundary for the carriageway and advise that the area for mitigation in Field 74, as advised by CCC, is included in the archaeological mitigation area. See Figure 5.33, Text section 5.21, Table 10.20 of the Phase 2 Evaluation Report and Figure 3 (AP8) of **Appendix 6.3: Analysis of Aerial Images TR010044/APP/6.3 (APP-165)**.

b) In terms of archaeological investigation, No.

Site strategies do not conform with the investigation strategies in the Joint Authorities’ Archaeological Brief that has been revised and updated by CCC,CBC,BBC to address a small number of points of clarity raised by AECOM (reissued as a pdf document for inclusion in a revised Archaeological Mitigation Strategy 23/08/21), others of which were dropped following the explanation of the need for the Local Authority requirements and guidance to be set out and responded to in the site-specific Written Schemes of Investigation that an archaeological contractor will produce. If the strategies and areas for archaeological excavation do not change to reflect the requirements of the LA produced brief, the investigation of sites will not conform to local standards nor NSPNN policy at 5.140 and 5.142 and we risk the loss of finite archaeological resource in some parts of the scheme.

That said, in terms of community engagement, there is a significant Public Archaeology and Community Engagement strategy (Appendix E of 6.12 Archaeological Mitigation Strategy). We support this and advise that if conducted from the outset of the scheme, this will provide a major public benefit and leave a significant heritage legacy in the area. The excavations will produce huge assemblages from which representative items will be displayed and interpreted for public interest, which will also enhance heritage sector tourism opportunities.

Q1.12.3 Milestone and Mileposts		
Q1.12.3.1	Historic England Cambridgeshire County Council Huntingdonshire District Council South Cambridgeshire District Council	<p>Removal and re-location</p> <p>The Proposed Development would entail the removal and subsequent relocation nearby of designated heritage assets, causing a permanent moderate adverse effect [APP-075, Section 6.9]. CCC, HDC and SCDC, and HistE, what is your view on the removal and subsequent re-location of the Milestone and Mileposts?</p>
<p>We support this. It will safeguard these assets for future enjoyment.</p> <p>Surveying, recording, conserving and relocating the mile markers is an objective of the Local Authority archaeology brief to inform archaeological contractors to work with local communities to involve them in this work following an approach by Eltisley History Society, parish members and their County Councillor to do so. Their ambition to relocate heritage assets into the village might not ultimately be achievable but their involvement in the process is paramount so that a solution can be agreed upon.</p>		

Q1.12.4 Archaeological Remains		
Q1.12.4.1	The Applicant Historic England Local Authorities	<p>General</p> <p>There are a number of archaeological remains, in and close to the Order Limits, which would be adversely affected by the construction of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed diversion of a gas pipeline to enable the scheme to proceed would entail disturbance to archaeological remains [APP-158]</p> <p>a) Applicant, explain how the ES has considered the effects of the proposed pipeline diversion on archaeological remains? Is this the same approach for archaeological remains as for the remainder of the Proposed Development?</p> <p>b) Applicant, provide more detailed justification for concluding moderate adverse residual effects from the Proposed Development on the archaeological remains [APP-075, Section 6.9]? HistE and LAs to comment.</p> <p>c) Applicant, what consideration has been given to the of the effect of the Proposed Development on all these remains, combined? HistE and LAs to comment.</p> <p>d) The ES states that for Phase 1 of the trial trench evaluation, the original scope of the works required 771 trenches, but 95 trenches were de-scoped and removed [APP-173, paragraph 4.1.2]. What is the justification for the reduction in scope of the works and what effect would it have on the evaluation, including spatially? HistE and LAs to comment.</p> <p>e) Are parties satisfied with the approach, scope and conclusions of the archaeological assessment, and proposed mitigation?</p> <p>f) BBC, you state that the focus of the assessment seems to be 'changes to the visual setting of the monument' [RR-008a, paragraph 4.5]. Clarify whether you are referring to a specific monument; if so which one? Or are you referring to the assessment of all assets in general?</p>

d) This was due to six factors:

1. ecology - nesting birds in woodland edges and hedgerows near to trench locations,
2. the presence of farmers' tramlines that they wished to preserve, and
3. flooded field conditions (the evaluation was conducted in a wet winter period).
4. Specific areas contained asbestos and trench numbers were reduced by agreement.
5. Some access to parts of fields by landowners prevented some loss of trenching in small areas.
6. Some specific trenches were removed in small number on CCC's advice during monitoring visits where wider field areas had already demonstrated a lack archaeological remains. A few trenches were reduced in length owing to hitherto unknown buried services or tramlines. CCC adopt a pragmatic approach to trenching when they are satisfied that sufficient information has been obtained. However, where the trench loss was at watercourses or woodland edges where archaeological sites were also present or where geoarchaeological evaluation work was needed but could not happen, this was problematic as these requirements of the evaluation brief were unfulfilled. The Covid pandemic also hindered interaction by specialist personnel being unable to travel to site for specialist fieldwork.

In short, the reduced trench coverage will have reduced our understanding a little but we expect that mitigation strategies will comply with CCC's requirements to rectify this and enable both robust and subtle archaeological remains of the distant past to be investigated.

e) CCC is satisfied with the approach, scope and conclusions of the archaeological assessment but not with the proposed mitigation in several areas of the scheme, as mentioned above. A table of sites agreed/not agreed has been the subject of discussion at numerous meetings.

We do not approve the categorisation of sites as they have been devised in the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy or the low intensity investigation strategy proposed for just under half of the sites as this will prevent useful interpretation of their character and form and deny their use in comparative analyses and synthesis of the archaeology of the A428 corridor. CCC has a duty to conserve and enhance the cultural heritage of the county and to manage the change to the archaeological resource appropriately. We do not accept that ignoring parts of wider occupation areas is a suitable alternative to their investigation.

Q1.12.4.2	The Applicant Historic England	Archaeological Mitigation Strategy
	Local Authorities	<p>a) BBC, submit the Archaeological Design Brief prepared jointly by BBC, CBC and CCC, mentioned in RR [RR-008a] and at Appendix B [APP-238].</p> <p>b) Applicant, provide a brief summary of the relevance of the Archaeological Design Brief to this Examination, with respect to NPS NN and local planning policies.</p> <p>c) BBC, provide proposed wording for Requirement 9.</p> <p>d) Applicant to comment.</p> <p>e) CCC, HDC, SCDC, CBC and HistE, what are your views on the scope of the archaeological mitigation strategy [APP-238] and its response to the joint Archaeological Design Brief?</p>
<p>a) Joint Authorities' Archaeological Brief for Investigation (JAAB produced by historic environment officers from CCC, Bedford Borough Council (BBC) and Central Bedford Council (CBC) was issued to the Applicant in December 2020, setting out the requirements for the archaeological programme, including a substantial public engagement element, a series of research aims and objectives, guidance for the preparation of the digital and physical archaeological archives, requirements for display and publication of the evidence. This was issued following the submission to CCC of a draft AMS that CCC had not been invited to be involved in the development of which is inconsistent with normal curatorial practices. The JAAB was issued to ensure that local requirements would be met and to retain a consistency with archaeological programmes current on other major development schemes in the vicinity of the Scheme's study area.</p> <p>Some parts of the AMS have conflicting research aims and objectives and this has recently been explained as deriving from the Applicant team's inclusion of a discussion paper and aspects of the Regional Research Framework being too directly applied and unedited (e.g. REF 48 of TR010044/APP/6.12, Vol 6 6.12 Archaeological Mitigation Strategy). That said, much of the AMS can be and has been approved by CCC as consistent with and relevant to the policies for recording archaeological remains contained in NPSNN paragraphs 5.139-5.14, which are similar to those in paragraphs 199-208 of NPPF.</p> <p>However, there are areas of the AMS where opinion has polarised between the Applicant team and CCC, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Archaeological site areas that we consider should be included in the investigation scheme, and b) Investigation methodology: including the use of appropriate geoarchaeological techniques to ensure that the relationship of rivers and streams to the archaeological sites located in proximity to them is properly established. <p>Following the return of CCC's review of the AMS listing 76 areas to be addressed in order to agree a suitable, operable archaeological programme, these areas are to be discussed by the Applicant's heritage team and CCC officers in the coming days and weeks. CCC are seeking to ensure that the AMS is suitably scoped and resourced so that scheme programming will not be subject to programme or financial risks owing to any misunderstanding about</p>		

what will be required in the archaeological investigation programme. CCC require the AMS to contain robust and accurate summaries of the works needed at each of the 31 Cambridgeshire archaeological sites.

Q1.13. Landscape and Visual Effects

Q1.13.1 General

Historic England
Local Authorities

Methodology

Within a predominantly rural landscape the ES states that the proposed scheme would have significant adverse residual effects, both during construction and operation [APP-076, section 7.9].

- a) LAs, are you content with the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) methodology, including the locations of viewpoints and photomontages [APP-123 – APP-137]?
- b) HistE’s views are sought in light of heritage assets that are present, including scheduled monuments such as a Bronze Age barrow and medieval moated sites [APP075, Paragraph 6.6.15], within the affected landscape.

The scope of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment was agreed with the Councils, and the methodology accords with relevant, and current best practice guidance, including *Highways England Design Manual for Roads and Bridges*¹⁸, the *Landscape Institute’s Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment: Third edition* and *The Landscape Institute’s Visual Representation of Development Proposals – Technical Guidance Note 06/19*¹⁹.

Q1.13.2 Visual Impact

¹⁸ <https://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/dmrb/>

¹⁹ https://landscapewpstorage01.blob.core.windows.net/www-landscapeinstitute-org/2019/09/LI_TGN-06-19_Visual_Representation.pdf

<p>Q1.13.2.1</p>	<p>Applicant Local Authorities</p>	<p>Design and visual appearance</p> <p>Applicant, in the Schedule of Mitigation [APP-235, EMB – LV8] you have identified "<i>Factoring landscape and visual considerations into the form and design of permanent structures (for example footbridges)</i>" as a commitment. The ExA notes that there is limited detail about the design and visual appearance of permanent structures, besides the engineering sections [APP-019] and the limited visuals in the ES [APP-072].</p> <p>a) In the absence of this information, please elaborate on how the design and visual appearance of the various permanent structures of the Proposed Development such as the grade separated junctions, bridges, gantries and signs, have been considered in LVIA?</p> <p>b) Local Authorities to comment.</p>
<p>With reference to computer generated Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTVs) The LVIA methodology [APP 6.1.] does not make note of elements which may have vertical features which might add to the assumed height of the highway; the highest points of the dual carriageway, with additional 1m allowance for vertical limits of deviation, and an additional 4m allowance for high sided vehicles. This would therefore not appear to include elements such as suspension mechanisms, arch bridges, gantries or similar features which may result in a change to the magnitude of visual effects. The methodology suggests that some allowance has been made for additional features, such as signage, in the fieldwork element of the assessment. The visual effects narrative [APP 6.1. – Table 1.3] explicitly discusses new bridges, roundabouts, and sliproads, though of course no detail on the design of the bridges is yet available which is a limitation to the assessment. This is why it is maintained that flexibility needs to be maintained within the Second Iteration of the EMP for any additional mitigation which may be identified as necessary during the development of detailed design proposals for permanent structures. Please see response to Q1.10.2.1</p>		

Q1.13.3 First Iteration EMP and Landscape and Ecology Management Plans

<p>Q1.13.3.1</p>	<p>Applicant Local Authorities Natural England</p>	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>a) LAs, are you satisfied with the level of detail regarding the proposed mitigation that would have been secured through the First Iteration EMP, including the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [APP-234] and the dDCO [APP-025]?</p> <p>b) The ES states that one of the measures to mitigate the effects of construction activities includes sympathetic lighting to minimise disturbance to nearby receptors. Applicant, are you intending to provide any further information about the objectives for lighting measures, than is already provided in the First Iteration EMP [APP-234, Section 1.4]? LAs and NE to comment.</p> <p>c) LAs, would the Proposed Development be sufficiently screened, particularly relative to existing settlements, such as Roxton, St Neots, or Caxton-Toseland?</p> <p>d) CCC, elaborate on your concerns regarding HE’s commitment to timing of planting, maintenance regime, and planting mixes [RR-013]</p>
------------------	--	--

The Councils refer to section 8 of their Written Representation in addition to the points made below. The Councils will consider the response from the Applicant and make further submissions at Deadline 3 if necessary.

Insufficient information about mitigation has been provided:

- a) It is not possible to determine the full level of impact of the scheme, due to incomplete survey work. Therefore, it is not possible to determine whether an acceptable level of mitigation has been secured as shown in the First Iteration EMP due to incomplete baseline survey for the following ecological receptors: Protected Road Verge (grassland of county importance), arable field margins (priority habitat), unimproved neutral grassland (potential priority lowland meadow habitat), aquatic habitat, terrestrial invertebrates, aquatic invertebrates, and bats. Furthermore, it is already possible to see where there are already some deficiencies in the information provided (as detailed below).

Protected Road Verge S8 – no consideration of PRV has been provided within the design / assessment. During the 2012 PRV surveys (undertaken by CCC) a nationally scarce vascular plant was recorded at the site and therefore, the site meets criteria for County Wildlife Site status, and it therefore consider of county importance for its grassland. A survey was undertaken July 2021 and results will be available early Sep 2021. There are no measures to protect or enhance this site within the LEMP in order to mitigate any adverse impact. Such sites comprise a vital element of the county’s ecological networks and habitat improvement of the network verge is specifically cited in NPS NN Section 5.36.

- b) Arable Field Margins (priority habitat) – no mitigation has been provided within the LEMP for the loss of district importance Arable Field Margins (Fields A29 & A30, para 4.3.3, Appendix 8-3, 6.3 ES). The scheme does not protect existing priority habitat or proposed re-instatement on sites that will be temporarily lost. An Arable Farm Margin mitigation strategy is required to demonstrate how this habitat can be protected, mitigated, and restored within the Order Limits.
- c) Hedgerows / Woodland (priority habitat) – there will be increases in woodland coverage, but the planting mixes do not reflect key characteristic (e.g. elm, particularly the Huntingdonshire variety which is resilient to Dutch elm disease) and/or include species not resilient to climate change (e.g. silver birch). And therefore, will be of lower quality. See answer to (D) below with regards to planting mixes.
- d) Unimproved neutral grassland (potential priority habitat) – at this stage, it is not possible to determine the quality of the grassland (due to lack of survey), however it has the potential to be of county importance (e.g. support notable species / good botanical assemblage) and/or priority lowland meadow habitat. No mitigation has been provided within the LEMP for the loss of unimproved neutral grassland, instead species-poor / mixes containing species not indicative of the local area have been selected.

Bats (European Protected Species) – with the lack of information submitted about the extent of lighting across the scheme, it is not possible to determine whether mitigation is sufficient. Requirement 17(2)a of the DCO states the lighting scheme will incorporate mitigation measures set out in Chapter 8. However, there are no specific mitigation measures set out at chapter 8, with the exception of a generic statement saying the lighting scheme has been designed to minimise spill onto adjacent habitats [8.9.122, Chapter 8, 6.1 ES]. Since there must be certainty of likely impacts on bats as European Protected Species, we would expect an outline lighting strategy to be submitted or evidence that there will be no lighting of hedgerows or tree belts. There is an indicative functionally linked habitat around Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC identified in the SCDC's Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Draft (July 2021)²⁰. This shows hedgerow adjacent to the proposed route which falls within the SAC's 10 km wider conservation area (Natural England) which would be negatively impacted.

Bats (European Protected Species) – there is insufficient detail about the design of the bat crossings to demonstrate they will be designed effectively for bats. There is no proposed design within the DCO documents, nor requirement for ecologically sensitive design of these structures within the DCO. Eight underpasses are shown as mitigation measures for otters and badgers in the applicant's Environmental Statement, Chapter 8: Biodiversity (and bats are mentioned in the text and in the Environmental Masterplan). However, there do not appear to be any plans to install underpasses that are a suitable height for bats, or green bridges, which may be a better alternative, or whether lighting will affect the underpasses. There is scientific evidence that underpasses have the potential to reduce the number of bats killed by traffic and increase the permeability of roads for bats to maintain connectivity across the landscape, but they must be built **on pre-construction commuting routes**. We would expect evidence that bat underpasses are being constructed in appropriate locations. The Environmental Masterplan cites 'creation of habitat to encourage bat movement under the viaduct and along the River Great Ouse'. These measures are not specified.

²⁰ <https://www.greatercambridgeplanning.org/media/2316/gcsp-biodiversity-planning-doc.pdf>

Great Crested Newts (European Protected Species) – ES states that the loss of breeding ponds and terrestrial habitat will be compensated through use of the District Level Licensing or on-site mitigation (under NE licence), or a combination of both. And that “*no operational impacts are predicted to occur for... Great Crested Newt*” [paragraph 8.9.135, Chapter 8, 6.1 ES]. However, no DLL certificate has been supplied to demonstrate the scheme is eligible for DLL (in accordance with NE guidance, this should be submitted as part of application for planning permission). In addition, no on-site mitigation (enhancement / creation of GCN habitat) has been provided within the LEMP. It is also noted that in Chapter 8, it is proposed to translocate GCN to existing ponds with GCN – this is considered inappropriate and poor practice, given the ponds are likely to be at carrying capacity & it would also risk spreading disease into healthy populations. An NE licence would be unlikely to be granted for this type of translocation. Actions to be taken for Great crested newts are not mentioned in the Biodiversity Pre-Commencement Plan (Feb 2021).

- e) Farmland birds - ES states that “*No operational impacts are predicted to occur for... birds*” [paragraph 8.9.135, Chapter 8, 6.1 ES] but this has not been adequately demonstrated for farmland birds within the LEMP. No landscape scheme is proposed beyond the narrow route corridor and therefore, is not suitable for breeding / wintering farmland bird species that are sensitive to noise / lighting etc. More detailed is required as to how these species will be mitigated within the wider Order Limits (e.g. restoration of site compounds / borrow-pits).
- f) Aquatic habitats / aquatic invertebrates - ES states “*the design of the Scheme includes the creation of 18 ponds and patches of wetland as well as the restoration of sections of the Hen Brook and other watercourses*” [paragraph 8.9.98, Chapter 8, 6.1 ES]. However, no ponds are proposed within the LEMP. The wetland habitats provided within the LEMP will be species-poor, with a small number of dominant grass species (e.g. rye grass). No aquatic or marginal species are proposed (with the exception of reed canary grass) and therefore, not of sufficient quality to mitigate loss of ponds/ aquatic invertebrate habitat. No information is provided within the LEMP about the restoration to the watercourses (including Hen Brook) – it is not clear whether this information will come forward as part of requirement 3 or 4 (2nd / 3rd Iteration EMPs).
- g) Terrestrial Invertebrates. From the survey information provided to date (albeit incomplete), elm and deadwood are two key habitats for terrestrial invertebrates of local & county importance (respectively). The LEMP does not include mitigation for loss of elm. While the applicant will consider elm within hedgerows, there is no confirmation this will be delivered, and there’s no commitment for inclusion with woodland. In addition, there is a proposal to create log piles, however this will not compensate for the loss of standing deadwood (upon which notable invertebrates were recorded).
- h) Biodiversity Net Gain – the LEMP does not provide any targets for the type and condition of the habitats to be created and how they will be monitored in order to deliver the 20.5% BNG. Requirement 6 landscape does not include any requirements for remedial actions for reinstating habitats that have failed (part from scrub and trees), nor is there any measure for managing the habitats until BNG has been delivered. This might be picked up as part of requirements 3 & 4 (2nd / 3rd EMP), but this is unclear at this stage. The EMPs will need to include a timetable for habitat condition assessments, mechanism for remedial action, and management until they need target condition (as set out in BNG assessment).

Q1.13.3.1 c) It is considered that additional screening could be provided for the benefit of residents of St Neots, particularly in the vicinity of Wintrigham Park which is currently under development. Effects here have been assessed in relation to receptors on Footpaths FP 1/9 and FP 194/55 (Viewpoint 27) and receptors on Footpath FP 1/19 (Viewpoint 28), though in the near future the receptors will also be residential. The visual effects of the development

to these receptors remains 'Moderate adverse' at year 15 of operation, though it is accepted that it is not possible to screen all elements of the proposed road corridor and associated infrastructure completely.

D)

Timing

Timing of planting – in light of the 90%+ failure of sections of the trees planting along some sections of the A14 Cambridge – Huntingdon scheme, we are mindful to ensure the same issue isn't repeated. And therefore, seek assurances within the documentation that the planting will be undertaken at the correct time of year.

Maintenance regime

Currently, the LEMP proposes an initial 5-year management period, followed by a long-term maintenance period. However, we are unclear how long this 'long management' period would last. It should last for the lifetime of the development. Or at the very least, a sufficient time period to enable all ecological mitigation and enhancement to be delivered, with habitat meets its target condition to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (in accordance with Technical Note accompanying Defra BNG model 3.0) and species populations to have successfully re-established to pre-construction levels.

Currently, the maintenance regime does not include objectives for each habitat, upon which the site will be managed / habitat condition assessed or monitor the success of mitigation for species (e.g. bats, GCN, terrestrial invertebrates). The regime should also include timetable of habitat condition assessments to demonstrate whether or not the target conditions have been achieved.

Mixes

LE1.1 amenity grassland and LE1.6 open grassland (containing only 6 grass species) are not considered appropriate for a rural road scheme. LE1.3 species-rich grassland is not well balanced / characteristic of the area. The grassland mixes should maximise the benefit for wildlife through the use of wildflower species-rich grassland throughout the scheme, using mixes that are indicative of the local area.

LE2.1 woodland mix figures are inaccurate & add up to greater than 100%. The use of silver birch at 25% is not appropriate, given it is not resilient to the climate change predicted within our area.

LE2.1 woodland mixes, scrub mixes (LE2.2, LE2.4, LE2.5, LE2.6 & LE2.8) and hedgerow mixes (LE4.3 & LE4.4) do not include elm. It is noted that "*English Elm (Ulmus procera) and small-leaved elm (Ulmus minor) are under consideration as part of the planting mix, predominantly for hedgerows*"

[paragraph 1.10.14, LEMP] but there is no guarantee this will be delivered. The Huntingdonshire variety of elm, which shows resistance to Dutch Elm disease is an important element of the local woodland and hedgerows (as discussed above). It might not be possible at this stage to commercially source sufficient stock for the planting scheme (depending on time scales). It may require a mechanism to be set up to work with a local nursery to produce Huntingdonshire elms, to be installed along the scheme and (where this is not possible) the wider Huntingdonshire landscape.

LE2.5 / LE5.1 – good to have a variety of species. Hornbeam and Beech (only found in Plantation headlands in S. Cambridgeshire) are not characteristic of the area, but acceptable in small quantities due to their resilience to predicted climate change. However, we are concerned about the usage of Silver birch, willows and alder on areas / embankments with limited rain / water retention in the soils.

L-10: Indicative individual trees mix. Disappointing that the Huntingdonshire variety of elm is not included within individual trees. It would be beneficial to locate elm specimens in close proximity to the veteran English elm, to future proof this habitat / if this tree was inadvertently impacted by the scheme.

The planting mixes for banks and ditches (LE6.2), reedbeds (LE 6.3) and marsh and wet grassland (LE 6.4) are species poor, comprising a small number of dominant species (e.g. rye grass and reed canary grass) and therefore provided little benefit to wildlife. These habitats were identified as being mitigation for loss of aquatic habitat (e.g. ponds) and associated aquatic invertebrates. Therefore, the planting mixes should be species-rich, including flowering plants, and include aquatic, marginal and wet grassland mixes. For example, use of coir rolls with a variety of native plant species should be used to maximise their biodiversity value.

Q1.14. Land use including open space and green infrastructure

Q1.14.1 Geology and Soils

<p>Q1.14.1.1</p>	<p>Applicant Local Authorities Interested Parties</p>	<p>BMV agricultural land</p> <p>The ES states that some 348 hectares of the BMV agricultural land will be permanently lost because of the Proposed Development, with some 512 hectares used temporarily, in association with the construction of the scheme [APP-078, paragraph 9.9.25].</p> <p>a) Applicant, please explain in what specific ways consideration was given to BMV during design of the Proposed Development and provide the justification for the acknowledged harm [APP-078, Table 9-14]. For land that is to be returned to agricultural use following the construction of the scheme, what consideration has been given to its soil condition?</p>
------------------	---	--

		<p>b) Interested Parties, your RRs refer to land that has been subject to regenerative agricultural practices to improve it [RR-039] [RR-061] [RR-083] [RR-113]. Provide further details about the effects of these practices. LAs and Applicant to comment.</p> <p>c) Applicant, how has the route / junction option selection process considered BMV agricultural land, including in terms of spatial functionality of remaining BMV agricultural land? LAs to comment.</p>
<p>We have requested that the DEFRA Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites is adhered to in all agricultural land re-instatement to ensure land returning to owners is workable in terms of agricultural practices.</p>		

Q1.16. Noise and Vibration		
Q1.16.1 Construction and Operational effects on sensitive receptors		
Q1.16.1.6	Local Authorities	<p>Significant noise effects of construction</p> <p>ES [APP-080, paragraph 11.3.11] states that consultation has been carried out with the Environmental Health Departments of BBC, CBDC, HDC and SCDC. Can the LAs confirm that they are in agreement with the assessment of significance and that there are no concerns regarding the mitigation provisions outlined, including the subsequent assessment stage?</p>
<p>HDC and SCDC are of the view that the appropriate working hours are “08:00 – 18:00 Monday - Friday and 08:00 – 13:00 Saturday, with no working on Sundays and Bank Holidays. Basic noise mitigation measures have been outlined in para 1.2.4. Para 1.2.5 indicates that “these mitigation measures would be set out in the Second Iteration EMP”. The mitigation provisions outlined need more location specific detail, including the subsequent assessment stage.</p> <p>The Councils also refer to section 9 of their Written Representation.</p>		

Q1.16.2 Proposed mitigation, management and monitoring		
Q1.16.2.4	Applicant	<p>Offsite noise barriers</p> <p>a) Can the Applicant confirm whether or not the use of offsite noise barriers has been considered as a potential means of reducing adverse effects.</p> <p>b) Can the Applicant explain how it has been determined that the additional reductions would be limited to 1dB(A)</p>
<p>HE's acoustic consultants have explained that they would be unable to use offsite noise barriers because this is outside of their boundary. The Councils believe this could be offered to noise sensitive residential properties such as those close to the scheme at Potton Road (Parkers Farmhouse (R20) and Rectory Farm Cottage (R21) and Greyholme (R25) and Tithe Farm on Cambridge Road. Also Wintringham Cottages (located to the north of the existing A428, close to the Cambridge Road junction) would particularly benefit from this because their back garden directly adjoins the scheme and the Councils question the final sentence in para 11.9.69 which informs us that a roadside noise barrier would not be effective because Wintringham Cottages are too far from the scheme. It may be possible to replace a garden fence with an acoustic fence.</p>		
Q1.16.2.5	Local Authorities	<p>Monitoring</p> <p>Monitoring requirements are described in the ES [APP-080, Section 11.10]. The LAs are asked to confirm whether or not they are satisfied with the monitoring arrangements proposed.</p>
<p>Confirmatory monitoring of operational noise should be undertaken at Rectory Farm Cottage (R21), Tithe Farm (R25), Oak Tree Cottage (Cambourne) and Eltisley.</p>		
Q1.17. Significant Cumulative Effects		
Q1.17.1 Approach to assessment		

<p>Q1.17.1.1</p>	<p>Applicant Local Authorities</p>	<p>Methodology and mitigation</p> <p>The Applicant has drawn a distinction between combined effects (where an individual receptor is affected simultaneous by more than one type of impact, such as noise, air quality and visual impact, as a result of the Proposed Development) and cumulative effects (where the effects of the Proposed Development are assessed alongside the effects of other proposed schemes on a single receptor) [APP-084, Section 15.3].</p> <p>a) Have you assessed cumulative and combined effects for receptors effected by construction traffic? Explain with reasons.</p> <p>b) LAs to comment.</p>
<p>Noise levels will have more of a disturbing effect on residents if they can visually see the noise source. Whilst dense vegetation would not stop sound transmission, it would reduce the perception of noise.</p> <p>Construction traffic has been considered as a part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-076]. We are therefore satisfied that the effects of construction traffic are included within the landscape and visual combined effects [App-083].</p> <p>We also consider that the cumulative effects of construction traffic on landscape and views has been sufficiently addressed through the identification of potentially simultaneously occurring developments in vicinity to the DCO area.</p> <p>The Councils may wish to respond to this question once they have seen and considered the Applicant's response.</p>		
<p>Q1.17.2 Assessment of cumulative effects</p>		
<p>Q1.17.2.1</p>	<p>Local Authorities Applicant</p>	<p>Approach</p> <p>a) LAs, are you satisfied with the Applicant's approach to shortlisting other proposed schemes for assessing cumulative effects [APP-084, Section 15.3]?</p> <p>b) LAs, do you agree with the five other proposed schemes that have been included in the assessment of cumulative effects [APP-084, Section 15.6]?</p>
<p>The shortlisting process for cumulative effects followed the Planning Inspectorate Advice Note Seventeen and we are satisfied with the applicant's approach to the process from a landscape perspective.</p>		

<p>We can confirm that we agree with the five other proposed schemes that have been included in the assessment of cumulative effects from a landscape perspective.</p> <p>The Councils also refer to their comments at 15.7.5 of the Written Representation on the cumulative impact of the Scheme with East West Rail and other projects.</p>		
<p>Q1.17.2.2</p>	<p>Local Authorities Applicant</p>	<p>Proposed mitigation</p> <p>The ES states that three other proposed schemes are predicted to cause significant cumulative effects with the Proposed Development. However, the Applicant has proposed no additional mitigation measures above those presented within the First Iteration EMP [APP-084, Section 15.7] [APP-229].</p> <p>a) LAs are you content with this approach. b) Applicant provide justification.</p>
<p>The Councils consider that mitigation measures should be applied based on the combined effect.</p> <p>The identified ‘Moderate Adverse’ cumulative effects [APP-084, Section 15.6] are all temporary in nature and relate to the possible overlap of construction activities between the other proposed schemes and the Proposed Development. From a landscape perspective it is accepted that no further mitigation is considered practical to help mitigate these temporary effects.</p> <p>Moderate Adverse cumulative visual effects have been identified on the residents of Swansley Farm (Receptor R104 on Figure 7.11 Environmental Statement [APP-112]) and Tithe Farm (Receptor R66 on Figure 7.11 Environmental Statement [APP-112]), both reducing to slight adverse cumulative visual effect by year 15. It is accepted that landscape and visual mitigation inevitably takes time to establish and therefore the effects are likely to be of greater magnitude during construction and year 1 than at year 15.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, HDC have made requests via Relevant Representation [RR-048] that additional planting in the form of individual trees and linear tree blocks is provided to the western and northern edges of the new Cambridge Road Roundabout, particularly where long stretches of mixed native hedgerow are proposed. [APP-091 – General Arrangement plans Regulation 5(2)(O) Sheet 9]. It is considered that this could help to further help to reduce the long term cumulative visual effects on Tithe Farm (Receptor R66 on Figure 7.11 Environmental Statement [APP-112])</p> <p>The Councils will consider the response from the Applicant and make further submissions on this point at Deadline 3 if necessary.</p>		
<p>Q1.17.3 Assessment of combined effects</p>		

<p>Q1.17.3.1</p>	<p>Local Authorities Applicant</p>	<p>Proposed mitigation Applicant, you have identified four receptors which would experience large adverse combined effects, and numerous others would experience moderate adverse effects [APP084] [APP-112]. a) Applicant, explain your position that no additional mitigation measures are proposed to alleviate the combined effects. b) LAs, do you agree with Applicant’s position. If not, what additional mitigation would be appropriate and effective, particularly for the four receptors that are worse effected.</p>
<p>Additional noise mitigation would be required as set out below:</p> <p>Q1.17.3.1 b) Landscape Response HDC and SCDC</p> <p>The four receptors that would experience ‘Large Adverse’ combined effects are situated around the Black Cat Roundabout and the Roxton Road Link, and the effects would be temporary during construction. [APP-084 15.5] We therefore defer comment to Bedford Borough Council.</p> <p>With regard to other temporary combined effects during construction, we accept the limitations of landscape mitigation due to the time it takes for any planting to establish.</p> <p>In terms of permanent combined effects, there are seven receptors which are likely to experience significant effects, seven receptors have been identified as experience large adverse combined effects and eight as moderate adverse combined effects. The following is a summary of those receptors within Cambridgeshire, and the LA’s position on the adequacy of proposed landscape mitigation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Glen Eden, The Bramleys, Parkers Farmhouse, The Bungalow, Eynesbury Warehouse - Potton Road, PE19 6XJ. The visual effects on the receptor are considered to be very large adverse at year 1 and moderate adverse at year 15 (Receptor R52 on Figure 7.11 Environmental Statement [APP-112]) LA’s position: The change in view is largely due to new landform and vegetation which curtails long distance views. Considerable areas of new native woodland have been proposed alongside the route adjacent to these receptors. As the woodland establishes it will soften the appearance of the new landform, but the new landform inevitably means that there will be significant adverse residual effects. 2. Rectory Farm and Rectory Farm Cottage, Potton Road, PE19 6XJ. The visual effects on the receptor are considered to be large adverse at year 1 and moderate adverse at year 15 (Receptor R53 on Figure 7.11 Environmental Statement [APP-112]). LA’s position: The receptor is situated in the immediate proximity of the proposed new highway. Native tree planting has been proposed within the landform surrounding the route, but will take time to establish. Planting of feathered or standard trees within the proposed native hedgerow along this section of road would help to provide more instant mitigation of visual effects. 3. 1-4 Wintringham Cottages, Toll Gate Cottage, Wintringham Road, PE19 6SP. The visual effects on the receptor are considered to be large adverse at year 1 and moderate adverse at year 15(Receptor R62 on Figure 7.11 Environmental Statement [APP-112]) 		

LA's position: The effects on this receptor will be mixed. A reduction of traffic is predicted on the existing A428 which passes directly to the south of the property. However, the receptor will be in close proximity to the permanent structures and lighting surrounding the new Cambridge Road junction. Though there is a framework of existing woodland to the north of the road corridor, the LA request that additional tree planting is introduced within the long stretches of hedgerow, and that this tree planting is formed of blocks as well as individual trees of more mature stock than the proposed hedgerow plants [As detailed in Annexe L of the First Iteration EMP, APP-234]. It is thought that this would further help to filter night-time light intrusion to this receptor.

4. Tithe Farm, Cambridge Road, PE19 6SW. The visual effects on the receptor are considered to be moderate adverse at year 1 and slight adverse at year 15 (Receptor R66 on Figure 7.11 Environmental Statement [APP-112])

LA's position: The visual effects on this receptor are thought by LVIA to be minimised by existing mature vegetation surrounding the farm complex. It is identified however that new lighting introduced around the Cambridge Road Junction would be seen between the intervening vegetation, where once views were over a dark landscape, yet only native hedgerow planting has been proposed on the north-western edge of the proposed new road infrastructure. The DCO red line area extends some way beyond this edge, and it is requested that additional tree planting is introduced within the space between Tithe Farm and the proposed A428 and Cambridge Road junction. This should be in the form of additional mature tree planting within proposed hedgerows, as well as new linear blocks of woodland in keeping with the landscape character.

5. Weald Farm Cottages, North Farm Cottage, Cambridge Road, PE19 6SR. The visual effects on the receptor are considered to be large adverse at year 1 and moderate adverse at year 15 (Receptor R80 on Figure 7.11 Environmental Statement [APP-112])
6. North Farm, Cambridge Road, PE19 6SR. The visual effects on the receptor are considered to be large adverse at year 1 and moderate adverse at year 15 (Receptor R81 on Figure 7.11 Environmental Statement [APP-112])

LA's position items 5 and 6 (R80 and R81): The receptors would experience a change in the view in terms of landform, where the proposed road is on an embankment, the introduction of the new Bridleway Accommodation Bridge, as well as moving traffic and headlights at night. The current mitigation comprises areas of linear tree and shrub planting, as well a native hedgerow to the southern edge of the planting. As the vegetation matures views would be reduced, though some views of passing cars on the elevated land would be remain inevitable. It is considered that adequate mitigation in keeping with local landscape character has been proposed.

7. Pastures Farm, Ermine Street, CB23 3PF. The visual effects on the receptor are considered to be moderate adverse at year 1 and slight adverse at year 15 (Receptor R102 on Figure 7.11 Environmental Statement [APP-112])

LA's position: The assessment considers that the current vegetation surrounding the farm complex will provide considerable screening of the realigned A428. However the removal of vegetation along the existing A428 paired with the proposed new vegetation not being established yet, it is considered there will be moderate changes to the view in year 1. The assessment also considers that by year 15 the changes will be barely perceptible. It is accepted that landscape mitigation takes time to establish, and therefore short-term effects are unavoidable. However additional individual tree planting to reflect the groups on the northern edge of the road in this section, would somewhat help to reduce the effects at the earlier stages of operation.

8. Oak Tree Cottage, New Bungalow - St, Neots Road, CB23 3PH. The visual effects on the receptor are considered to be moderate adverse at year 1 and 15 (Receptor R105 on Figure 7.11 Environmental Statement [APP-112])

LA's position: Whilst the Assessment of Cumulative Effects chapter of the EIA [APP-086] report states that visual effects on the receptor will be moderate adverse at year 1 and 15 [Table 15-3] The LVIA [APP-076] states the effects will be slight adverse at year 1 and neutral at year 15. We believe this is an error in the Cumulative Effects chapter and have no further comments.

9. The Range, Potton Road, Abbotsley, PE19 6XJ. The visual effects on the receptor are considered to be moderate adverse at year 1 and slight adverse at year 15 (Receptor R114 on Figure 7.11 Environmental Statement [APP-112])

LA's position: Some views of the proposed development are inevitable, however one of the west facing embankments on this section of the road [APP-091, Environmental Master Plan Sheet 5 of 16] is proposed to be left as bare ground. The LA's request that no areas of bare land are left to self-colonise post completion, but that a species rich grassland or meadow is introduced as a minimum land cover on any new embankment and cuttings. This would help to reduce adverse effects in the early years of operation and promote a high level of design.

10. Papworth Hotel / Iway Inn, Ermine Street South, CB23 3PB. The visual effects on the receptor are considered to be moderate adverse at year 1 and slight adverse at year 15 (Receptor C29 on Figure 7.11 Environmental Statement [APP-112])

LA's position: The hotel is in a very proximate location to the proposed new junction at Caxton Gibbet. Considerable new woodland planting has been proposed for the area surrounding the hotel and it is accepted that the time required for mitigation to establish limits the mitigation potential in the early years of operation. The proposed mitigation is considered acceptable.

Q1.18. Socio-economic effects		
Q1.18.1 Methodology		
Q1.18.1.1	Applicant Local Authorities	<p>Human health study area</p> <p>The ExA notes that study area for human health in the ES [APP-081, Section 12.5]. Should the effect on mental and physical health also be considered for receptors (particularly residential receptors) that will experience large and moderate adverse combined effects [APP-084] [APP-112]? LAs to comment.</p>
<p>Yes, there are some residential receptors who would experience significant increases in noise levels and who may need additional support. This should be clearly assessed. Some of the receptors that should be considered are at Potton Road (e.g. Rectory Farm Cottage and/or Parkers Farmhouse, Wintringham Park (e.g. Cole Walk), Wintringham Village (e.g. Wintringham Cottages), Cambourne West (e.g. Oak Tree Cottage) and Eltisley, or where justifiable complaints have been received.</p>		

Q1.19. Water quality and resources		
Q1.19.1 General		
Q1.19.1.1	Environment Agency Local Authorities Natural England	<p>General</p> <p>There is scope for the construction and operation of the proposed scheme to affect the water environment, including water quality.</p> <p>a) Are you satisfied that construction activities and water use from the scheme would not cause harm to the water environment and the species that live in or around it [APP082]?</p> <p>b) Are you satisfied that the risk of pollution from the scheme, both during construction and operation and both direct and indirect, would not cause harm to the water environment and the species that live in or around it [APP-082]?</p>
<p>There is a concern that the criteria for dealing with pollution is if “Contaminated Land” (defined by Part 2A EPA) is encountered, whereas we would prefer that any unsafe contamination is remediated. See response to Q1.1.1.3.</p>		