

Application by Highways England for an Order Granting Development Consent for A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet Improvements (TR010044)

Response to the Examining Authority’s written questions and requests for information (WQ2) - issued on Friday 15 October 2021

For and on behalf of National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc (NGET) and National Grid Gas Plc (NGG)

Dated 22 October 2021

No.	Ex A Written Question		NGG and NGET Response
Q2.5.	Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession		
Q2.5.2	Protective Provisions		
Q2.5.2.1	<p><u>Statutory Undertakers</u> Applicant</p>	<p>Protective Provisions</p> <p>(a) Comments are invited from relevant Statutory Undertakers with respect to the updates provided in Statutory Undertakers Progress Schedule Rev 1 [REP1-036] and the update at CAH1 [EV-024] to [EV-031]. Comments may be provided by way of confirmation of the update that is expected to be provided by the Applicant at D4.</p>	<p>A draft side agreement and modified protective provisions, in respect of NGG and NGET apparatus, are currently under negotiation and are the subject of ongoing discussions between the parties. A Statement of Common Ground is in circulation.</p>
Q2.7.	Draft Development Consent Order		
Q2.7.1	General		
Q2.7.1.2	<p>Authorities and <u>Statutory Undertakers</u></p>	<p>Authorities and Statutory Undertakers</p> <p>Comment if you have concerns [REP1- 022, Appendix to WQ1.7.1.3]</p>	<p>A draft side agreement and modified protective provisions, in respect of NGG and NGET apparatus, are currently under negotiation and are the subject of ongoing discussions between the parties. A Statement of Common Ground is in circulation.</p>
Q2.7.3	Articles		
Q2.7.3.1	<p>Applicant <u>All Parties</u></p>	<p>Article 2(4) and 2(5) – Interpretation</p> <p>(a) Without prejudice, provide suitable wording for Article 2(4) to clarify that measurements and distances in this dDCO, while ‘approximate’ will remain within the Limits of Deviation in Article 9.</p> <p>(b) Without prejudice, provide suitable wording for Article 2(5), that the expected tolerance for the areas described in the Book of Reference allow for small tolerance and will remain within the Limits of Deviation in Article 9.</p>	<p>No comment – not relevant to NGG/NGET apparatus/interests.</p>

		(c) Parties, state if you have comments or concerns.	
Q2.10.	Good Design		
Q2.10.1	Visual appearance and design principles		
Q2.10.1.1	Local Authorities All Parties	<p>Scheme Design Approach and Design Principles</p> <p>(a) The ExA is seeking views from Las and all parties on the content of the Applicant's Scheme Design Approach and Design Principles [REP3-014], and if the design approach, design vision and design principles will guide the development of the detailed design post consent (should consent be granted) to deliver the following outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) sensitivity to place, siting and design measures relative to existing landscape, character and function (NPS NN, Paragraphs 4.29, 4.30, 4.33) (other relevant local policies [REP1-051], [REP1- 054] [REP1- 055]); (ii) producing high quality, beautiful and sustainable places (NPS NN, Paragraphs 4.29, Chapter 12 of the NPPF) (iii) meeting principal objectives of the Proposed Development, mitigating problems, minimising adverse impacts, and sustaining the improvements to operational efficiency (NPS NN, Paragraph 4.31); (iv) taking into account functionality, aesthetics, and technology (NPS NN, Paragraph 4.33); and (v) best possible integration with the surrounding landscape [REP3-014, Paragraph 3.1.1]. <p>(b) Do you feel that the design principles and features of specific structures [REP3-014, Appendix C] cover the range of physical structures, landscape features, and other measures that design principles should be set out for?</p> <p>(c) Do you have understanding of the rationale behind the design principles for individual structures, in relation to the immediate surroundings, for instance [REP3-014, Appendix C]? Are you clear how the Scheme Design Approach and Design Principles would be secured through the DCO process, and is that adequate [REP3-014, Paragraphs 1.2.12]?</p>	No comment – not relevant to NGG/NGET apparatus/interests.
Q2.10.2	Design development process		
Q2.10.2.1	Local Authorities All Parties	<p>Design development process</p> <p>(a) Are you clear about the design development process and which parties would be consulted through the process [REP3-014, Section 5]?</p> <p>(b) Are you content with the proposed design development process and which parties would be consulted through the process [REP3-014, Section 5]?</p>	No comment – not relevant to NGG/NGET apparatus/interests.
Q2.11.	Highways – network and structures		

Q2.11.1	Transport Modelling		
Q2.11.1.2	Local Authorities All Parties	<p>COVID-19</p> <p>At Deadline 1 the Applicant provided additional submission Assessing the Potential Impacts of COVID 19 – The implications for traffic forecasts for the Scheme [REP1-029]. Do LAs and all parties broadly accept the findings of the document provided? If not explain with reasons.</p>	No comment – not relevant to NGG/NGET apparatus/interests.
Q2.11.1.3	Local Authorities All Parties	<p>Economic Sensitivity Test</p> <p>At Deadline 1 the Applicant provided additional submission Economic Sensitivity Test Technical Note [REP1-027]. Do LAs and all parties broadly accept the findings of the document provided? If not explain with reasons.</p>	No comment – not relevant to NGG/NGET apparatus/interests.
Q2.16.	Noise and Vibration		
Q2.16.1	Construction and Operational effects on sensitive receptors		
Q2.16.1.1	Local Authorities All Parties	<p>Borrow Pits</p> <p>Does the Applicant’s Borrow Pits Excavation and Restoration Report [REP3-011] adequately address concerns relating to noise associated with the use of Borrow Pits? If not, explain with reasoning.</p>	No comment – not relevant to NGG/NGET apparatus/interests.
Q2.16.1.2	Local Authorities All Parties	<p>Noise baseline monitoring</p> <p>Do LAs and IPs agree with the rationale put forward by the Applicant [REP3-019, Appendix B] to explain how the baseline noise monitoring undertaken was sufficient for the purposes of the ES? If not, explain with reasons.</p>	No comment – not relevant to NGG/NGET apparatus/interests.
Q2.16.1.3	Local Authorities All Parties	<p>Noise and Vibration Errata</p> <p>Do LAs or IPs have any comments regarding REP3-27 which clarifies that dates of Base Year traffic data, as referred to in various submissions by the Applicant, should be 2015 rather than 2016.</p>	No comment – not relevant to NGG/NGET apparatus/interests.