

Response to Action Points arising from ISH4, ISH5 and ISH6

This document sets out the response to Action Points arising from Issue Specific Hearing 4 (ISH4), Issue Specific Hearing 5 (ISH5) and Issue Specific Hearing 6 (ISH6) by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC), Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) and South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) (together, the Councils). The tables below set out the action point in question, together with the Councils' response.

Issue Specific Hearing 4 (ISH4)

Action		Councils' Response
8	Submit DEFRA 2.0 metric technical appendix and user guide in relation to interpreting Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).	Please see the Councils' separate submission CLA.D6.ISH4.BNG – Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Note, Sections 2-4 and Appendix B: CLA.D6.ISH4.BNG.AB .
9	Provide evidence as to whether the use of the DEFRA metrics in assessing Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) has been included in other NSIPs.	Please see the Councils' separate submission CLA.D6.ISH4.BNG – Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Note, Section 5.
10	Position and supporting policy basis, especially in NPS NN, regarding the need to use BNG metrics.	Please see the Councils' separate submission CLA.D6.ISH4.BNG – Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Note, Section 6.
11	Technical note regarding groundwater and surface water modelling and sensitivity testing. IPs to provide comment at following deadline or include in Statement of Common Ground.	The Councils confirm that the technical note will be reviewed following publication and will be commented on at Deadline 7.
18	LAs to provide evidence relating to any	As part of agenda item 7, Mr Parkin asked about understanding the significance of effects of the greenhouse gas emissions of the Proposed Development by making like for like

	<p>local or regional carbon budgets, including formal adoption process and how individual schemes are considered in relation to those budgets.</p>	<p>comparisons at a local, regional, national and international level. The Proposed Development has already been assessed against the national carbon budgets. The Cambridgeshire Authorities have made representations regarding the potential to assess the scheme against local carbon budgets, which was discussed at a meeting related to the Statement of Common Ground on the 8 July 2021.</p> <p>While like for like comparisons at local, regional, national and international levels are complex due to the way in which carbon budgets are calculated at different geographies, at a local level, as referenced during the ISH4 session, the authorities consider that the most appropriate budgets to use would be those produced by the Tyndall Centre (as submitted to the examination under reference CLA.D6.ISH4.AP18). These budgets are aligned with the commitments in the United Nations Paris Agreement, informed by the latest science on climate change and defined by science-based carbon budget setting. Budgets are available for each of the local authority areas within which the Proposed Development is located, split into five yearly budgets.</p>
--	--	---

Issue Specific Hearing 5 (ISH5)

Action	Councils' Response
1	<p>Update to be provided on discussions regarding potential road space reallocation related design changes referred to by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Bedford Borough Council (BBC) in Agenda Item 3.</p>
2	<p>Further modelling at M11 Junction 13 and Eltisley Junction to be undertaken and flow checks to be provided for Potton Road and Toseland Road for CCC. Update/ outcome to be submitted to Examination.</p>
	<p>The Councils confirm that an update will be provided at Deadline 7.</p>
	<p>The Councils look forward to further modelling being provided by the Applicant. We will comment when available.</p>

4	Positions of Local Highway Authorities (LHAs) and Applicant on how the Network Management Duty should be considered, at the wider network level or the more granular detail of individual junctions, and providing relevant policy justification for any view.	Please see the Councils' separate submission CLA.D6.ISH5.AP4 – Network Management Duty.
5	Detailed information on the Monitor and Manage process to be provided, in general and specifically in relation to the Proposed Development, including roles and responsibilities; funding for any necessary mitigation; how it would be secured and policy justification for respective positions.	<p>The Councils have agreed a joint suggested approach with Central Bedfordshire Council (CBC) and Bedford Borough Council to the 'Monitor and Manage' system and means of securing it as directly related to addressing the impacts of the A428 DCO scheme. This has been submitted to the Applicant ahead of D6, and is submitted to the ExA as CLA.D6.ISH5.AP5 – Monitor and Manage draft requirement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Under the Networks National Policy Statement (NPS), paragraph 4.11 it is noted that "Linear infrastructure is connected to a wider network, and any impacts from the development will have an effect on pre-existing sections of the network." 2. Under NPS policy in paragraph 5.211 "The Examining Authority and the Secretary of State should give due consideration to impacts on local transport networks and policies set out in local plans". 3. Paragraph 5.215 of the NPS states that mitigation measures should be "proportionate and reasonable" (paragraph 5.215, NPS). Since the proposed requirement relates to the monitoring and mitigation of acknowledged potential direct impacts from the Scheme, the Councils' view is that the proposed requirement is both proportionate and reasonable. 4. Paragraph 5.216, in particular, states that "Where development would worsen accessibility such impacts should be mitigated so far as reasonably possible."

12	CCC to confirm current status and details of proposal to restrict HGV traffic through Hilton.	<p>CCC are currently advertising the Cambridgeshire County Council (Various Roads, Hilton Area) (Prohibition of Heavy Commercial Vehicles) Order 20--¹.</p> <p>The effect of the Order will be to introduce a Prohibition of Heavy Commercial Vehicles at all times on B1040 Potton Road and St Ives Road at Hilton, between Hemingford Grey/Fenstanton and Papworth Everard. At present that length of road is subject to the same prohibition, but only during the hours of 11pm and 7am. The existing full-time prohibition on other roads in the Hilton, Boxworth, Childerely, Conington, Elsworth, Fenstanton, Knapwell and Papworth Everard area will be unchanged. Vehicles over 7.5 tonnes will be permitted to enter the whole restricted area for loading/unloading and other essential access purposes.</p> <p>Objections to the above proposals are required by 17th December 2021².</p>
14	Submission of Local Transport Note 1-20 to the Examination Library.	Local Transport Note 1/20: Cycle Infrastructure Design ³ is submitted to the examination under reference CLA.D6.ISH5.AP14 .
15	What specific changes would be needed to particular parts of the Design Principles document, so as to affect the design of specific components of the Proposed Development. Marked up changes requested.	A marked up copy of the Design Principles document is submitted to the examination under reference CLA.D6.ISH5.AP15 .
16	Comparison information with other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project linear road schemes, such as for the A14, in terms of consultation undertaken at detailed design stage.	Please see the Councils' separate submission CLA.D6.ISH5.AP16 – Detailed Design Requirements.

¹ [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

20	A428 Non-Motorised User linear route (pre)feasibility report to include level of land take and whether deliverable within existing built highway.	Please see the Councils' D6 submission: CLA.D6.ISH5.AP20 - A Brief Feasibility Assessment for a new Non-Motorised User Link between St Neots and Cambourne.
----	---	--

Issue Specific Hearing 6 (ISH6)

Action	Councils' Response																		
2	Local Authorities (LAs) to Provide any further comments on Pre-commencement plan, such as through a marked up copy.																		
6	<p>The Councils can confirm an update in relation to the de-trunking agreement is provided in the latest Statement of Common Ground, to be submitted by the Applicant at D6. The Councils have not had a chance to discuss a timetable with the Applicant, however our proposed timetable is set out below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="831 837 1993 1173"> <thead> <tr> <th>Event</th> <th>Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>LA version</td> <td>D6, 14 Dec</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NH response</td> <td>B4 7 Jan</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Escalation meeting</td> <td>10 Jan</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LA response</td> <td>14 Jan (D8)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Escalation meeting</td> <td>Between 17 Jan and 21 Jan</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NH response</td> <td>21 Jan</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Final version</td> <td>Before D9 - 25 Jan</td> </tr> <tr> <td>[possible ISH]</td> <td>[8 Feb]</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Event	Date	LA version	D6, 14 Dec	NH response	B4 7 Jan	Escalation meeting	10 Jan	LA response	14 Jan (D8)	Escalation meeting	Between 17 Jan and 21 Jan	NH response	21 Jan	Final version	Before D9 - 25 Jan	[possible ISH]	[8 Feb]
Event	Date																		
LA version	D6, 14 Dec																		
NH response	B4 7 Jan																		
Escalation meeting	10 Jan																		
LA response	14 Jan (D8)																		
Escalation meeting	Between 17 Jan and 21 Jan																		
NH response	21 Jan																		
Final version	Before D9 - 25 Jan																		
[possible ISH]	[8 Feb]																		