

A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvements

TR010044

Volume 9

9.73 Applicant response to actions arising from Issue Specific Hearing 6

Planning Act 2008

Rule 8(1)(k)

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

December 2021



Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvements

Development Consent Order 202[]

9.73 Applicant's response to actions arising from Issue Specific Hearing 6

Regulation Reference:	Rule 8(1)(k)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme	TR010044
Reference	
Application Document Reference	TR010044/EXAM/9.73
Author	A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvements Project Team, National Highways

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 1	14 December 2021	Deadline 6



Table of contents

Chap	oter	Pages
1	Applicant's Response to actions arising from Issue Specific Hearing 6	1
Table	of Tables	
Table	1-1 Applicant's response to actions arising from Issue Specific Hearing 6	1



1 Applicant's Response to actions arising from Issue Specific Hearing 6

- 1.1.1 Following Issue Specific Hearing 6 (ISH6) which was held on Thursday 2
 December 2021 the Examining Authority (ExA) published a list of actions arising
 from ISH6 on 3 December 2021 which required a response or update at Deadline
 6.
- 1.1.2 Of the actions identified a number were identified for the Applicant whilst others were directed to other interested parties.
- 1.1.3 The following table sets out only those actions directed to the Applicant and the Applicant's corresponding response. In some instances, as noted within the table, further discussions will take place with relevant parties after Deadline 6 and the Applicant will update the ExA at subsequent deadlines as appropriate.

Table 1-1 Applicant's response to actions arising from Issue Specific Hearing 6

Action No.	Action	Party	Response at Deadline 6
1.	Consider the following changes in the Pre-Commencement Plan:	Applicant	Refer to the Pre-commencement Plan [TR010044/EXAM/9.48v2] submitted at Deadline 6, which addresses these
	Re-wording Section 1.2 in relating to the wording to describe scope and method.		points.
	Closer alignment to First Iteration Environmental Management Plan in some of the larger activities.		
	Mitigation measures to be set out for each specific activity.		
	Further details for contaminated land, traffic management measures, road space booking and likely Heavy Goods Vehicle flows.		

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR010044 Application Document Ref: TR010044/EXAM/9.73



Action No.	Action	Party	Response at Deadline 6
2.	Local Authorities (LAs) to Provide any further comments on Pre- commencement plan, such as through a marked up copy.	LAs	N/A to the Applicant.
3.	Provide agreed detail of the discussion and any agreed actions at recent meeting with National Farmers Union (NFU), particularly regarding the types and distances of surveys required under Article 23.	Applicant	The Applicant held a meeting with the NFU on the 24 November 2021. At this meeting the Applicant went through the draft SoCG with the NFU, along with further information relating to the ALO role. Following the call, both documents were issued to the NFU for comment. At the time of writing no responses have been received on the SOCG as yet. In relation to surveys under Article 23, please refer to the SoCG for the current position of both parties.
4.	Consider whether specific surveys could be referred to in terms of the meaning of access required to adjacent land.	Applicant	The Applicant has considered this request made by the Examining Authority further and notes that while it may be possible to provide a list of potential surveys that may be undertaken using this power the very fact that these surveys would include environmental surveys means that this proposition is unworkable. The reason for this is that species that may need to be surveyed may not be known at this stage but may move into the area prior to the commencement of construction. Including an express list of specific surveys would not allow the Applicant any flexibility in dealing with this possibility.
			In addition, and as has been said previously, this power is similar to a power that would be available to the Applicant pursuant to section 172 (rights to enter and survey land) of the Housing and Planning Act 2016. Section 172 of that Act allows a person authorised in writing by an acquiring authority (which in this context includes the Applicant) to enter on and survey or value land in connection with a proposal to acquire an interest in or a right over land. Section 172 of that Act then goes on to state that an authorisation under this section may



Action No.	Action	Party	Response at Deadline 6
			relate to the "land which is the subject of the proposal or to other land". It is therefore clear that this 'other land' referred to in section 172 could include land adjacent to, and it is not limited to land to be compulsorily acquired.
			Finally, this power has wide precedent in many made Orders to date including the Silvertown Tunnel Order, the M42 Junction 6 Order and the A303 Stonehenge Order.
			In the recommendation report for the M42 Junction 6 Order, the ExA concluded at paragraph 9.2.53 that "the ExA is therefore satisfied that in principle, such articles are well precedented and are acceptable in the particular circumstances of this application".
5.	Applicant to confirm whether increasing the notice period to 28 days in Article 40 and Article 23 will impact the construction programme and any other part of the	Applicant NFU	The Applicant maintains its previous submissions on this point made both in writing and submitted to the Examination at various Deadlines and during the various Issue Specific Hearings. The Applicant does not propose to list or repeat that information here.
	Environmental Assessment. If so in what way. Substantiate your response. NFU and any other Interested Parties to explain with reasoning what the operational benefits would be to landowners of increasing the notice period from 14 to 28 days.		In terms of direct impacts on the Applicant, there is the potential for a significant impact on the overall construction programme, and consequently an impact on the ability of the Scheme to be delivered by the committed Open for Traffic milestone. While the timeline for delivery is considered condensed by industry standards, at this stage in the process it is not common to have prepared a detailed construction programme. Without such detailed construction programme, it is difficult to show the anticipated delays which would be caused. However, from practical experience, the following delays are anticipated to arise:
			Article 40
			Development of the Scheme contains many seasonal construction activities, such as earthworks, which can only be carried out during specific windows in the year. An extended notice period during a



Action No.	Action	Party	Response at Deadline 6
			season window could mean that whole phases of construction 'jump' between different construction seasons. Activities which couldn't be completed within traditional construction seasons would not be undertaken in 'out of season' periods, and would need to be paused at the end of one season prior to the commencement of the next season the following year.
			Article 23
			The construction programme allows for pre-construction ecological surveys to be undertaken prior to construction works commencing. The assumption has been made that the results of these pre-construction surveys will not identify any new ecological species not previously identified, and that they will not identify new locations where ecological species reside. As such, walkover ecological surveys are anticipated to be sufficient to administer prior to works starting in new areas throughout the overall construction programme.
			However, the risk exists that, due to the transient nature of ecological species, at any point during the construction programme, ecological species might be identified in an unexpected location. Should this occur, access would need to be obtained to survey the area before determining a suitable course of action. When working with/around ecological species, seasonal calendars place constraints on when mitigation works can be undertaken. For example it is imperative to avoid particularly sensitive periods such as hibernation and nesting periods. Should Article 23 be required to access land, increasing the notice period to 28 days could mean that the species oriented window for survey work is missed and consequently works are prevented from commencing in a timely manner because construction is stalled until the next ecological window becomes available. It is necessary for the Applicant to maintain agility with regards the timing of carrying out these surveys to allow



Action No.	Action	Party	Respo	nse at Deadline 6	
					ence in a timely manner al seasonal calendars have
			works, increasi days is not con impactful, and this additional to cannot be said when increasindays might, as works cannot be	ed and planned surveying the notice period to 28 sidered to be significantly the Scheme would plan in ime period. However, this for unplanned works, go the notice period to 28 stated above, mean that e completed within all time constraints.	
6.	Update in relation to de- trunking agreement to be provided in the next	Applicant LHAs		has been made this is Statements of Common	
	Statement of Common Ground with Local Highway Authorities (LHAs). Timetable for	Ground with Local Highway Authorities (LHAs). Timetable for		Council have ag	nd Bedford Borough greed the below timeline e completion of the legal
	agreement of the Detrunking agreement to		Date	Step	
	also be provided.	also be provided.	17 December 2021	BBC will have provided any amendments sought to the legal agreement in so far as they relate to the new highway assets.	
			17 December 2021	NH to arrange meeting/call with the Operations Directorate Team to discuss the assets to be de-trunked and handed over.	
			14 January 2022	BBC will provide any amendments sought to the legal agreement in so far as they relate to the detrunked assets.	
			14 January 2022	The Applicant to provide comments on the amendments sought to the legal agreement in relation to the new highway assets.	
			21 January 2022	The Applicant to provide comments on the amendments sought to	



Action No.	Action	Party	Respo	nse at Deadline 6
				legal agreement in relation to the de-trunked assets.
			21 January – 15 February 2022	The parties will work towards agreeing a final version of the legal agreement by Deadline 10 prior to the close of the Examination.
			to Central Bedfo	roposed the below timeline ordshire Borough Council of the Deadline had not onse confirming whether it
			Date	Step
			17 December 2021	CBC will have provided any amendments sought to the Legal Agreement.
			14 January 2022	The Applicant to provide comments on the amendments sought to the legal agreement.
			14 January – 15 February 2022	The parties will work towards agreeing a final version of the Legal Agreement by Deadline 10 prior to the close of the Examination.
			timeline with Ca	as agreed the following mbridgeshire County completion of the legal
			Date	Step
			14 December 2021	CCC will have provided its further comments on the legal agreement.
			7 January 2022	The Applicant to provide comments on the amendments sought to the legal agreement.
			10 January 2022	The parties will attend an escalation meeting to seek



Action No.	Action	Party	Respo	nse at Deadline 6
				to resolve outstanding issues.
			14 January 2022	CCC to provide comments on the amendments sought to the legal agreement.
			17 January – 21 January 2022	Additional escalation meeting as required.
			21 January 2022	The Applicant to provide comments on the amendments sought to the legal agreement.
			25 January 2022	The parties will work towards agreeing a final version of the legal agreement by Deadline 9 prior to the close of the Examination.
7.	Provision of the current version of the detrunking side agreement and two associated documents.	Applicant	copy of the curr legal agreemen for handing ove highway assets is not necessary for this view is the Applicant surplement of trunked assets of the Applicant surplement contrequired for harmonew/altered locate-trunked asset that the agreement currently being parties. For examade in track of necessarily been parties, nor agree a clear picture of the legal agreement for recommendation scheme. This is dDCO submitte [TR0120044/AFF]	s of the view that providing a ent working draft of the t, which includes a process of the new/altered local and the de-trunked assets, of at this stage. The reason wofold, the first being that albmitted at Deadline 4 the indover process for deand local highways [REP4-rly sets out what the legal ains and the process indover of both the early highway assets and the east. The second reason is sent is in a state of flux and inegotiated between the mple, any amendments in anges have not in contemplated by both ead, and would not provide as to the present position. Policant's view that securing ment is not an essential the Panel to make its in in relation to the is because the updated did at Deadline 6 PP/3.1 v4] contains of the entire that the



Action No.	Action	Party	Response at Deadline 6
			Applicant will be unable to handover an unsatisfactory asset to the relevant local highway authority. The control in relation to new/altered local highway assets is contained within Article 13 of the dDCO [REP4-006]. Article 13 requires that the highways constructed, altered or diverted under this power must be completed to the 'reasonable satisfaction' of the local highway authority. Therefore, the local highway cannot be complete until that first test is met i.e. that it has been completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the local highway authority. Only when that test is met could the local highway be considered to be 'complete' and then transferred over to the local highway authority in accordance with Article 13. If this was not the correct interpretation, reference to 'reasonable satisfaction' would be obsolete. This means that the Council's point that by operation of law the relevant highway will be handed over to the local highway authority when complete is not entirely correct and in fact the relevant highway must be completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the local highway authority.
			In relation to the de-trunked aspects, the Applicant has inserted a new paragraph (9) to Article 14 in the updated dDCO submitted at Deadline 6 that requires any de-trunking date to be consented to by the Secretary of State after consultation with the relevant local highway authority. The inclusion of this new step ensures again that the Applicant is unable to handover the de-trunked assets without any measures in place to protect the receiving local highway authority.
			Based on the above, while the legal agreement would complement the process for handing over de-trunked or new/altered local highway assets it is not an essential element given the controls already in place within the dDCO.
8.	Update to be provided on the progress made with de-trunking agreements at each deadline going forward until agreed.	Applicant	A further updated on progress will be provided at Deadline 8 and ongoing as required by this action.



A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvements Applicant response to actions arising from Issue Specific Hearing 6

Action No.	Action	Party	Response at Deadline 6
9.	Clarification as to why the second version Environmental Masterplan was provided at D4, and provide a schedule of changes.	Applicant	The Environmental Masterplan was provided at Deadline 4 due to the addition of bat underpasses on the drawing. A further updated Environmental Masterplan [Figure 2.4v3 of TR010044/APP/6.2] has also been submitted at Deadline 6. The Schedule of Changes to the Environmental Masterplan [TR010044/EXAM/9.88] sets out the changes that have been made to the Environmental Masterplan since submission of the DCO Application.