

Response to ExA's Third Written Questions (WQ3)

This document sets out the response to the Examining Authority (ExA)'s Third Written Questions (WQ3) by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC), Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) and South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) (together, the Councils). The table below sets out the topic, question number and Councils' response.

Question Number	Question for	Question	Councils' response
Q3.1. General and Cross-topic Questions			
Q3.1.2 Environment Act 2021			
Q3.1.2.1	All Parties Applicant	<p>Environment Act 2021</p> <p>The ExA is aware that the Environment Act 2021 received royal assent on 9 November 2021.</p> <p>a) All Parties and the Applicant are invited to explain, with reasons, whether the assent of the Act has any implications on the Proposed Development, including with regard to Air Quality, Biodiversity, Water, Waste and Monitoring.</p> <p>b) More specifically, Section 99 and Schedule 15 of the Act and the subsequent amendments to the Planning Act 2008 will require certain NSIPs to increase biodiversity by 10% compared to predevelopment values. Do you believe there are any implications on the</p>	<p>a) Whilst the Environment Act 2021 (EA2021) received royal assent on 9 November 2021, the majority of the operative provisions of the Environment Act 2021, including those of relevance to the Scheme, are yet to come into force. Section 147 of the EA2021 provides that the key provisions are to come into effect on such a date as the Secretary of State may by regulations appoint. The precise timescales for the majority of the provisions are yet to be announced.</p> <p>Once in force, the key provisions of relevance to the Scheme are those relating to biodiversity, set out in section 99 and schedule 15 of the EA2021.</p> <p>b) Section 99 and schedule 15 of the EA2021 are not yet in force and will come into effect on a date to be appointed in regulations made by the Secretary of State. In its current consultation on Biodiversity Net Gain Regulations and Implementation¹, the government has</p>

¹ consultation opened 11 January 2022 and closes 5 April 2022

		<p>Proposed Development, if so explain with reasons, including if relevant, how any additional measures could be delivered.</p>	<p>stated its intention that the mandatory 10% biodiversity net gain requirement will apply for all terrestrial NSIP projects by November 2025.²</p> <p>Whilst these precise statutory requirements are not yet in force, NPS NN requires the Secretary of State to consider whether the Applicant has maximised opportunities for building in beneficial biodiversity or geological features (paragraph 5.33).</p> <p>Paragraph 5.25 of the NPS NN requires, as a general principle, that significant harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests is avoided, mitigated or compensated.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.35 of the NPS NN requires the Secretary of State to ensure that applicants have taken measures to ensure that priority habitats are protected from the adverse of effects of development.</p> <p>The Councils have expressed concerns relating to the Scheme’s ability to comply with these policy requirements and reference is made in particular to pages 8-10 of the Councils’ response to the Applicant’s response to the Councils’ Local Impact Report [REP4-058] and the Councils’ Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Note [REP6-062].</p>
<p>Q3.3 Biodiversity and Ecological Conservation</p>			
<p>Q3.3.2 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</p>			

² page 42, [REDACTED]

<p>Q3.3.2.1</p>	<p>Applicant Natural England Local Authorities</p>	<p>Metric for calculating BNG</p> <p>a) NE, following discussions at ISH4 [EV-060] and the submissions at D6 [REP6-036] [REP6-030] [REP6-068] [REP6-062] confirm if you consider the Applicant's calculation for BNG using the DEFRA 2.0 metric shows a net loss or net gain or neutral finding.</p> <p>b) NE, if you consider the calculations to show a net gain, and based on your current position that you are satisfied that the delivery of the Proposed Development would achieve genuine gains in biodiversity when compared with existing conditions [REP6-017], why do you still feel that the ES should be updated with the findings of the DEFRA 2.0 metric?</p> <p>c) NE, in what way do you believe that the findings of the DEFRA 2.0 metric would revise the assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development on biodiversity in the ES with reference the NPS NN (Paragraph 5.33) which requires the Applicant to maximise opportunities resulting in beneficial biodiversity or geological features in and around developments? Applicant and LAs may respond.</p> <p>d) Applicant, explain the reasons and criteria that would be determine the use of DEFRA 2.0 for road NSIPs [REP6-030] [REP6-062], and if those criteria be</p>	<p>WQ 3.3.2.1 a) to d) and f) request comments from the Applicant and other Interested Parties, including on the Councils' submission REP6-062. The Councils would welcome the opportunity to comment on the responses from the Applicant and other Interested Parties once submitted.</p> <p>e) The DEFRA User Guide [REP6-068], Rule 5, states that it is not the area of habitat created that determines whether ecological equivalence or better has been achieved but the net change in biodiversity unit. The BNG spreadsheet [REP3-013] currently shows a net loss in hedgerows and uncompensated loss in high / medium quality habitats and therefore does not meet Rules 3 (trading down) and 5 (using biodiversity units instead of area). The purpose of the metric is to conserve the highest quality habitats and therefore loss of these should be avoided. From a nature conservation perspective, the creation of low-quality habitat is not beneficial and will lead to further degradation and habitat loss.</p>
-----------------	--	---	--

		<p>relevant here. NE and LAs may respond.</p> <p>e) NE and LAs, with particular reference to Rules 3 and 5 of the DEFRA User Guide [REP6-068] and the Cambridgeshire Council's position [REP6-062 Sections 3, 4, and 6] comment on the Applicant's position at ISH4 [EV-060] that a quantitative increase of low quality habitat outweighs or is equivalent to the high value habitats being replaced. Applicant may explain.</p> <p>f) Applicant and NE, the Cambridgeshire Councils raise concerns regarding the loss of habitats of medium/ high distinctiveness and that further on-site and off-site compensation is required [REP4-059, Q2.3.2.1] [REP6-064] [REP6-062 Sections 3, 4, and 6]. What are your views on this and how it could be delivered?</p>	
Q3.3.4 European Designated Sites			
Q3.3.4.2	Applicant Natural England Local Authorities	<p>Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC</p> <p>a) Applicant and NE, following your meeting on 23 November 2021, provide an update regarding [REP4-044, Paragraph 4.2.7]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • justification of the survey approaches undertaken at Transect locations 3, 5, 7 & 8, and at Pillar Plantation; and • justification as to why Natural 	<p>d) The Councils are not aware of the Cambridgeshire Bat Group dataset and the SCDC survey referred to by Mr Max Wade at 1:07:30, ISH4 [EV-059]. Therefore we cannot any provide any comments. The Councils would welcome the opportunity to comment on the data once submitted.</p>

		<p>England's recommendation to survey 40 crossing points [REP1-032] was scoped out of the assessment.</p> <p>b) Applicant and NE highlight any areas of disagreement, if any, regarding the scope of the 2018 surveys and the current survey. If there are disagreements, can they be resolved without the applicant undertaking more survey work?</p> <p>c) Applicant and NE, with reference to the approach to the 2018 survey are you satisfied that the baseline has been characterised reliably in terms of Barbastelle but also other bats. Explain with reasons. If there are concerns with the scope, approach of the survey, and as such the baseline, has the Applicant addressed these issues in the current survey round? Explain with reasons.</p> <p>d) Applicant, list with EL reference, or ensure copies have been submitted to the Examination, of all surveys/ reports that have led to the conclusion of no likely significant effects on the SAC, including the Cambridgeshire Bat Group and the South Cambridgeshire District Council survey referenced at WQ3 [EV-059]. Details of the times and dates of the surveys should be included. NE/ LAs what is your view of these surveys / reports?</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>e) Applicant and NE, as stated by the Applicant at ISH4 [EV-059] the full suite of 2021 surveys of the Barbastelle bats of the SAC, including the hibernation suitability at Pillar Plantation, will not be completed until after Deadline 6 has passed, with the consequent reports to be submitted later. In this context, Applicant and NE provide by Deadline 8 your reasoned positions as to whether an Appropriate Assessment is required for the HRA.</p>	
<p>Q3.3.5 Habitat Fragmentation</p>			
<p>Q3.3.5.1</p>	<p>Applicant Natural England Local Authorities</p>	<p>Adequacy of mitigation measures</p> <p>a) Applicant, for the identified bat crossings of the Proposed Development identify all existing and proposed landscaping features that will help guide bats to these crossing points. What assurance can the ExA have that the proposed landscaping will function as intended?</p> <p>b) What landscaping or other measures will help guide other animal species, including mammals, birds, amphibians to these crossing points?</p> <p>c) Applicant, provide examples of the evidence referred to at ISH4 [EV-060] showing that bats will use multi-purpose underpasses, including ones used by humans.</p> <p>d) What evidence is there that other</p>	<p>b) There are no specific landscape measures to help guide other animal species bat crossing points within Cambridgeshire. Normally, we would expect to see guide fencing for badgers, however, we are unclear if this will be provided as part of the scheme.</p> <p>Bat crossing point 4 [REP6-006] is located on the alignment of an existing wildlife corridor of the Hen Brook and therefore, we would anticipate species already commuting along the watercourse would be able to utilise the underpass, once the proposed landscape vegetation along the watercourse has established.</p> <p>Bat crossing point 5 [REP6-006] is not an existing wildlife corridor and therefore, it is unclear how species will be guided to this safe crossing point.</p> <p>d) The Councils require the NMU underpass to be suitably open and naturally lit, so that they do not look threatening to users. Naturally lit and open structures</p>

		animal species will use such multipurpose underpasses?	<p>would benefit mammals (Yanes, Velasco and Suarez, 1995)³ and this is therefore the preferred option of the Councils.</p> <p>However, if artificial lighting is required for NMU route, this would have an impact on wildlife. Illuminated structures are less likely to be used / avoided by light sensitive species, such as otter / bat (Bhardwaj, M. <i>et al</i> 2020)⁴.</p> <p>Underpasses are likely to be more successful if located on existing wildlife corridors and guide fencing / planting is utilised. There is a considerable amount of information available on the use and design of underpasses in Wildlife and Traffic - A European Handbook for Identifying Conflicts and Designing Solutions⁵.</p>
Q3.3.6 Aquatic Environment and Biodiversity			
Q3.3.6.1	Natural England Environment Agency Applicant Local Authorities	<p>Mitigation measures</p> <p>a) Applicant and EA have you reached agreement that the various biodiversity measures identified by EA [RR-036] would be addressed by the Proposed Development within iterations of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP). How is this secured?</p>	The Councils would welcome the opportunity to comment on the Applicant's response to Q3.3.6.1.

³ Yanes M., Velasco J.M. & Suarez F. (1995) Permeability of roads and railways to vertebrates: the importance of culverts. *Biological Conservation*, 71, 217-222. Submitted as CLA.D8.WQ3.R.A1 – Appendix 1.

⁴ Bhardwaj, M., Soanes, K., Lahoz-Monfort, J. J., Lumsden, L. F., & van der Ree, R. (2020). Artificial lighting reduces the effectiveness of wildlife-crossing structures for insectivorous bats. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 262, 110313. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.110313. Submitted as CLA.D8.WQ3.R.A2 – Appendix 2.

⁵ [REDACTED] Submitted as CLA.D8.WQ3.R.A3 – Appendix 3.

		b) Applicant, respond to the Cambridgeshire Council's concerns regarding Pond 83 [REP4-054]?	
Q3.4 Climate Change and Carbon Emissions			
Q3.4.1 Emissions			
Q3.4.1.1	Applicant Transport Action Network Local Authorities	<p>Assessment of effects for the Proposed Development alone and cumulatively at a local and regional level</p> <p>a) Applicant, your response to [REP4-037, WQ2.4.1.1] and your position at ISH4 [EV-062] is unclear to the ExA. Indicate what level of emissions would be considered significant in this context, for the Proposed Development alone and for cumulative and in-combination effects. In particular, with reference to Paragraph 5.18 of the NPS NN, what increase in carbon emissions would be considered "so significant that it would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets"?</p> <p>b) Paragraph 5.17 of the NPS NN requires applicants to "provide evidence of the carbon impact of the project". This is addressed at various locations within the examination library, including [APP-254 paragraph 4.4.7]. Applicant, the GHG emissions of the Proposed Development of -£127.0 million in discounted 2010 prices is a greater</p>	<p>d) The Councils can confirm that the Tyndall Centre 'energy only' carbon budgets do include transport related emissions as it includes energy/fuel used in transport as well as in buildings and industry. The term 'energy only' is used as the budgets do not include the CO2 emissions associated with elements such as soil, deforestation, waste decay, or industrial process chemical reactions. International aviation and shipping are also excluded from the Tyndall Centre budgets. As such the budgets do consider the emissions associated with the transport emissions associated with the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>e) Whilst the Councils have not carried out an assessment of the significance of effects of the Scheme against local carbon budgets, it is likely that the effects would be classed as significant and as such greater clarity on mitigation measures would therefore be required. We remain of the view that it is for the Applicant to carry out such an assessment.</p> <p>f) As set out in the Councils' joint Local Impact Report [REP2-003], a key approach to reducing carbon emissions associated with transport across Cambridgeshire is a reduction in vehicle miles travelled. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Climate Commission have recommended a reduction in</p>

		<p>negative sum than the combined accident and journey time reliability benefits [APP-240 Table 4-4]. Explain how environmental effects of such a scale are not considered to be significant.</p> <p>c) Applicant, TAN, would the changes to the Green Book and increased carbon values adopted by BEIS and DfT in September and October 2021 [REP6-134] [REP6-135] affect the assessment of cumulative effects?</p> <p>d) BBC and the Cambridgeshire Councils, evidence to show carbon budgets for Bedford [REP6-134 Annex 1], Huntingdonshire and South Cambridgeshire [REP6-063] produced by the Tyndall Centre has been provided. However, for all cases the Carbon Budgets are described as “Energy Only”. Confirm whether this would include transport emissions such as would be produced by the Proposed Development during construction and operation. Applicant and TAN may comment.</p> <p>e) TAN, BBC and the Cambridgeshire Councils, what would be the effect on these local and regional carbon budgets [REP6-134 Annex 1] [REP6-063] of the</p>	<p>car miles travelled of 15% by 2030⁶, a recommendation that has been endorsed by the Councils and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA). The climate change chapter of the Environment Statement [APP-083] notes at paragraph 14.9.12 that the increase in operational emissions is associated with an increase in vehicle kilometres travelled. This increase therefore has the potential to impact on the ability of the CPCA to meet the targets set out in the Climate Commission.</p> <p>As set out in detail at the Councils’ response to Q3.11.2.1 below, securing modal shift from vehicles to non-motorised modes of transport is critical to enabling the region to achieve the Climate Commission’s targets endorsed by the Councils and the CPCA. The package of NMU improvements requested by the Councils to be delivered as part of the A428 scheme is therefore fundamental to securing that vital modal shift. This includes the strategic NMU route along the old A428 between St Neots and Caxton Gibbett, and improvements to the design of the NMU underpasses west of the new Wintringham Park development. As set out in the Councils’ response to Q3.11.2.1 below, the NICE report⁷ demonstrates the importance of creating attractive and effective NMU infrastructure at the outset to encourage and enable lasting behavioural change in transport usage. This is true for both existing populations within major urban centres and in outlying villages such as at Abbotsley, Croxton and Toseland,</p>
--	--	---	---

⁶ Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Commission on Climate, 2021. Fairness, nature and communities: addressing climate change in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Available at: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Submitted as CLA.D8.OS.A.C.A2 – Appendix 2.

		<p>Proposed Development over the 60-year project lifetime, with particular regard to the apportionment of carbon emissions for road transport used by BEIS [REP6-121]? Applicant may comment.</p> <p>f) Applicant and LAs, in what way would the Proposed Development affect the ability of LAs to meet any locally or regionally adopted carbon reduction targets?</p> <p>g) Does the cancellation of the Oxford Cambridge Expressway project in March 2021 in any way change the need for the Proposed Development and, or, effect the economic justification and the BCR for the scheme?</p>	<p>and for new populations. As the 2,500 new homes being built at Wintringham Park directly adjacent to the new A428 will be delivered over the next 5 years or so, the timing is ideal for the A428 scheme to help ensure a high level of active travel and healthy lifestyle within that new population.</p>
Q3.6 Construction methods and effects			
Q3.6.2 Borrow pits, construction compounds, waste management			
Q3.6.2.1	<p>Local Authorities National Farmers Union The Church Commissioners of England</p>	<p>Borrow pits Comment on Annex R Borrow Pits Management Plan in the First Iteration EMP [REP6-008].</p>	<p>The Councils have commented on Annex R Borrow Pits Management Plan in the First Iteration EMP [REP6-008] in our Deadline 8 submission CLA.D8.OS.A.C.</p>
Q3.6.3 Environmental Management Plan			
Q3.6.3.1	<p>Applicant All Parties</p>	<p>First Iteration EMP a) Applicant, set out a schedule of the fundamental changes proposed in the First Iteration EMP [ref]. Is there any relevance to the colour coding in the track change versions [REP6-007]? b) All relevant Parties comment, if you</p>	<p>b) The Councils refer to their comments on the updated First Iteration EMP at section 6.8 of document reference CLA.D8.OS.A.C., also submitted at Deadline 8.</p> <p>d) Following discussions with the Applicant on 11 January 2022, the Councils' position is now reflected in our comments on the draft Development Consent Order (CLA.D8.dDCO.C). In summary, construction work for</p>

		<p>have concerns, to the changes proposed in the First Iteration EMP [REP6-008].</p> <p>c) The ES provides detail of construction related activities that would fall outside the defined construction working hours [APP-071 Annex K, paragraph 1.4]. Applicant, no reference to 'departure' is made in the updated First Iteration EMP [REP6-008, 1.4.3 a. or b.] Therefore, would the departure of delivery vehicles from site and the departure of vehicles from the works compounds fall within the scope of the set construction hours?</p> <p>d) All Parties, provide comment as to whether those activities referred to in First Iteration EMP [REP6-008, 1.4.3 a or b] are reasonable to be excluded from the set construction hours set out in the ES. How would they be controlled?</p>	<p>the authorised development must only take place between 0700 hours and 1800 hours Monday to Friday, and 0700 hours to 1300 hours on Saturdays, with no activity on Sundays or bank holidays, except as specified in Schedule 2 Part 1 paragraph 19(2). Our amendments in CLA.D8.dDCO.C include the removal of certain previous exceptions that were considered to be potentially noisy activities.</p>
Q3.7 Draft Development Consent Order			
Q3.7.2 Definitions			
Q3.7.2.1	Applicant Local Authorities	<p>Pre-commence and pre-commencement</p> <p>All relevant parties comment on the Pre-commencement plan [REP6-028] and definition of pre-commencement in Article 2 of the dDCO [REP6-003].</p>	<p>The Councils refer to their comments on the Pre-commencement plan [REP6-028] at section 9.48 of document reference CLA.D8.OS.A.C, as well as comments on the marked-up copy of the draft Development Consent order, reference CLA.D8.dDCO.C, also submitted at Deadline 8.</p>
Q3.11 Highways – network and structures			
Q3.11.2 Road layout, junctions and bridges			

<p>Q3.11.2.1</p>	<p>Applicant Local Highway Authorities</p>	<p>Operational phase monitoring and evaluation</p> <p>Further to discussion at ISH5 [EV-069], the Applicant has provided a technical note regarding the ‘monitor and manage’ approach [REP6-041]. The Technical Note explains that the locations referred to in the Transport Assessment Annex [APP-243], identified as requiring a ‘monitor and manage’ approach on the Strategic Road Network, would be dealt with under the ‘business as usual’ activities of the Applicant, under its 2015 Operating Licence. As such, the Applicant does not consider that the ‘monitor and manage’ approach needs to be secured separately through the DCO. The Applicant has previously explained that post scheme monitoring of the local road network could occur at certain junctions across the extent of the scheme [REP5-014], in response to representations of the joint Cambridgeshire authorities [REP4-58]. However, this appears to be entirely different from the ‘monitor and manage’ process as the Applicant does not consider it their duty to monitor and manage beyond the SRN. Instead, the Technical Note explains that a Post Opening Project Evaluation (POPE) will occur and sections of the local road network will likely be included, albeit the scope is as yet undefined. Additionally,</p>	<p>c, d, and e) The Councils refer to their comments on the Monitor and Manage Technical Note at section 9.81 of the Councils’ Comments on the Applicant’s D6 Submissions (document reference CLA.D8.OS.A.C) submitted at Deadline 8</p> <p>The Councils would request that the POPE includes the monitoring and review of the positive and negative impacts of the scheme on NMU and active travel policy requirements and aspirations, and on the climate change agenda. With the A14 scheme there were significant problems with the way detailed design was evolved and how NMU aspects of the scheme were delivered. Although a lessons learned exercise has been undertaken at CCC’s instigation, it was not formally attached to the scheme and there does not appear to be any formal commitment from National Highways to ensuring that the outcomes are actively fed into future schemes. The Councils have not yet seen any POPE relating to the A14 scheme either.</p> <p>Central government requirements relating to active travel and climate change are advancing rapidly, as seen in their response to the ongoing pandemic and the COP26 summit. In October the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Independent Commission on Climate published its seminal report <i>Fairness, Nature and Communities</i>, which provides independent recommendations to central and local government, the broader public sector and business on setting and meeting carbon reduction targets for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and on preparing for climate change. As active travel and NMU modes of travel and associated green infrastructure impact directly on the</p>
------------------	--	--	--

		<p>the Technical Note [REP6-041, Paragraph 1.5.5] also states that there is no requirement to intervene upon the evaluation of the Proposed Development, although any findings may inform future solutions.</p> <p>a) Applicant, confirm whether the operational monitoring described in the Technical Note is intended to form any form of mitigation relied upon in the ES to reduce effects of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>b) Applicant, explain with reasons if there has been a divergence in your approach to operational monitoring of the effects of the Proposed development on the local road network during the examination.</p> <p>c) LHAs comment on the content of the Technical Note [REP6-041], including whether the approach explained in the document differs from that previously presented by the Applicant. If not, what are the implications, if any, of the residual effects after mitigation that is secured in the dDCO, excluding 'monitor and manage'.</p> <p>d) Applicant, is the POPE intended to be secured in the DCO, if so how? Would LHAs see any value in the POPE being secured in the DCO given it appears to be a generic approach to post scheme</p>	<p>local and strategic road networks (see (h) below for more detail), the outcomes will significantly affect the region's ability to achieve its net zero carbon targets. It would therefore be extremely valuable for the A428 POPE to include both subjects in its scope. A similar recent example is the A11 Elveden dualling POPE⁸. The Councils would welcome discussion with the Applicant to agree to scope of the A428 POPE.</p> <p>h) The monitoring and management of traffic at certain locations on the local network, requested by the LHAs arises from the predicted impacts of the Scheme. As the need to monitor and manage local traffic at these locations is a direct consequence of the Scheme, the LHAs consider that this monitoring and mitigation ought to be funded by the Applicant, as would be expected for other predicted Scheme impacts such as noise impacts. This is common practice for major developments and the LHAs do not consider there to be a conflict between this approach and the LHAs' broader network management duty. Indeed, the LHAs consider that securing the monitoring and management of predicted areas of congestion at an early stage to be a proactive method of discharging that network management duty.</p> <p>The evidence submitted by the Applicant indicates that some areas will see a reduction in traffic levels namely St Neots town Centre, Toseland, Yelling and Eltisley, whilst other areas will see an increase in traffic as a direct result of the introduction of the scheme namely Great North Road and Cambridge Road St Neots, Cambourne, Dry Drayton, Madingley and Coton.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>evaluation of the Applicant?</p> <p>e) If the POPE, or other traffic monitoring on the local road network, is not secured in the DCO, how can LHAs have any certainty that the monitoring previously suggested by the Applicant [REP5-014] would be undertaken by the Applicant?</p> <p>NPS NN (Paragraph 5.211), explains that the ExA and SoS should give due consideration to impacts on local transport networks, and that where development would worsen accessibility such impacts should be mitigated as far as possible (Paragraph 5.2156).</p> <p>f) Notwithstanding no definition of 'accessibility' in this regard is provided in the NPS NN how can the Applicant be confident that no adverse impact affecting accessibility to, or within, the local transport networks would occur and not require mitigation without operational phase monitoring of traffic on such networks?</p> <p>The affected LHAs have provided a document [REP6-074] outlining how they consider a joint approach with the Applicant to an operational 'monitor and manage scheme' should be taken forward through the use of a Requirement in the DCO.</p>	<p>The examination of the evidence supplied by the Applicant undertaken by the Councils indicates that some of the adverse impacts of the scheme are because of errors in the coding of the model such as in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coton, • Dry Drayton, and • Madingley. <p>Therefore, the Councils have requested monitoring of the impacts of the scheme in the following locations so that the actual impact of the scheme can be assessed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. St Neots <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Great North Road (between Nelson Road and A428) ii. Cambridge Road (between Station Road and A428) iii. High Street (between Town Bridge and B1043 Huntingdon Street) b. Toseland c. Yelling d. Eltisley e. Cambourne f. Coton g. Dry Drayton, and h. Madingley. <p>i) The A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme DCO contains the following Requirement: <i>"Traffic Monitoring and Mitigation</i> <i>17.—</i> <i>(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until written details of a traffic impact</i></p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>g) Applicant, comment on the proposed Requirement associated with an operational monitor and manage scheme submitted by the LHAs [REP6-074].</p> <p>h) It would appear that LHAs consider the full costs associated with the requested monitor and manage scheme should be met in full by the Applicant. How is this justified given your own statutory duties to manage the expeditious movement of traffic on the local network?</p> <p>i) Are LHAs aware of similar Requirements being included in other made DCO road schemes such as the recently constructed A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme? How is it justified in relation to the Proposed Development? Applicant to also respond.</p> <p>j) LHAs, what would be the trigger point(s) of such a Requirement?</p> <p>(See related questions to Monitoring of traffic re-routing during construction)</p>	<p><i>monitoring and mitigation scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the highway authority.</i></p> <p><i>(2) The traffic impact monitoring and mitigation scheme must include— (i) a before and after survey to assess the changes in traffic; (ii) the locations to be monitored and the methodology to be used to collect the required data; (iii) the periods over which traffic is to be monitored; (iv) the method of assessment of traffic data; (v) control sites to monitor background growth; (vi) the implementation of monitoring no less than 3 months before the implementation of traffic management on the existing A14; (vii) agreement of baseline traffic levels; (viii) the submission of survey data and interpretative report to the highway authority; and (ix) a mechanism for the future agreement of mitigation measures</i></p> <p><i>(3) The scheme approved under sub-paragraph (1) must be implemented by the undertaker.”</i></p> <p>A similar Requirement is contained in the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling DCO.</p> <p>The Requirement requires a traffic monitoring and mitigation scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local highway authority prior to the commencement of the authorised development. The Requirement does not limit the monitoring and mitigation scheme to solely the construction or operation phase.</p> <p>The approved monitoring and mitigation scheme required monitoring to take into account of the impact of specific development traffic and background growth from the base year counts undertaken before any works or advanced signage was erected with the surveys</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>being undertaken in April 2016. The monitoring of the A14 scheme impacts is ongoing.</p> <p>j) The LHAs have proposed a draft Requirement to address the impacts of this Scheme on the local road network at document REP6-074 and REP6-091. The Requirement would require a monitor and manage scheme to be submitted to and approved by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the relevant local highway authorities, prior to the commencement of the authorised development.</p> <p>Under the A14 monitoring and mitigation scheme, if the monitoring highlighted an adverse impact as a direct result of the A14 scheme then the Applicant was to fund mitigation that should be agreed with CCC and the local Parish Council. The triggers for the mitigation measures were influenced by the predicted traffic impacts shown by the model and were discussed and agreed by National Highways, CCC and the local Parish Council on a site-by-site basis as some sites may be more directly impacted by scheme traffic than other sites.</p>
Q3.11.2.3	Applicant Local Authorities	<p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Vision Zero Strategy</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire Authorities have requested that an enforceable commitment is provided by the Applicant to accord with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Vision Zero road safety strategy on both the strategic and local</p>	<p>a) The Vision Zero strategy document has been approved by the Vision Zero Partnership (which includes National Highways) and was adopted by CCC on 7 July 2020⁹. It was first referenced in the Councils' joint Written Representations [REP1-048] and subsequently expanded on in submission CLA.D4.WR.AC.C (Comments on the Applicant's comments on Written</p>

⁹ See minutes of Highways and Transport Committee on 7 July 2020, available at:
[REDACTED]

		<p>highway network [REP6-020].</p> <p>a) Confirm the status of this strategy document and signpost to when it, or extracts of it, were submitted to the Examination for consideration.</p> <p>b) What form should such an 'enforceable commitment' take and how could it realistically be enforced given the array of factors that can influence the safety of the highway at any given point in time?</p> <p>c) Applicant to comment and provide an agreed position with the Cambridgeshire Authorities.</p>	<p>Representations) [REP4-060]. The visions, aims and objectives can be found in the Strategy Document¹⁰.</p> <p>b) and c) It has been agreed with the Applicant that, as National Highways are already part of the Partnership, no further 'enforceable commitment' is required.</p>
Q3.11.6 Non-motorised users			
Q3.11.6.1	Applicant All Parties	<p>Providing opportunities for NMUs</p> <p>At ISH5 [EV-070] and throughout the Examination to date, it is clear various parties including Local Highway Authorities, CamCycle, the British Horse Society and individual representations consider the Applicant should go further in terms of NMU provision across the extent of the Order Limits of the Proposed Development. The scheme objectives [APP071], also referred to in the Statement of Reasons [APP-030], include ensuring the safety of cyclists, walkers and horse riders and those who use public transport by improving the</p>	<p>a) Detailed design work for a NMU route between St Neots and Cambourne by the Applicant would be welcomed by the Councils as part of the dDCO. The Councils remain concerned that leaving the construction work to a Designated Funds bid considerable uncertainty, as there is no guarantee funding for the work will be approved. Securing the work through the dDCO would ensure the detailed design and construction work is completed.</p> <p>It is also the Councils' view that it is critical to deliver this strategic route simultaneously with the delivery of the main scheme because research shows that this is the optimum time to change people's behaviour and achieve</p>

¹⁰ [REDACTED] Submitted as CLA.D8.WQ3.R.A4 – Appendix 4.

		<p>routes and connections between communities improving accessibility. The ExA note this local concern, particularly where there may be scope to maximise future and potentially lock-in benefits of the Proposed Development, specifically along the A428 to be de-trunked and Barford Road bridge.</p> <p>a) A428 corridor</p> <p>The Applicant has previously explained how it considers that the construction of a NMU link along the existing A428, once de-trunked, to be beyond the scope of the Proposed Development [Q2.11.6.1, REP4-037], also that there is an absence of likely usage or feasibility information to justify such provision. otwithstanding likely usage data is somewhat unclear, the development of such a route, by virtue of the communities served and underlying topography, may assist in meeting the objectives of the scheme, the NPS-NN, local policies and LTN 1/20, particularly in terms of modal shift, improving health and wellbeing. CCC have provided a pre-feasibility document [REP6-065] outlining the form such a scheme could take. The Applicant has explained there is nothing to prevent the LHA from pursuing such a scheme once</p>	<p>modal shift, for benefits to population health and well-being and wider cost benefits to the NHS, as well as benefit for climate change. This is because people are most likely to try out new infrastructure when first put in place because they have been forced to change their routine. If they feel it benefits them personally they are likely to maintain the change permanently. See the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence’s 2018 guidance NG90 ‘Physical activity and the environment’, in particularly Rationale 1.2.3 at p57¹¹.</p> <p>Therefore the Councils’ request that this NMU route is formally secured in the DCO. The Councils suggest that this could be achieved through an additional section delivered as a different work package, but related to, the main scheme. This model was used for delivery of improvements to the local highway network around Huntingdon as Section 6 of the A14 scheme. In the first instance the Councils would suggest that it is the Applicant’s responsibility to design and deliver the route. As set out in the Preliminary Feasibility report submitted by CCC, a route is considered possible within the red line boundary of the dDCO. The Councils are committed to working with the Applicant to deliver a suitable route.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, and as set out in the Preliminary Feasibility report submitted by CCC [REP6-065], any provision made by the Applicant in the</p>
--	--	--	--

¹¹ [h](#) [REDACTED] Submitted as CLA.D8.OS.A.C.A2 – Appendix 2.

		<p>de-trunked. Would the Applicant commit, through the dDCO or other means, to undertaking detailed design of such a route, in liaison with the LHA, so as to enable a scheme to be constructed in future by the LHA, potentially through designated funds or other funding streams? Would parties consider this to be sufficient given the current status of such a scheme?</p> <p>b) Barford Road bridge At ISH5 [EV-070] the Applicant explained that any future aspirations of CBC for the provision of NMU infrastructure at or near the proposed Barford Road bridge could be dealt with by either a bolt-on structure to that intended as part of the Proposed Development or the creation of a separate crossing facility. The ExA is unaware of such a design having been considered previously by the Applicant, particularly in terms of visual impact or the suitability of the proposed road bridge to accommodate such a bolt-on structure. As such, should the intended bridge not provide a crossing with sufficient deck space to retrofit NMU facilities within its footprint in future?</p>	<p>Scheme should connect properly and safely to the adjacent network, and in that respect, completing the gaps in the DCO scheme identified at locations 1,2 and 10 in that report should be considered essential parts of the base DCO scheme.</p>
<p>Q3.11.7 Construction traffic impacts</p>			

Q3.11.7.1	Applicant All Parties	<p>Construction Workers Travel Plan</p> <p>The Applicant has provided an Outline Travel Plan [REP5-016] for workers associated with the construction of the proposed development.</p> <p>a) The Examining Authority invites comments on its content and scope from any Interested Party so as to inform any future iterations of the document.</p> <p>b) Does the Applicant intend to investigate further the feasibility of provision of temporary bus stops or the creation of welfare facilities that may encourage sustainable travel to site compounds?</p> <p>c) Is it the intention of the Applicant that the Travel Plan would relate to pre-commencement works? If not, explain with reasoning. If so, provide wording for cross-referencing between the two certified documents.</p>	a) The Councils submitted comments on 9.66 Outline Travel Plan [REP5-016] on pages 33-34 of our Deadline 6 submission CLA.D6.OS.A.C [REP6-058].
Q3.11.7.2	All Parties	<p>Adequacy of updated Outline CTMP</p> <p>All parties comment on and highlight any pending concerns with the updated Outline CTMP [REP4-011], giving due regards to the Applicant's summary table detailing how comments received to date from IPs and particularly LHAs have been addressed or considered [REP4-037, WQ2.11.7.2].</p>	The Councils refer to their comments on the updated Outline CTMP [REP6-009] in document reference CLA.D8.OS.A.C, also submitted at Deadline 8.

<p>Q3.11.7.4</p>	<p>Applicant Local Authorities</p>	<p>Local impacts of construction traffic Notwithstanding the Applicant's response to ISH5 Action Point 11 [REP6-031], the ExA is concerned that there is a lack adequate evidence before it in relation to the likely construction traffic effects of the Proposed Development, particularly with regard to likely HGV movements in, or near, residential areas. At ISH5 [EV-071], the ExA requested that the construction traffic restriction maps contained in the Outline CTMP [REP4-011] be annotated to give an indication of potential HGV movements, ideally by construction phase, providing an indication of a range if there was uncertainty. However, this was rejected by the Applicant. The ExA note that the Applicant does not consider impacts associated with construction traffic would be significant following mitigation [REP6-41, Paragraph 1.9.6] based upon the findings of the strategic traffic model.</p> <p>a) How does the strategic traffic model provide a reliable picture of likely construction traffic movements in the absence of such data being available to the ExA?</p> <p>b) Applicant, provide the HGV data referred to for each site compound or signpost to where in the Examination this information has been presented.</p> <p>c) Applicant, for clarity what mitigation</p>	<p>a) The strategic traffic model potentially indicates the worst-case scenario in terms of self-diverting traffic as the model assumes that traffic on the A428 in the base year was travelling at or close to the speed limit (60mph) whereas in actual fact the traffic was travelling much slower due to high volumes of traffic and congestion at key junctions along the existing route including Caxton Gibbet. Therefore, the model shows widespread rerouting caused by traffic self-diverting away from the existing A428 due to the reduced speed limits imposed during construction. The impact of self-diverting traffic indicated by the traffic model has the potential to impact a wide area of the County leading to significant increase in AADT flows for up to 3 years in some areas. However, in the absence of any other information the model represents the only available information on which to gauge the impact of self-diverting traffic during construction.</p>
------------------	--	---	--

		measures described in the Schedule of Mitigation [APP-235] relate to HGV construction traffic? How has the effectiveness of the mitigation been assessed in the absence of HGV numbers?	
Q3.11.7.5	Applicant Local Highway Authorities	<p>Monitoring of traffic re-routing during construction</p> <p>The ExA are unconvinced that there is currently a robust mechanism or methodology agreed between the Applicant and LHAs to effectively monitor and manage the impact of traffic re-routing on to the local network during the construction phases of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>a) Do the Applicant and LHAs agree that such an approach is necessary, for the purposes of effective traffic management during construction phases, beyond any existing arrangements for collaboration? Explain with reasoning.</p> <p>b) The Applicant is asked to respond to the proposed Requirement of the LHAs [REP6-074] relating to a construction phase monitor and manage scheme.</p> <p>c) It would appear that LHAs consider the full costs associated with the requested monitor and manage scheme should be met in full by the Applicant. How is this justified given your own statutory duties to manage the expeditious movement of</p>	<p>a) The Local Authorities are of the opinion that such an approach is necessary because the impact of unrestricted self-diverting traffic especially HGV traffic away from the SRN can have a significant impact on affected communities.</p> <p>The monitor and manage scheme submitted pursuant to the Requirement covered only operational impacts and not construction impacts. This led to real issues in Cambridgeshire during the construction of the A14 where the following were experienced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contravening the night-time weight restrictions through villages despite permanent signage and increased large temporary signs, • attempting to drive under low bridges (ignoring signage) and getting stuck, • HGVs driving down narrow streets and getting stuck and damaging walls and even the side of a house, • HGVs using narrow single track country lanes and causing significant damage to verges and laybys and road surface, • HGVs using narrow lanes through villages causing a noise nuisance to the local residents, as this was mainly at night, as the HGVs attempted to avoid the night time closures on the A14,

		<p>traffic on the local network?</p> <p>d) Are LHAs aware of similar Requirements being included in other made DCO road schemes such as the recently constructed A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme? How is it justified in relation to the Proposed Development? Applicant to respond.</p> <p>e) LHAs, what would be the trigger point(s) of such a Requirement?</p> <p>(See related questions to <i>Operational phase monitoring and evaluation</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive number of additional HGVs on roads through Cambridge at night avoiding the strategic diversion e.g. Huntingdon Road causing vibration and noise nuisance to residents, • HGVs speeding when self-diverting, • HGVs not updating sat navs and continuing to try to find their way onto the old route then ending up getting lost and driving down unsuitable routes and HGVs following sat navs suitable for cars which took them down unsuitable routes. <p>The Local Authorities consider this to be a key lesson to be learnt from the A14 scheme.</p> <p>c) As with the operational phase comments above (see response to question 3.11.2.1) the focus of this requirement is to fully understand the precise impact of the scheme in practice and introduce measures to limit the impact of the scheme on local communities. The Applicant's model indicates that certain areas on the local network will be subject to significant adverse effects as a result of the construction of the Scheme and those impacts therefore need to be fully understood and arrangements made for mitigation. The Local Authorities do not consider there to be a conflict with the discharge of their network management duties.</p> <p>d) The A14 DCO included Requirement 17 on Traffic Monitoring and Mitigation (see extract in response to question 3.11.2.1 above). The Requirement does not limit the monitoring and mitigation scheme to solely the construction or operation phase.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>In practice, the scheme submitted in respect of the A14 development did not specifically include traffic monitoring during the construction phase. The experience of the Cambridgeshire Authorities is that self-diverting traffic during construction was a major issue both in terms of impact on local communities and damage to the local road network and therefore the Councils request that monitoring of construction traffic be specifically included in the DCO (see response to part (a) above). These impacts could have been avoided had construction phase traffic monitoring and mitigation been secured in the scheme under the Requirement.</p> <p>The locations where this monitoring would be required include but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abbotsley • Broadway, Bourn Airfield • Cambourne • Caxton • Coton • Elsworth • Eltisley • Eynesbury Hardwicke • Gamlingay • Great Gransden • Highfields Caldecote • Knapwell • Little Gransden • Madingley • Toseland • Waresley • Yelling
--	--	--	---

			<p>e) The LHAs have proposed a draft Requirement to address the impacts of this Scheme on the local road network at document REP6-074 and REP6-091. The Requirement would require a monitor and manage scheme to be submitted to and approved by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the relevant local highway authorities, prior to the commencement of the authorised development.</p> <p>The trigger point for mitigation measures would need to be agreed in the scheme on a site by site basis, with different thresholds potentially applying to different parts of the route.</p>
Q3.16 Noise and Vibration			
Q3.16.2 Proposed mitigation, management and monitoring			
Q3.16.2.1	Applicant All Parties	<p>Operational noise monitoring</p> <p>The Applicant has previously explained that no operational noise monitoring is proposed following the construction of the Proposed Development other than to ensure that 'measures' were installed as required [APP-080, Paragraph 11.10.2] [EV-072].</p> <p>a) Is this typical of other made DCOs for road schemes?</p> <p>b) Do IPs agree with this approach? If not, explain with reasons.</p> <p>c) Applicant, how would you deal with any unanticipated noise effects during operation, particularly for residential receptors such as at R16, R17 and R18</p>	<p>a) The Councils only have experience of this for the A14 DCO. During the examination, we asked for post-construction (operational noise) monitoring. This was resisted by the Applicant who considered their assessment methodology, based on traffic flows to be sufficient.</p> <p>After completion, complaints were received by residents indicating noise had increased, but the absence of an appropriate Requirement meant that it was not possible to require the Applicant to undertake measurements of the impacts and the Applicant relied on the previous modelling to demonstrate sufficient protection was employed.</p> <p>b) The Councils do not agree with this approach, as while the performance specification of specific operational mitigation measures would be confirmed at</p>

		<p>[REP6-018], Little Barford as well as receptors around the Potton Road Junction and Cambridge Road Junction [REP6-020]?</p>	<p>the Scheme detailed design stage to ensure the performance assumed in the assessment is achieved. This refers to design specifications rather than “real world” noise assessment once in situ. No further monitoring is proposed. Due to the inherent uncertainty of modelling and prediction methods we would like to see actual real time noise measurements being taken to demonstrate the levels of protection provided are in line with what was proposed. If they are not, further mitigation will be required. In order to carry out this assessment, only representative sampling is required, at sensitive locations, where residential properties are potentially impacted. Scheme-wide, long-term monitoring is not required, as appears to be being suggested as a reason for resisting any monitoring by the Applicant.</p>
--	--	--	---