

# A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvements

TR010044

Volume 8

8.4 Statement of Common Ground with Central Bedfordshire  
Council

Planning Act 2008

Rule 8(1)(e)

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules  
2010

February 2022

## Infrastructure Planning

## Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning  
(Examination Procedure) Rules 2010****A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet  
improvements  
Development Consent Order 202[ ]**

---

**8.4 Statement of Common Ground with  
Central Bedfordshire Council**


---

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Regulation Reference:</b>                  | Rule 8(1)(e)   |
| <b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b> | TR010044   |
| <b>Application Document Reference</b>         | TR010044/EXAM/8.4  |
| <b>Author</b>                                 | A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet Improvements Project Team, National Highways |

| <b>Version</b> | <b>Date</b>      | <b>Status of Version</b>           |
|----------------|------------------|------------------------------------|
| Rev 1          | 31 August 2021   | Final for Submission – Deadline 1  |
| Rev 2          | 4 November 2021  | Final for Submission – Deadline 4  |
| Rev 3          | 14 December 2021 | Final for Submission – Deadline 6  |
| Rev 4          | 15 February 2022 | Final for Submission – Deadline 10 |

## STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

**This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by (1) National Highways Company Limited and (2) Central Bedfordshire Council.**

Signed.....  .....

Lee Galloway  
Project Director  
on behalf of National Highways  
Date: 15 February 2022

Signed...  .....

David Lamb  
Strategic Delivery Manager  
on behalf of Central Bedfordshire Council  
Date: 15 February 2022

## Table of contents

| <b>Chapter</b>                                 | <b>Pages</b> |
|--|--------------|
| <b>1 Introduction</b>                          | <b>1</b>     |
| 1.1 Purpose of this document                   | 1            |
| 1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground | 2            |
| 1.3 Terminology                                | 2            |
| <b>2 Record of Engagement</b>                  | <b>3</b>     |
| <b>3 Issues Raised</b>                         | <b>34</b>    |

### Table of Tables

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Table 2-1 - Record of Engagement.....                           | 3   |
| Table 3-1 – DCO and Legal Matters .....                         | 34  |
| Table 3-2 – Compulsory Acquisition and Property Matters.....    | 51  |
| Table 3-3 – Transport Matters .....                             | 52  |
| Table 3-4 – Environment Matters.....                            | 68  |
| Table 3-5 – Archaeological Matters .....                        | 114 |
| Table 3-6 – Highways, Design, Public Rights of Way and WCH..... | 116 |

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared in respect of the A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvements (the Scheme) made by National Highways Company Limited (National Highways) to the Secretary of State for Transport (Secretary of State) for a Development Consent Order (the Order) under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008).
- 1.1.2 The Order, if granted, would authorise National Highways to construct a new 10 mile (16km) dual 2-lane carriageway from the Black Cat roundabout to Caxton Gibbet roundabout and in addition approximately 1.8 miles (3km) of tie-in works. The Scheme includes the following components:
- a. A new three-level grade separated junction at Black Cat roundabout, with the A1 at the lower level, the new dual carriageway on the upper level and a roundabout between the two at approximately existing ground level. In addition to slip roads, a new free flowing link between the A421 eastbound carriageway and the A1 northbound carriageway will also be provided.
  - b. A new grade separated all movements junction will be constructed to the east of the existing Cambridge Road roundabout to provide access to the new dual carriageway and maintain access to the existing A428.
  - c. At the Caxton Gibbet roundabout, a new grade separated all movements junction will be constructed, incorporating the existing roundabout on the south side of the new dual carriageway and a new roundabout on the north side. The new dual carriageway will then tie-in to the existing A428 dual carriageway to the east of the new Caxton Gibbet junction.
  - d. In the vicinity of the new Black Cat junction, direct access onto the A1 from some local side roads and private premises will be closed for safety reasons. A new local road will provide an alternative route. The existing Roxton Road bridge will be demolished and replaced with a new structure to the west to accommodate the realigned A421.
  - e. New crossings will be constructed to enable the new dual carriageway to cross the River Great Ouse, East Coast Main Line railway, Barford Road, the B1046/Potton Road, Toseland Road and the existing A428 at Eltisley.
  - f. The existing A428 between St Neots and Caxton Gibbet will be de-trunked and retained for local traffic and public transport with maintenance responsibility transferred to the local highway authorities.
  - g. An alternative access will be provided to side roads at Chawston, Wyboston and Eltisley.

h. There will be safer routes for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders.

1.1.3 This SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority (ExA) where agreement has been reached between the parties to it, and where agreement has not (yet) been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and so focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the Examination.

## 1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by (1) National Highways as the Applicant and (2) the Central Bedfordshire Council (CBC).

1.2.2 National Highways (formerly known as Highways England) became the Government-owned Strategic Highways Company on 1 April 2015. It is the highway authority in England for the strategic road network and has the necessary powers and duties to operate, manage, maintain and enhance the network. Regulatory powers remain with the Secretary of State. The legislation establishing National Highways made provision for all legal rights and obligations of National Highways, including in respect of the Application, to be conferred upon or assumed by National Highways.

1.2.3 CBC is a prescribed consultee for this application under Sections 42(1)(a) and 56(2)(a) of the PA 2008.

1.2.4 Collectively National Highways and CBC are referred to as ‘the parties’.

## 1.3 Terminology

1.3.1 In Section 3 of this SoCG:

- a. “Agreed” indicates where the issue has been resolved.
- b. “Not Agreed” indicates a final position.

1.3.2 It can be taken that any matters not specifically referred to in the Issues chapter of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to CBC’s representation and therefore have not been considered in this document. It is recognised however that engagement between both parties will need to continue due to their joint vested interest in the area of the Scheme.

## 2 Record of Engagement

2.1.1 The parties have been engaged in consultation since the pre-application period for the proposed development. A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between National Highways and CBC in relation to the Application is outlined in the records of engagement set out in Table 2-1.

**Table 2-1 - Record of Engagement**

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes  |
|------------|------------------------|--|
| 29/01/2018 | Meeting                | Meeting held with CBC Highways to introduce the Scheme and discuss the Scheme's impact on side roads within CBC's jurisdiction as well as de-trunking extents and requirements.  |
| 29/01/2018 | Meeting                | Meeting held with CBC to discuss and understand issues associated with waste material placed on land to the north-west of Black Cat Junction on the site of a proposed lorry park and the associated Enforcement Notice that had been imposed by CBC. Also discussed was the status of the gravel pits in operation on the eastern side of the Black Cat Junction. |
| 06/02/2019 | Email                  | Departures from Standard application for Barford Road cross section sent to CBC to complete.   |
| 13/03/2018 | Email                  | Confirmation from CBC that there are no heavy or high load requirements for CBC side roads that may impact on the strategic road network.  |
| 27/03/2018 | Email                  | Following the meeting on 29/01/2018 with CBC Highways, the A428 project team requested accident data for Barford Road to assist in development the realignment designs.  |
| 27/03/2018 | Email                  | CBC Highways provided A428 project team with collision history data relating to the Barford Road Realignment   |
| 27/03/2018 | Email                  | A428 project team requested full STATS 19 data for the extent of Barford Road from CBC Highways.   |
| 26/03/2018 | Email                  | Discussions with CBC and Bedfordshire and Luton Suicide Prevention Steering Group regarding the design of suicide prevention measures.   |
| 10/05/2018 | Email                  | Three draft drawings depicting Representative Viewpoints for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) shared with CBC.  |
| 18/05/2018 | Meeting                | Highways England (HE) held a meeting with CBC to discuss the options for the Barford Road realignment.   |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|------------|------------------------|---|
| 21/05/2018 | Meeting                | Archaeology Presentation in Phase 1 Evaluation.   |
| 23/05/2018 | Meeting                | Meeting held with CBC to discuss the updated traffic modelling and environmental surveys with the authority.  |
| 23/05/2018 | Email                  | Confirmation that pavement design requirements in Central Bedfordshire can be designed to the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) requirements with specified surface material from CBC.   |
| 03/07/2018 | Meeting                | A meeting was held with BBC, CBC, HDC, and SCDC during which a presentation was given on the Landscape visual impact assessment (LVIA) viewpoints to landscape officers. The ongoing nature of consultation was discussed, and HE invited further thoughts on the initial viewpoint selections for LVIA photomontages, so that they could brief surveyors in August 2018. |
| 13/08/2018 | Email                  | Email informing CBC of the identification of zigzag elm sawfly during ecological surveys.   |
| 14/01/2019 | Email                  | Email from CBC asking for details of the scheme which passes through their council area.  |
| 21/01/2019 | Email                  | Brief sent from CCC and covering CBC and BBC too.   |
| 18/02/2019 | Email                  | Confirmation from CBC that consultation material cannot be displayed at Council Offices but could be displayed at the Sandy Library.  |
| 20/02/2019 | Email                  | Confirmation that information booklets for the A428 Scheme can be displayed at the Sandy Library.   |
| 14/03/2019 | Email                  | Information emailed to BBC, CBC, and CCC on preferred route announcement. Update on progress to geophysical survey.   |
| 15/03/2019 | Email                  | Link to plans etc emailed to BBC, CBC, and CCC.   |
| 25/03/2019 | Email                  | Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) prepared by MHI for geophysical survey sent to BBC, CBC, and CCC.   |
| 26/03/2019 | Email                  | CCC comments on WSI, sent on behalf of all three councils.  |
| 28/03/2019 | Email                  | Response to some comments on WSI sent back.   |
| 29/03/2019 | Email                  | Updated version of geophysics WSI sent to the councils.   |



| Date   | Form of correspondence      | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|--|-----------------------------|---|
| 01/04/2019   | Email                       | Confirmation that CBC are happy with the content in the draft Statement of Community Consultation.  |
| 09/04/2019   | Email                       | Interim geophysical survey results sent to councils.  |
| 10/04/2019   | Email                       | Correspondence regarding potential extensions to the 1km archaeological study area and data requests for the majority of St. Neots.   |
| 10/04/2019   | Email                       | Cultural heritage: Request for additional data for small outlier compounds etc.   |
| 12/04/2019   | Email                       | Confirmation from CBC that proposed study area for compounds is acceptable.   |
| 12/04/2019   | Email                       | Request for additional data (from OP).  |
| 15/04/2019;<br>07/05/2019;<br>and<br>08/05/2019  | Email                       | Emails with CBC regarding an outstanding invoice to be resolved before CBC can send data.   |
| 15/04/2019,<br>24/04/2019,<br>08/05/2019,<br>29/05/2019,<br>12/08/2019,<br>19/08/2019<br>and<br>22/10/2019 | Email                       | Interim geophysical survey results sent to councils.  |
| 30/04/2019   | Meeting – cultural heritage | Meeting held with BBC, CCC, and CBC to give an update on the programme and work to date, including the aerial photography and geophysical survey. There was discussion of the trenching strategy that led to an agreement that a percentage coverage was not a ubiquitous measure and that trenching could be intensified in areas if it was justified. |
| 14/05/2019   | Email                       | Interim geophysical survey results sent to councils. Links to georeferenced files also provided.  |
| 21/05/2019   | Meeting                     | Community Forum – update on the Scheme’s development.   |
| 02/06/2019   | Letter                      | Statutory Consultation Launch Communications.   |
| 06/06/2019   | Email                       | Cultural heritage: First draft of Phase 1 trenching layout sent to BBC, CBC, and CCC.   |
| 07/06/2019   | Email                       | Email from CBC detailing some initial high-level comments on the trenching plan.  |

| Date       | Form of correspondence             | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|------------|------------------------------------|---|
| 07/06/2019 | Email                              | Agreement to CBC email from CCC.  |
| 10/06/2019 | Meeting                            | Trenching strategy discussion and the principles of it.   |
| 14/06/2019 | Email                              | Meeting minutes emailed to BBC, CBC, and CCC.   |
| 24/06/2019 | Email                              | Cultural Heritage: Second draft of Phase 1 trench layout.   |
| 24/06/2019 | Email                              | Confirmation from CBC that two additional trenches can be dug due to constraints of an overhead line.                                     |
| 28/06/2019 | Email                              | Cultural Heritage: Further comments received from CBC on Phase 1 trench layout.   |
| 22/07/2019 | Email                              | Cultural Heritage: Requesting final comments on the Phase 1 trenching from councils.  |
| 22/07/2019 | Email                              | Confirmation from HE to CBC that HE have not been doing any noise monitoring in Sandy.  |
| 24/07/2019 | Email                              | Confirmation that CBC comments on the trenching stand – these override comments from CCC.   |
| 26/07/2019 | Response to Statutory Consultation | CBC Public Consultation response.   |
| 06/08/2019 | Email and File share               | Final trenching plan sent to councils.  |
| 06/08/2019 | Email                              | Cultural Heritage: Removal of trenches in an area no longer affected. Request from one landowner to remove trenches.                      |
| 07/08/2019 | Email                              | Cultural Heritage: CBC not content with removal of trenches at landowner request.   |
| 13/08/2019 | Email                              | Update to inform CBC Officers that ground investigations and archaeological surveys will be carried out along the route of the Scheme.    |
| 21/08/2019 | Email                              | Cultural heritage: Request for updated brief. Confirmed that Phase 2 Geophysical Survey results will be targeted in Phase 2 of trenching. |
| 21/08/2019 | Email                              | Cultural heritage: Updated brief sent from CCC on behalf of all councils.   |
| 30/09/2019 | Meeting                            | Community Forum – Western Area.   |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|------------|------------------------|---|
| 01/10/2019 | Email                  | Email asking how many trenches could be signed off on each monitoring visit.  |
| 01/10/2019 | Email                  | Response from CBC regarding trench sign-off and asking if there was a start date for the trenching works.   |
| 01/10/2019 | Email                  | Response from BBC regarding trench sign-off.  |
| 01/10/2019 | Email                  | Response to CBC and BBC that a start date for trenching was not yet available.  |
| 02/10/2019 | Meeting                | Highways and Planning Technical Working Group.  |
| 08/10/2019 | Meeting                | Strategic Road Users Technical Working Group.   |
| 08/10/2019 | Meeting                | Walkers, Cyclists and Horse Riders Technical Working Group.   |
| 17/10/2019 | Meeting                | An inaugural meeting was held with BBC, CCC, CBC, and SCDC as part of the formation of the Flood Risk/Water Management group. The meeting covered the terms of reference for the working group, the lessons that could be learnt from the A14 and each authorities' areas watercourses and responsibilities. HE also gave an overview of the different types of hydraulic modelling of water course crossings and overland runoff for the three main technical notes to be generated (River Ouse Crossing, Bedfordshire Area and Cambridgeshire Area). The Environment Agency and the Bedford Group of Drainage Boards were also in attendance. |
| 22/10/2019 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Email from CCC asking about aerial photographic report and whether contractor on board for trenching.  |
| 22/10/2019 | Email                  | Confirmation that the aerial photographic report is being reviewed internally and that there is no preferred contractor for trenching works at this stage.  |
| 22/10/2019 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Information on status of aerial photography report sent to councils. Responded to query about trenching contractor – TBC.  |
| 24/10/2019 | File transfer          | Draft geophysical survey results sent.  |
| 24/10/2019 | Email                  | Asked for X-Y plots and shapefiles of results.  |
| 24/10/2019 | Email                  | Echoed request from CCC for geophysical shapefiles.   |
| 28/10/2019 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Update on charging for consultation time sent to councils.   |

| Date       | Form of correspondence  | Key topics discussed and key outcomes  |
|------------|-------------------------|--|
| 05/11/2019 | Email                   | Dropbox link for geophysical X-Y plots.  |
| 05/12/2019 | Email                   | Cultural heritage: Copy of MOLA's WSI for the Phase 1 trenching (sent via file share to CCC).  |
| 09/12/2019 | Meeting                 | Economic and Benefits Technical Working Group.   |
| 10/12/2019 | Meeting                 | Strategic Road Users Technical Working Group.  |
| 11/12/2019 | Meeting                 | Highways and Planning Technical Working Group.   |
| 13/12/2019 | Email and file transfer | Cultural heritage: Phase 2 trenching plan sent to councils.  |
| 16/12/2019 | Meeting                 | Walkers, Cyclists and Horse Riders Technical Working Group.  |
| 18/12/2019 | Email                   | Cultural heritage: Requested copies of the trenching scope of works and the aerial photo report.   |
| 18/12/2019 | Email                   | Cultural heritage: Response confirming AP report was not ready to be sent. Scope of works sent.  |
| 18/12/2019 | Email                   | Cultural heritage: Screen shot of slight amendment to Phase 2 trenches.  |
| 20/12/2019 | Email                   | Comments from CBC on the Phase 1 WSI from MOLA.  |
| 14/10/2019 | Meeting                 | Economic and Benefits Technical Working Group.   |
| 13/12/2019 | Email                   | Phase 2 trenching plan sent to councils.   |
| 18/12/2019 | Email                   | Requested copies of the trenching scope of works and the aerial photo report.  |
| 18/12/2019 | Email                   | Response confirming AP report was not ready to be sent. Scope of Works sent.   |
| 18/12/2019 | Email                   | Screen shot of slight amendment to Phase 2 trenches.   |
| 20/12/2019 | Email                   | Provided comments on the Phase 1 WSI.  |
| 14/01/2020 | Email                   | A428 Bedfordshire Watercourse Technical Note shared with CBC.  |
| 16/01/2020 | Email                   | Request from CBC for historical flood event data for fluvial, pluvial, groundwater, sewer, snowmelt, reservoir and other artificial flood sources. |
| 21/01/2020 | Meeting                 | Economic and Benefits Technical Working Group.   |

| Date                  | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---|
| 22/01/2020            | Email                  | Formal request from CBC to start drawing up the Planning Performance Agreement (PPA).   |
| 24/01/2020            | Email                  | Updated Phase 1 WSI prepared by MOLA shared following comments by CBC, BBC and CCC.   |
| 24/01/2020            | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Further comments on Phase 1 WSI from CBC.  |
| 24/01/2020            | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Dates for induction.   |
| 24/01/2020            | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Confirmation that comments on WSI will be addressed and asked for any other comments from CCC and BBC. Work will start on site on 28/01/2020.  |
| 28/01/2020            | Email                  | Cultural Heritage: Email from HE Archaeologist regarding CSCS cards and inductions.   |
| 28/01/2020            | Email                  | Cultural Heritage Warned that if they cannot monitor the evaluation then comments to PINS will reflect the fact that they cannot validate results, which they would like to avoid.  |
| 28/01/2020            | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Emails regarding trench changes in F44 due to services.  |
| 28/01/2020            | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Email confirming work had started and that contingency can be accommodated as required. Informed curators of need for minor changes to Phase 1 trenches for safety reasons. Reminder that comments on Phase 2 trench layout were needed. |
| 28/01/2020            | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Email from CBC asking if the aerial photograph layer was available to inform comments.   |
| 28/01/2020            | Email                  | Cultural heritage: CBC trying to determine what aerial photographic information Arial Photography information they have.  |
| 29/01/2020            | Email                  | Cultural heritage: HE confirmed Arial Photography aerial photographic layer not yet available. Requested information from CBC.  |
| 29/01/2020            | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Emails with CBC regarding Phase 2 trenching.   |
| 30/01/2020-31/01/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Changes to F44 trenches. All agreed.   |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes  |
|------------|------------------------|--|
| 31/01/2020 | Email                  | Request for planning data from CBC regarding strategic sites, transport related infrastructure schemes and certainty of development.   |
| 10/02/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 2 of Phase 1 trial trenching shared with CBC.  |
| 13/02/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Emails with CBC regarding photographs of trenches from site and access to MOLA GIS system.  |
| 31/03/2020 | Email                  | Request to CBC for details of nearby developments to inform the EIA Cumulative Effects Assessment.   |
| 17/02/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Desk-Based Assessment shared with BBC, CBC, and CCC.  |
| 18/02/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Confirmed which fields CBC will monitor.  |
| 10/02/2020 | Email                  | Draft PPA shared with CBC.   |
| 17/02/2020 | Email                  | Draft version of the Archaeological DBA shared with CBC.   |
| 24/02/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 4 of Phase 1 trial trenching shared with CBC.  |
| 25/02/2020 | Meeting                | Economic and Benefits Technical Working Group.   |
| 02/03/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Geophysical survey reports sent to BBC, CBC, and CCC for comment.   |
| 02/03/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 5 of Phase 1 trial trenching shared with CBC.  |
| 03/03/2020 | Meeting                | Walkers, Cyclists and Horse Riders Technical Working Group.  |
| 03/03/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Emails resending geophysical information.   |
| 05/03/2020 | Meeting                | Meeting held with BBC, CCC, and CBC during which the project team presented information on the Stage 3 Model, including the model network and area of detailed modelling. The traffic forecasting process was explained and presented to the local authorities as well as the Model Cordon Data. |
| 06/03/2020 | Email                  | Comments from CBC on the draft version of the Archaeological DBA.  |
| 06/03/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Confirmation that no comments on Desk-Based Assessment DBA.   |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes  |
|------------|------------------------|--|
| 09/03/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 6 of Phase 1 trial trenching shared with CBC.  |
| 11/03/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 7 of Phase 1 trial trenching shared with CBC.  |
| 12/03/2020 | Meeting                | Further to the meeting on 17 October 2019 a second meeting was held with BBC, CCC, CBC, and SCDC for the Flood Risk/ Water Management Technical Working Group. Each local authorities' watercourse was reviewed and discussed and the terms of reference for the group were finalised and agreed. The Environment Agency and Bedford Group of Drainage Boards were also in attendance. |
| 18/03/2020 | Email                  | Link shared by CBC to assist HE with finding local and hard to reach groups.   |
| 23/03/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 8 of Phase 1 trial trenching shared with CBC.  |
| 24/03/2020 | Email                  | Correspondence to CBC that fieldwork will be temporarily stopped as a result of lockdown measures; and a request for remote sign-off for backfilling currently open trenches.  |
| 30/03/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 9 of Phase 1 trial trenching shared with CBC.  |
| 02/04/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 10 of Phase 1 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 02/04/2020 | Email                  | List of remaining Phase 1 trial trenches shared with CBC.  |
| 03/04/2020 | Email                  | Comments from CBC on the geophysical survey report.  |
| 03/04/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Comments on geophysical survey report.  |
| 03/04/2020 | Email                  | Comments on Geophysical Survey Report for Phases 1 and 2 and proposals for Phase 3 Trench locations from CBC.  |
| 08/04/2020 | Email                  | Request for updated housing data from CBC required to complete uncertainty log.  |
| 09/04/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Phase 2 trench layout query.  |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|------------|------------------------|---|
| 14/04/2020 | Meeting                | Cultural heritage: An archaeological consultation meeting was held which included discussion on SOCGs and how COVID-19 might impact archaeological investigation. An update was also provided on Phase 1 fieldwork and the archaeological potential and land access of various fields were discussed. Historic England were also in attendance. |
| 14/04/2020 | Email                  | Photos taken of trenches in F39 shared with CBC.  |
| 16/04/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 11 of Phase 1 trial trenching shared with CBC.  |
| 17/04/2020 | Email                  | Updates to the work package programme as of April 2020 shared by HE.  |
| 20/04/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 12 of Phase 1 trial trenching shared with CBC.  |
| 22/04/2020 | Email                  | Confirmation from Historic England shared with CBC, confirming that F44 is not being considered to be designated as a scheduled ancient monument.   |
| 23/04/2020 | Email and file share   | Cultural heritage: WSI for Phase 2 trenching sent to councils.  |
| 24/04/2020 | Email                  | Confirmation from CBC that clearance of archaeological excavations will require a temporary compound where a necessary planning permission would be required.   |
| 27/04/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Sent revised Phase 2 WSI to BBC and CBC.   |
| 27/04/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Comments on Phase 2 WSI from CBC.  |
| 28/04/2020 | Email                  | Comments on v3 of the Phase 2 trenching WSI.  |
| 28/04/2020 | Email                  | Response from HE Archaeologist HE to CBC comments on Phase 2 WSI.   |
| 28/04/2020 | Email                  | Requested final Phase 1 WSI.  |
| 30/04/2020 | Email                  | Planner for May archaeological information shared.  |
| 30/04/2020 | Email                  | Final Phase 1 WSI sent to CBC.  |
| 30/04/2020 | Email                  | Noted that Figure 5 in the Phase 1 WSI was wrong. Asked for an amended version at some stage (not urgent).  |



| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|------------|------------------------|---|
| 30/04/2020 | Email                  | Email from HE Archaeologist with programme for when reviews needed from curators. Responses from all authorities with some confusion.   |
| 01/05/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 1 of Phase 2 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 04/05/2020 | Meeting                | Meeting with CBC in which the project team explained the ecological approach to F44, an area on the approach to Alington Hill. This area is of archaeological interest for the Scheme so the local authority was interested in how ecological mitigations would be made within the archaeological excavation. |
| 06/05/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 2 of Phase 2 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 07/05/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Phase 3 geophysics and Phase 3 trench plan sent to councils.   |
| 11/05/2020 | Email                  | EWP1 Major Developments work package issued to CBC.   |
| 11/05/2020 | Email                  | Proposed environmental work packages for CBC shared by HE.  |
| 13/05/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 3 of Phase 2 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 13/05/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Comments from CBC on the addendum to the geophysical survey report and the proposals for the Phase 3 trench locations.   |
| 14/05/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: HE response to comments on Phase 3 trench layout.  |
| 15/05/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 3 of Phase 1 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 15/05/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Information on trench numbers requiring changes in F34.  |
| 15/05/2020 | Email                  | Phase 1 archaeological trenching results shared with CBC.   |
| 18/05/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Phase 1 Trenching Report shared with CBC.  |
| 19/05/2020 | Meeting                | This meeting was a Local Model Validation Report (LMVR) and modelling workshop with CCC and CBC during which the project team ran through an overview of the Stage 3 Model,   |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|------------|------------------------|---|
|            |                        | including an overview of the base year model calibration and validation performance.  |
| 19/05/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Copy of Phase 1 trenching report to BBC, CBC, and CCC.   |
| 19/05/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Response regarding F34 trenches.   |
| 20/05/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Request for Phase 1 trench report figures.   |
| 20/05/2020 | Email                  | Latest programme for the work packages and Local Authority engagement shared with CBC.  |
| 21/05/2020 | Teams Meeting          | Cultural Heritage Meeting with BBC, CCC, and CBC during which MOLA gave a presentation on the results of the Phase 1 trenching. Attendees were informed that it was possible that not all trenching results would be available with the submission of the DCO and could be submitted as an addendum.  |
| 21/05/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Slides from presentation sent to Historic England, BBC, CBC, and CCC   |
| 21/05/2020 | Email                  | Information from CBC regarding NMP data.  |
| 22/05/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 4 of Phase 2 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 29/05/2020 | Teams Meeting          | Cultural heritage: Following the meeting on the 4 May 2020, an additional cultural heritage meeting was held with CBC to clarify the approach to ecological mitigation with the local authority. The proposed layout of the scope of works was described. Ecological constraints were discussed, along with the archive and publication. The local authority was satisfied with the ecological and archaeological approach set out by the project team. |
| 01/06/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 5 of Phase 2 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 03/06/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Comments from CBC on Phase 1 trenching report.   |
| 10/06/2020 | Email                  | Latest draft of draft PPA with CBC shared.  |
| 10/06/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 7 of Phase 2 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 12/06/2020 | Email                  | Draft scope of works for excavation in Field 44 shared with CBC.  |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes  |
|------------|------------------------|--|
| 16/06/2020 | Email                  | Draft PPA with CBC shared by HE.   |
| 17/06/2020 | Email                  | Comments on draft scope of works for F44 shared by CBC.  |
| 18/06/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 8 of Phase 2 trial trenching shared with CBC.  |
| 18/06/2020 | Email                  | Amended draft of draft PPA with CBC shared.  |
| 23/06/2020 | Email and file share   | Cultural heritage: Phase 3 WSI prepared by MOLA sent to BBC, CBC, and CCC.   |
| 24/06/2020 | Letter                 | Supplementary Consultation Launch Communications.  |
| 24/06/2020 | Email                  | MOLA Report from week 9 of Phase 2 trial trenching shared with CBC.  |
| 24/06/2020 | Email                  | Link for online consultation sent to BBC, CBC, and CCC.  |
| 25/06/2020 | Teams Meeting          | A cultural heritage meeting was held with BBC, CCC, and CBC to discuss five sites (F9, F34, F44, F59 and F97) that would be targeted early for advanced construction activity including compounds, statutory diversions and borrow pits. Concerns over furrows were raised by attendees and further specialist research was undertaken as a result. Historic England were also in attendance HE. |
| 25/06/2020 | Email                  | Notes from Phase 1 presentation issued.  |
| 01/07/2020 | Email                  | Comments from CBC on the Phase 3 WSI from MOLA.  |
| 01/07/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Comments on Phase 3 WSI received from CBC. Plan of F45 trenches also shared.  |
| 02/07/2020 | Email                  | Screenshot of trenching plan in F45 shared.  |
| 02/07/2020 | Email                  | Asked if trench plan for F45 would be in updated WSI and if a scale plan be sent in due course.  |
| 02/07/2020 | Email                  | Latest version of draft PPA with CBC shared.   |
| 03/07/2020 | Email                  | Programme for work packages and Local Authority engagement for June 2020 shared by HE.   |
| 16/07/2020 | Email                  | Technical note detailing proposed mitigation for the archaeological excavation works in F44 shared with CBC.   |
| 09/07/2020 | Email                  | Draft trenching layout shared with CBC.  |

| Date       | Form of correspondence                 | Key topics discussed and key outcomes  |
|------------|--|--|
| 16/07/2020 | Email                                  | CBC asked if extracts from Phase 1 eval report reflected the updated report following their comments.  |
| 16/07/2020 | Email                                  | HE confirmed that the Phase 1 eval report did not reflect comments – some still awaited.   |
| 17/07/2020 | Email                                  | MOLA Report from week 12 of Phase 2 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 21/07/2020 | Meeting                                | A meeting was held with BBC, CCC, and CBC to present the methodology adopted for the traffic forecasting and the results of the future forecasts to the local authorities.   |
| 23/07/2020 | Email                                  | Local Authority Work Package programme update for July 2020.   |
| 23/07/2020 | Email                                  | Programme for work packages and Local Authority engagement for July 2020 shared by HE.   |
| 24/07/2020 | Email                                  | Photos of trenches in F45 shared with CBC.   |
| 24/07/2020 | Email                                  | MOLA Report from week 13 of Phase 2 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 28/07/2020 | Meeting                                | A meeting was held with CBC to present a summary of the assessment of the wider traffic impacts and junction capacity modelling to be contained in the Transport Assessment (TA).  |
| 28/07/2020 | Response to Supplementary Consultation | CBC response to Supplementary Consultation.  |
| 28/07/2020 | Meeting                                | Cultural heritage meeting including discussion of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheme and programme update.</li> <li>• Update provided on engagement of stakeholders, including previous meeting with BBC conservation and archaeology officers, and with Historic England.</li> <li>• Update on progress with archaeological trial trenching.</li> <li>• Discussion of advanced works.</li> <li>• Brook Cottages and listed milestones discussed.</li> </ul> |
| 29/07/2020 | Email                                  | MOLA Report from week 14 of Phase 3 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 30/07/2020 | Meeting                                | Local Economy Legacy Working Group.  |

| Date       | Form of correspondence            | Key topics discussed and key outcomes  |
|------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 30/07/2020 | Email                             | CBCEWP7 Archaeology WSI+ATT work package issued to CBC County Archaeologist.   |
| 30/07/2020 | Email                             | Work package "CCCHWP15 LTN 1/20" issued to CBC for info only.  |
| 04/08/2020 | Email                             | Work package on Order Plans & Schedules issued to CBC.   |
| 12/08/2020 | Email                             | MOLA Report from week 16 of Phase 3 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 17/08/2020 | Email                             | Cultural heritage: Meeting notes for 25 June meeting sent to Historic England, BBC, CBC, and CCC.  |
| 19/08/2020 | Email                             | MOLA Report from week 17 of Phase 3 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 21/08/2020 | Email                             | Cultural heritage: Received comment on meeting notes from 25 June from CBC.  |
| 25/08/2020 | Meeting                           | HE cultural heritage meeting was held regarding gas diversion in F34 and advance archaeological works. It was recognised that the plan would not impact on the archaeological deposits within F34, but it was agreed it would be preferable to undertake the excavation in advance of work.  |
| 25/08/2020 | Email from CCC to HE, BBC and CBC | <p>Email explaining following receipt of the notes made in the meeting held on 25 June, the council does not recall the need to provide a revised brief. The council explains they have not received firm plans for F59 and therefore cannot specify an area in a brief.</p> <p>The council explained they are obliged to respond to the consultation plan but advise no such division of Wintringham Park Site, 3 as proposed for the A428, should occur.</p> |
| 27/08/2020 | Email                             | MOLA Report from week 18 of Phase 3 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 02/09/2020 | Email                             | MOLA Report from week 19 of Phase 3 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 07/09/2020 | Email                             | Cultural heritage: Minutes from meeting regarding gas diversion in F34 and advance archaeological works  |
| 09/09/2020 | Meeting                           | Meeting with CCC, CBC, and HDC to provide an update on the Scheme, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), landscape design approach and next steps.  |
| 09/09/2020 | Email                             | Invite from HE's Archaeologist HE to consultees to invite them to a meeting to discuss the rationale and strategy for  |

| Date       | Form of correspondence            | Key topics discussed and key outcomes  |
|------------|-----------------------------------|--|
|            |                                   | mitigation on the A428, to include for discussion on the strategies for the 39 sites have identified during the evaluations.   |
| 10/09/2020 | Email                             | MOLA Report from week 20 of Phase 3 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 10/09/2020 | Email from HE to CBC              | Email attaching notes with key points on the Archaeological Mitigation in Field 34. The council explained they are reading the draft specification for archaeology and the phase 2 evaluation report from MOLA.  |
| 16/09/2020 | Email                             | MOLA Report from week 21 of Phase 3 trial trenching shared with CBC.   |
| 18/09/2020 | Meeting                           | Cultural heritage: Archaeological meeting with BBC, CCC, and CBC to present the results of the Phase 2 trenching evaluation. The presentation was by MOLA.   |
| 22/09/2020 | Email and file share              | Cultural heritage: Slides of Phase 2 trenching presentation were shared.   |
| 22/09/2020 | Email from HE to CCC, CBC and BBC | Email attaching the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Archaeology Presentation.  |
| 23/09/2020 | Email                             | Cultural heritage: Email sending current draft of the archaeological strategy document prepared by HE in advance of the meeting on 24-09-2020.   |
| 23/09/2020 | Email                             | CBC confirmed receipt of the archaeological mitigation table and strategy document and will aim to review.   |
| 24/09/2020 | Meeting                           | Cultural heritage: An archaeological meeting was held with BBC and CBC to discuss the archaeological mitigation strategy [TR010044/APP/6.12] with local authority officers.<br><br>Presentations on the archaeological approach, the rationale and strategy, and the form of the strategy for the Environmental Statement. |
| 25/09/2020 | Email                             | Email from HE requesting file share for the PowerPoint of the meeting held on 24/09/2020. Second email regarding the drawings. Requested examples from the A14 scheme.   |
| 25/09/2020 | Email and file share              | PowerPoint from meeting on 24/09/2020 shared with the councils.  |
| 30/09/2020 | Email                             | Water Courses work package issued to CBC Biodiversity/Drainage teams.  |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|------------|------------------------|---|
| 30/09/2020 | Meeting                | Cultural heritage: Minutes of the Phase 2 trenching presentation were shared.   |
| 30/09/2020 | Meeting                | Cultural heritage: Email from HE to CCC, BBC and CBC with attached minutes of the meeting on the Rational, Strategy and Mitigation were shared.   |
| 30/09/2020 | Email                  | Email from HE to CCC, BBC and CBC attaching the minutes of the Phase 2 trenching presentation   |
| 30/09/2020 | Email                  | Email from HE's Archaeologist HE with dates of the review programme for the evaluation reports.   |
| 30/09/2020 | Email                  | Email from HE's Archaeologist HE on inputs required on the mitigation strategy.   |
| 30/09/2020 | Email                  | Email from HE to CCC, BBC and CBC providing a series of milestones for the delivery and review of the archaeological evaluation reports by MOLA and agreement made Friday 16 <sup>th</sup> for the next presentation.   |
| 02/10/2020 | Email                  | Geophysical Survey Report for Phases 1 and 2 shared with CBC.   |
| 02/10/2020 | File transfer          | Cultural heritage: Updated Phase 1 and 2 trenching reports, plus draft mitigation area figures.   |
| 13/10/2020 | Email                  | HE's Archaeologist emailed copies of mitigation area plans in CBC.  |
| 14/10/2020 | Email                  | Comments on v4 of Phase 1 report.   |
| 15/10/2020 | Email                  | Email from CCC to HE, BBC and CBC explaining the Phase 1 and 2 report, alongside the AECOM proposed mitigation areas have been reviewed. CCC have not had time to review the areas alongside levels of engagement. The council consider the proposal is inconsistent or unworkable. Mitigation area review document may need to be sent to MFT service as this document is too large. |
| 15/10/2020 | Email                  | Emails regarding photographic requirements in Bedfordshire.   |
| 15/10/2020 | Email                  | Request for suggested peer review of medieval text in CBC.  |
| 16/10/2020 | Email                  | CBC suggested a person for the medieval peer review.  |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|------------|------------------------|---|
| 16/10/2020 | Meeting                | An archaeological meeting was held with BBC, CCC, and CBC present the Phase 3 trenching results. This was the result of all the trenching proposed. The presentation was by MoLA.   |
| 18/10/2020 | Email                  | Email from BBC to HE, CCC and CBC outlining key issues with the Phase 1 report, this includes Section 6.3, Section 6.4 and Appendix 4, Table 4.1. The council complained about the length of the document and reported the documents kept crashing on their system. The council raised cross referencing is a time consuming process. The council explained they are part way through reviewing the Phase 2 report.                                   |
| 19/10/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Information on time required to review medieval paper.   |
| 20/10/2020 | Email                  | HE's Archaeologist HE email indicating a lesson's learnt exercise on the trenching will be needed.  |
| 21/10/2020 | Email                  | Project management work package "MWP1" issued to CBC for review.  |
| 27/10/2020 | File transfer          | Cultural heritage: Draft Phase 3 report sent to BBC, CBC, and CCC.  |
| 28/10/2020 | Email                  | Comments on Mitigation Strategy and Rationale.  |
| 29/10/2020 | Meeting                | <p>Cultural heritage: An archaeological meeting with BBC, CCC, and CBC was called by HE to review the mitigation rationale document and discuss the archaeological mitigation strategy [TR010044/APP/6.12]. The meeting covered the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Documents to be included in the DCO.</li> <li>- Discussion on the Rationale and Strategy.</li> <li>- Mitigation strategy for individual sites.</li> </ul> |
| 03/11/2020 | Email                  | Carbon work package "CBCEWP14" issued to CBC for review.  |
| 05/11/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Response to curator comments on the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy.  |
| 09/11/2020 | Email                  | Invite from HE's Archaeologist HE for lessons learnt session.   |
| 09/11/2020 | Email                  | Cultural heritage: Comments on Phase 3 trenching report (shared via BOX and resent as a pdf)  |
| 10/11/2020 | Meeting                | A meeting was held with ecologists from BBC and CBC to discuss work package EWP2a.  |



| Date       | Form of correspondence         | Key topics discussed and key outcomes  |
|------------|--------------------------------|--|
| 12/11/2020 | Email                          | Work package "EWP2b" (landscaping) issued to CBC for review.   |
| 12/11/2020 | Meeting                        | A meeting was held with BBC, CCC, CBC, SCDC, and HDC to provide a briefing on the draft Development Consent Order to highlight the key articles and provide an overview of the requirements. An overview of the structure of the Environmental Management Plan and explanation of the role of local authorities in the post submission process (covering Adequacy of Consultation responses and Local Impact Reports) was also provided. |
| 17/11/2020 | Email                          | Responses to CBC points, and requests for clarification on the A428 Rationale and Strategy by HE.  |
| 17/11/2020 | Email                          | CBC advised no issue with the response to CBC comments on the Rationale and Strategy.  |
| 20/11/2020 | Email                          | Email to check that CBC had the A428 Phase 1 issue 4 and Phase 2 issue 3 final reports. The revised Phase 3 report will be sent.   |
| 20/11/2020 | Email                          | Confirmation that CBC had received the Phase 1 (issue 4) and Phase 2 (issue 3) final reports.  |
| 20/11/2020 | We Transfer and CCC file share | Cultural heritage: Revised Phase 3 report sent to Historic England, BBC, CBC, and CCC.   |
| 25/11/2020 | Meeting                        | Lessons learnt session for the A428 Evaluation reporting process.  |
| 25/11/2020 | Email                          | Email to CBC stating that we had thought that it was agreed that the Phase 1 report could be submitted as is and then amendments made for the HER submission of the report. Asked CBC to confirm if amendments were required.  |
| 25/11/2020 | Email                          | CBC had missed that the Phase 1 amendments would not be included in the DCO submission. Asked for confirmation that issue 4 of the report would go into the EIA.   |
| 30/11/2020 | Email                          | Notified CBC that HE had addressed CBC and BBC comments, but that no comments were received from CCC. Asked if CBC wanted to see the revised document.   |
| 30/11/2020 | Email                          | Confirmed that CBC would like to review the revised rationale and strategy by HE.  |
| 04/12/2020 | Meeting                        | Cultural heritage: discussion on SoCG, archives and other matters relating to mitigation.  |

| Date         | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes  |
|--------------|------------------------|--|
| 04/12/2020   | Email                  | Draft SoCG info sent to CBC following the meeting.   |
| 04/12/2020   | Email                  | Email from HE with notes and actions from lessons learnt session.  |
| 21/01/2021   | File share             | Final version of Phase 1 trenching report issued to councils.  |
| January 2021 | Email                  | Planning data requested from CBC, including public transport schemes.  |
| 03/02/2021   | Briefing               | Officers from BBC, CCC, and CBC were briefed on a Scheme walk through which included mainline alignment design and reason for changes, junction locations and designs, key structures, public rights of way proposals, borrow pits and key constraints and design considerations. The structure of the DCO application and the key documents within it were also covered. A recap was provided on the role of local authorities in the post submission period, as well as an update on the draft legal agreements. |
| 05/02/2021   | Meeting                | In this meeting with BBC, CCC, and CBC, the results of the sensitivity tests for the update of the Uncertainty Log were presented to the local authorities. This is reported in application document [TR010044/APP/7.9] - Sensitivity Test Utilising 2020 Uncertainty Log Data.  |
| 21/04/2021   | Email                  | Email from HE to CBC providing a link to the confidential ecological appendices  |
| 25/05/2021   | Meeting                | Biodiversity update meeting including introduction to the SoCG and biodiversity impacts, effects and mitigation. Meeting minutes were provided following the meeting on 27/05/2021.  |
| 26/05/2021   | Meeting                | Cultural heritage update meeting including introduction to the SoCG and cultural heritage impacts, effects and mitigation. Meeting minutes were provided following the meeting on 28/05/2021.  |
| 10/06/2021   | Meeting                | Air quality and noise and vibration update meeting including introduction to the SoCG and air quality and noise and vibration impacts, effects and mitigation. Meeting minutes were provided following the meeting on 16/06/2021.  |
| 22/06/2021   | Meeting                | Meeting to discuss the cultural heritage elements of the SOCG. Meeting minutes were provided following the meeting on 30/06/2021.  |

| Date                                  | Form of correspondence                                | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| 23/06/2021                            | Meeting   | Meeting to discuss the biodiversity elements of the SOCG and update the team on the landscape and visual effects assessment. Meeting minutes were provided following the meeting on 30/06/2021.   |
| 23/06/2021                            | Email   | Email from CBC querying why borrow pits are not being discussed as part of the Material Assets and Waste Update presentation  |
| 23/06/2020                            | Email   | WSI for Phase 3 prepared by MOLA shared.  |
| 25/06/2021                            | Email   | Email from HE to BBC, CBC and CCC detailing a borrow pit technical note is being prepared and once issued HE will set up a specific meeting to discuss borrow pits.   |
| 01/07/2021                            | Meeting   | Joint meeting with BBC, CBC and CCC on material assets and waste covering roles in Examination, navigating the ES, the SOCG and material assets and waste impacts, effects and mitigation. Meeting minutes were provided following the meeting on 08/07/2021. |
| 01/07/2021                            | Meeting   | Joint meeting with BBC and CBC about construction impacts on traffic.   |
| 02/07/2021                            | Meeting   | Local Technical Review Group meeting - discussion on strategic and local models.  |
| 05/07/2021, 08/07/2021 and 27/07/2021 | Email   | Email from HE to CBC requesting the names of specialist team members from CBC geology and soils, road drainage and water environment, climate and population and human health with a view to organising future SOCG meetings. No response received.           |
| 05/07/2021, 08/07/2021 and 27/07/2021 | Email   | Email from HE to CBC landscape team requesting availability for a future meeting.   |
| 08/07/2021                            | Email   | Email from HE to CBC issuing the meeting minutes and presentation slides for the material assets and waste meeting on 01/07/2021.   |
| June 2021                             | Letter from CBC to HE (via the Planning Inspectorate) | Letter from CBC to HE detailing their Relevant Representation.  |
| 20/07/2021                            | Meeting   | Meeting with CBC and BBC on the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan  |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes  |
|------------|------------------------|--|
| 22/07/2021 | Meeting                | Meeting to discuss the air quality and noise and vibration elements of the SOCG.   |
| 28/07/2021 | Email                  | Email from HE to CBC issuing the meeting minutes and presentation slides following the air quality and noise and vibration SOCG meeting on 22/07/2021.   |
| 28/07/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC Landscape Team advising that they don't have capacity to be involved in relevant discussion for the Scheme.   |
| 30/07/2021 | Email                  | Email from HE to CBC detailing the location of the report for the Sensitivity Test using 2020 Uncertainty Log Data which is part of the DCO application documents.   |
| 11/08/2021 | Email                  | Email from HE to CBC requesting air quality monitoring data for 2019 and 2020 if available.  |
| 12/08/2021 | Meeting                | JAAB (Joint Archaeological Advisors Brief) meeting with CCC and CBC to discuss outstanding questions about the "Cambridgeshire / Bedfordshire Brief for a Programme of Archaeological Investigation" for the A428.   |
| 13/08/2021 | Meeting                | Meeting between HE, the Cambridgeshire authorities (CCC, HDC and SCDC), BBC, CBC on borrow pits and the additional information provided in the Borrow Pit Technical Note. Meeting minutes were provided following the meeting on 23/08/2021.                     |
| 17/08/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to HE with NO <sub>2</sub> diffusion tube data and NO <sub>2</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> data at the Sandy monitoring station.   |
| 20/08/2021 | Email                  | Email from National Highways to CBC asking if any of the monitoring tubes have been relocated.   |
| 20/08/2021 | Email                  | Email from National Highways to CBC requesting predicted operational noise levels for receptors R16, R17 and R18.  |
| 23/08/2021 | Email                  | Email from National Highways to CBC detailing that input will be required from CBC to a position statement on HRA and mitigation matters following a meeting between Natural England and National Highways on 23/08/2021. A recording of the meeting was shared. |
| 23/08/2021 | Email                  | Email from National Highways to CBC with the minutes from the Borrow Pits meeting on 13/08/2021.   |
| 23/08/2021 | Email                  | Latest programme for the work packages and Local Authority engagement shared by National Highways.   |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|------------|------------------------|---|
| 24/08/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to National Highways advising that the monitoring tubes had not been relocated. CBC advised review of the 2019 monitoring data.  |
| 26/08/2021 | Email                  | The position statement for HRA and mitigation matters was shared with CBC for input. No response received.  |
| 02/09/2021 | Email                  | Email from National Highways (NH) to CBC with daytime noise levels for receptors R16, R17 and R18. National Highways advised that night-time noise levels would follow in a couple of weeks due to scheduled annual leave.  |
| 13/09/2021 | Meeting                | Meeting with CBC Roads team covering Highways, PRoW and WCH items within Table 3-6 of the Statement of Common Ground.   |
| 20/09/2021 | Meeting                | Meeting between NH and CBC to discuss the Joint Position Statement  |
| 30/09/2021 | Meeting                | Meeting with CCC, HDC, SCDC, BBC and CBC in response to Action 2 from the Issue Specific Hearing 3 (24 September 2021). Biodiversity issues discussion on drainage ponds and planting arrangement. Meeting minutes were provided following the meeting on 04/10/2021. |
| 04/10/2021 | Email                  | Position Statement detailing matters related to design principles and planting at attenuation basins circulated to CBC, other host authorities and Natural England for input at Deadline 3 of the Examination.  |
| 04/10/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC re. Position Statement covering the matters raised by CBC at the Open Floor Hearing 1  |
| 04/10/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC re. Position Statement with regards to transport modelling, methodology and outcomes.  |
| 05/10/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC with night-time noise predictions at receptors R16, R17 and R18 within CBC.  |
| 05/10/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH requesting LA <sub>max</sub> night time noise values.  |
| 08/10/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC confirming that LA <sub>max</sub> noise values is not part of the noise and vibration methodology set out in LA 111.   |
| 08/10/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH re. SoCG on Highways Design Matters  |
| 25/10/2021 | Meeting                | Meeting between NH and CBC to discuss Sensitivity Tests Outputs   |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes  |
|------------|------------------------|--|
| 02/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH to advise additional traffic comments have been added on the SoCG   |
| 02/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC to they will review additional comments from CBC on the SoCG  |
| 02/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH, CCC and BBC arranging a site visit to F44. Agreed date between all parties 25/11/21. CBC also confirmed they are happy with the revised AMS.   |
| 02/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH requesting teams meeting to discuss F34 assessment report   |
| 04/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH detailing additional air quality and noise and vibration mitigation comments to be considered in the next iteration of the SOCG.  |
| 04/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH requesting a link to the D4 SoCG to add comments. NH advised that further comments cannot be added at his stage however updated can be made for D5. NH sent submitted version                                     |
| 04/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH confirming they would like to be involved in the digital archiving consultation. NH confirmed to CBC that they will look into dates for another environmental/discussion and F44                                  |
| 04/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH confirming F44 visit. NH confirmed F44 visit on 24/11/2021. CBC confirmed to BBC and CCC F44 visit.   |
| 04/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC advising that their additional comments on air quality and noise vibration mitigation cannot be added to the D4 version of the SoCG as it's too late but confirming they can in the D5 of D6 version of the SoCG. |
| 05/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC with availability for F34 meeting, CBC suggested time   |
| 05/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH requesting a monitoring catch up prior to F44 site visit.   |
| 05/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC requesting detailed overview of designated funds, NH response including other aeras of NH to respond  |
| 05/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to request D & A test for colleague   |
| 08/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH with F34 Assessment Report Review attached  |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|------------|------------------------|---|
| 08/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH to suggest chat about F34 Assessment Report Review   |
| 08/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH chasing up information about designated funds. NH confirmed information has been issued and should CBC have further queries to reach out                                   |
| 08/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH to confirm the representative who will attend the road safety audit  |
| 10/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC to provide the version of the SoCG submitted at D4 and highlighting that this has now been published on the PINS website   |
| 11/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC regarding concerns around air Quality at Sandy, requesting further information on related policies and studies   |
| 14/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH with new availability to discuss F34 report  |
| 16/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH with F34 PXA pdf and comments. NH confirmed receipt and replies with corresponding availability  |
| 17/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CB and MOLA to arrange F34 meeting. Meeting arranged for 23/11/21  |
| 18/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC with a SoCG plan and principles for deadline 6   |
| 18/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC with signposts to comments on other parties responses, chapter 11 noise and vibration and borrow pits restoration report submitted at D5 and published on the PINS website |
| 19/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH chasing up D&A   |
| 19/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC requesting a meeting to catch up about ongoing noise and vibration issues ahead of the hearing. CBC confirmed date.  |
| 24/11/2021 | Meeting                | Meeting between NH and CBC to discuss ongoing noise and vibration issues  |
| 24/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC to request catch up call prior to planned meeting, time agreed by CBC and NH   |
| 30/11/2021 | Meeting                | Meeting between NH and CBC regarding noise insulation. Meeting minutes were distributed on 9.12.2021.   |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|------------|------------------------|---|
| 30/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC with position on construction impacts and legal agreement fees requested in the meeting  |
| 01/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC and CCC to confirm site visit in the absence of Hannah from CBC as she is unwell   |
| 03/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC requesting a response on an earlier email to address outstanding construction noise impact issues  |
| 06/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH requesting a change in time for proposed SoCG Final check for d6 submission meeting  |
| 06/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC to confirm change in time for proposed SoCG Final check for Deadline 6 submission meeting  |
| 09/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH issuing a draft DCO requirements document.   |
| 09/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC issuing a noise position statement following an action from the issue specific hearings.   |
| 10/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH providing input to the noise position statement.   |
| 10/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC to highlight new Deadline 7  |
| 10/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH to confirm they have noted the update to Deadline 7.   |
| 13/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC outlining SoCG final check for Deadline 6 submission meeting and what will be able to be achieved in the meeting.  |
| 14/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC regarding communication about the A428 DCO and asking to share the A428 social media pages.  |
| 15/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC to confirm who will attend the STRG meeting.   |
| 15/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC to provide the updated version of the SoCG that was submitted at Deadline 6 and informing them of where the next working version of the SoCG would be saved. |
| 16/12/2021 | Email                  | Follow up email from NH to CBC to correct a deadline date in from the previous email  |
| 16/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH to advise they have shared the A428 social media accounts on the CBC page.   |



| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes  |
|------------|------------------------|--|
| 16/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC to propose a time and date for a meeting between NH, NE and CBC to discuss an action point from the hearings relating to bat crossing points.                         |
| 16/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH to advise of suitable time for bat crossing points meeting.   |
| 17/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC thanking them for sharing social media accounts.  |
| 17/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH requesting an invoice address.  |
| 17/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH with invoice.   |
| 20/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC to inquire if there are any SoCG issues they would like included in a request from Cambridgeshire and District to be escalated to STRG.                               |
| 21/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH to confirm who would attend the STRG meeting.   |
| 21/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH to confirm items they want to be included in agenda for the STRG.   |
| 22/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC to confirm attendee and agenda items have been acknowledged.  |
| 22/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH with summary sheets to be discussed at the STRG. Noting there are some staff on leave who have not yet had the chance to add what they need to.                       |
| 22/11/2021 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC to thank them for providing papers on short notice and requesting if there are any updates from those staff on leave to provide them as early as possible for review. |
| 22/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH to note request.  |
| 24/12/2021 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH to confirm receipt of final phase machine plans.  |
| 05/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC and others with STRG meeting documents and link.  |
| 06/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH requesting they forward the invite to an additional colleague.  |
| 06/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC to confirm the colleague's position before confirming attendance.   |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|------------|------------------------|---|
| 06/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC to confirm who is best to contact to discuss drainage.   |
| 07/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC forwarding STRG meeting documents and link to additional invited colleague.  |
| 07/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH to confirm attendance to STRG meeting but flagging they would not have time to look at all the documents due to time constraints.  |
| 07/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC to confirm which part of the agenda they should focus on to help with time constraints.  |
| 07/01/2022 | Meeting                | Meeting between NH, Natural England, CBC, BBC and the Cambridgeshire authorities on bat crossing points.  |
| 12/01/2022 | Meeting                | Meeting between NH and CBC on the Joint Noise Position Statement.   |
| 13/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC issuing the minutes from the bat crossing points meeting.  |
| 13/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC thanking them for their quick turn around on the Joint Position Statement, advising them that NH would send around the final draft soon and sharing the results of the Asbestos survey for Brook Cottages. |
| 14/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC issuing the minutes from the meeting on the Joint Noise Position Statement.  |
| 14/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC with comms plan from MOLA.   |
| 14/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH to advise they have no substantive changes to add to the SOCG.   |
| 14/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC thanking them for the update on the SOCG and advising them of the next steps for the SOCG sign off as well as asking who in CBC would need to sign off the final version.                                  |
| 14/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC issuing the minutes from the meeting on the Joint Noise Position Statement.  |
| 17/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH asking if the next 428 Strategic Stakeholder Board meeting is going ahead on 20/01/22.   |
| 18/01/2022 | Meeting                | Meeting between NH and CBC to discuss Sandy Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).   |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|------------|------------------------|---|
| 19/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC issuing the Joint Noise Position Statement for CBC comment.  |
| 20/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC issuing a draft statement on Baseline Traffic Monitoring.  |
| 21/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC with the Flood Risk Assessment Technical Note submitted at Deadline 6 of the Examination.  |
| 21/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC with an updated SOCG for them to review and update, advising them it needs returning on 01/02/22.  |
| 24/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH with minor amendments to the Joint Noise Position Statement.   |
| 24/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC suggesting deletion of two paragraphs in the Joint Noise Position Statement.   |
| 24/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH suggesting not to delete the two paragraphs within the Joint Noise Position Statement.   |
| 24/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC with timescales for the Joint Noise Position Statement (Deadline 9) and the SOCG (Deadline 10).  |
| 24/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC with the Deadline 9 version of the Joint Noise Position Statement following legal review.  |
| 24/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH confirming agreement to the Joint Noise Position Statement to be submitted at Deadline 9.  |
| 25/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC with one further change to the Deadline 9 version of the Joint Noise Position Statement.   |
| 25/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH confirming agreement to the amendment to the Joint Noise Position Statement to be submitted at Deadline 9.   |
| 25/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH confirming the CBC position with regards to Baseline Traffic Monitoring.   |
| 25/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC and BBC advising them that as their positions on construction baseline monitoring and different it is best to submit separate position statements. |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes  |
|------------|------------------------|--|
| 25/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC advising them they will receive an invited to collaborate on shared documents, the first being Local Highway Design Standard. NH ask CBC to add comments and review and to let NH know when done so a meeting can be arranged to discuss.                           |
| 26/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC answering query raised regarding Local Highway Design Standard document and suggesting a meeting with the subject matter experts to discuss any other queries.  |
| 26/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC answering query raised regarding Local Highway Design Standard document and suggesting a meeting with the subject matter experts to discuss any other queries.  |
| 26/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH confirming receipt of the noise and mitigation JPS and points raised in email.  |
| 28/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH requesting to be kept posted on news coverage of F44 excavations.   |
| 28/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC outlining potential news coverage and an updated on the podcast.  |
| 28/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC with DCO and legal table extracted from the SOCG for review.  |
| 31/01/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC asking if they will be able to review and comment on the DCO and Legal table extracted from the SOCG by the following day.  |
| 01/02/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC advising them of upcoming news coverage of the F44 excavations.   |
| 01/02/2022 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH advising them that they are still waiting for colleagues comments on the SOCG before they can issue it back. CBC asked NH if it's worthwhile delaying issuing the SOCG until the proposed NH meeting at the end of the week so outstanding issues can be addressed. |
| 01/02/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC advising they will discuss their proposal to wait to issues the SOCG until the end of the week with their colleague when they return to the office the following day.   |

| Date       | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|------------|------------------------|---|
| 02/02/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC advising them to send the SOCG back as soon as it's been reviewed so NH can begin their review advising them that If there are any subsequent updates following the meeting on Friday, these can be sent through separately. |
| 04/02/2022 | Meeting                | Meeting between NH and the LHAs on Construction and Operational Phase monitoring.   |
| 07/02/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC following up on the previous SOCG email asking when they will be sending it over.  |
| 07/02/2022 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH agreeing to attend environmental regulator engagement meetings and advising who from the CBC team should attend these meetings.  |
| 09/02/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC with updated Joint Noise Position Statement for CBC comment.   |
| 09/02/2022 | Email                  | Email from NH to CBC on the Rule 17 Letter received from PINS and in particular questions regarding the High Pressure Pipeline Diversion.   |
| 10/02/2022 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH with the updated SOCG.   |
| 11/02/2022 | Email                  | Email from CBC to NH with no comments on the updated Joint Position Statement ahead of Deadline 10.   |

- 2.1.2 It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key engagement and consultation undertaken between (1) National Highways and (2) CBC in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.
- 2.1.3 The issues and matters highlighted in Section 3 of this SoCG summarise the key issues that have been identified in relation to a number of key areas of the DCO application.

### 3 Issues Raised

Table 3-1 – DCO and Legal Matters

| Issue                 | Document Reference                        | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status     | Date     |
|-----------------------|---|--|---|------------|----------|
| Draft DCO Definitions | Draft Development Consent Order [APP-025] | <p>The draft DCO (dDCO) definitions are appropriate for the Scheme.</p> <p>The updated dDCO submitted at Deadline 1 included the date of the planning permission referred to within the definition of "advanced works permission".</p> <p>While National Highways does not agree that these elements should be deleted from the definition of "commence" we are proposing to submit an updated pre-commencement plan at Deadline 6. This definition has been subject to change during the course of the Examination. At Deadline 4 National Highways submitted a revised dDCO with a new definition of "pre-commencement works" to clearly identify the works classed as pre-commencement works and therefore captured by the "pre-commencement plan" – this plan (see Schedule 2 requirements) was submitted at Deadline 4 and updated at Deadline 8 (see [REP8-008]) and will be a</p> | <p>CBC has suggested the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definition of "advanced works permission" on page 5 – insert date of planning permission as 8th April 2021.</li> <li>• CBC would recommend the following underlined elements are deleted from the definition of "commence" in the draft DCO</li> </ul> <p>"commence" means beginning to carry out any material operation (as defined in section 56(4) of the 1990 Act) forming part of the authorised development other than operations consisting of archaeological investigations and mitigation works, <b>environmental surveys, pre-construction mitigation works, investigations for the purpose of assessing and monitoring ground conditions and levels, remedial work in respect of any contamination or other adverse ground conditions, erection of any</b></p> | Not agreed | 14/02/22 |

| Issue                            | Document Reference                        | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status  | Date     |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|---|----------|
|                                  |   | <p>certified document, and in National Highways' view gives comfort those early works are subject to appropriate controls including in respect to traffic management (see paragraph 3.1.49)</p> | <p>temporary means of enclosure, temporary hard standing, receipt and erection of construction plant and equipment, diversion and laying of underground apparatus and utilities, protection works, demolition (save in relation to Brook Cottages), site clearance, construction compound set up, and the temporary display of site notices or advertisements and "commencement" is to be construed accordingly.</p> <p>It is also the view of CBC that the traffic implications of the 'advance works' need to be addressed, both specifically and under the wider controls of the OCTMP. At present a large number of activities, classed as 'advanced works' with potentially significant traffic implications, are excluded from these controls.</p> |   |          |
| Draft DCO Articles/powers sought | Draft Development Consent Order [APP-025] | The articles and schedules in the dDCO contain those powers required by National Highways to deliver the Scheme. The powers sought are appropriate for the Scheme.                              | See comments elsewhere.  | Agreed, (subject to specific articles set out below). | 10/02/22 |

| Issue                  | Document Reference  | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status      | Date     |
|------------------------|---|---|---|-------------|----------|
| Draft DCO Requirements | <p>Draft Development Consent Order [APP-025]</p> <p>First Iteration Environmental Management Plan [APP-234] (see also version 2 submitted to Examination at Deadline 6, version 3 at Deadline 9 [REP9-009] and [TR010044/APP/6.8v4] at Deadline 10)</p> <p>Joint Position Statement with CBC and NH on discussions regarding noise and mitigation measures [REP6-046]</p> | <p>The requirements set out in Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the dDCO are appropriate and provide a suitable framework for securing the necessary and relevant environmental mitigation measures and other environmental control measures.</p> <p>The procedures for discharge requirements as set out in Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the dDCO are appropriate and satisfactorily involve CBC. Refer to rows below.</p> | CBC has requested amendments to the draft DCO requirements (and/or the documents incorporated by reference in Schedule 2) as follows (see CBC representation dated August 2021): - refer to rows below. | Not agreed. | 10/02/22 |



| Issue   | Document Reference   | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status            | Date            |
|---|--|--|--|-------------------|-----------------|
| <p>Draft DCO Requirements</p> <p>Traffic Monitoring</p> <p>Construction Phase</p> | <p>Draft Development Consent Order <b>[APP-025]</b></p> <p>First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>[APP-234]</b> (see also version 2 submitted to Examination at Deadline 6, version 3 at Deadline 9 <b>[REP9-009]</b> and version 4 at Deadline 10 <b>[TR010044/APP/6.8v4]</b>)</p> <p>Joint Position Statement with CBC and NH on discussions regarding noise and mitigation measures <b>[REP6-046]</b></p> | <p>National Highways has submitted the Monitor and Manage Technical Note at Deadline 6 <b>[REP6-041]</b>, response to ExA's third written questions <b>[REP8-014]</b>, together with a position statement on construction phase monitoring <b>[REP9-036]</b> which provides further detail in relation to the monitor and manage approach for the Scheme. This has been updated in a submission at Deadline 10 <b>[TR010044/EXAM/9.118]</b>.</p> | <p>CBC are seeking a requirement within the DCO requiring, prior to the commencement of the works, the agreement of a Construction Phase monitor and manage plan. CBC has sent draft joint wording from the local highway authorities (LHAs) to NH and submitted at Deadline 6 <b>[REP6-074]</b>. CBC requests the Secretary of State to impose as DCO requirements.</p> | <p>Not agreed</p> | <p>15/02/22</p> |

| Issue   | Document Reference   | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status     | Date     |
|---|--|--|--|------------|----------|
| Draft DCO Requirements<br>Traffic Monitoring<br>Operational Phase | Draft Development Consent Order [APP-025]<br>First Iteration Environmental Management Plan [APP-234] (see also version 2 submitted to Examination at Deadline 6, version 3 at Deadline 9 [REP9-009] and version 4 at Deadline 10 [TR010044/APP/6.8v4]) | National Highways has submitted the Monitor and Manage Technical Note at Deadline 6 [REP6-041], response to ExA's third written questions [REP8-014], together with a position statement on operational phase monitoring [REP9-034] which provides further detail in relation to the monitor and manage approach for the Scheme. This has been updated in a submission at Deadline 10 [TR010044/EXAM/9.116]. | CBC are seeking a requirement within the DCO requiring, prior to the commencement of the works, the agreement of an Operational Phase monitor and manage plan. CBC has sent draft joint wording from the LHAs to NH and submitted at Deadline 6 [REP6-074]. CBC requests the Secretary of State to impose as DCO requirements                                      | Not agreed | 15/02/22 |
| Draft DCO Requirements  | Draft Development Consent Order [APP-025]<br>First Iteration Environmental Management Plan [APP-234] (see also version 2 submitted to Examination at   | This issue is addressed in Table 3-6 (Highways Design, PRow and WCH), Design Geometry. National Highways does not accept that an additional requirement is necessary and has provided further detail on its position in Applicant's Comments on Deadline 6 Submissions [REP8-010].   | Station Road is not suited to accommodating significant construction traffic or extraordinary loads, and as such CBC requests that the Secretary of State addresses this in connection with the DCO (whether as a DCO requirement, incorporated documents listed in Schedule 2 or some other mechanism). CBC is putting forward proposed wording and this has been | Not agreed | 15/02/22 |

| Issue                  | Document Reference   | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status | Date     |
|------------------------|--|--|---|--------|----------|
|                        | Deadline 6, version 3 at Deadline 9 [REP9-009] and version 4 at Deadline 10 [TR010044/APP/6.8v4])  |  | sent to NH and submitted at deadline 6. CBC requests the Secretary of State to impose as a required update to the traffic management plan in Schedule 2 of the DCO.   |        |          |
| Draft DCO Requirements | Draft Development Consent Order [APP-025]<br><br>First Iteration Environmental Management Plan [APP-234] (see also version 2 submitted to Examination at Deadline 6, version 3 at Deadline 9 [REP9-009] and version 4 at Deadline 10 [TR010044/APP/6.8v4]) | This issue is addressed in Table 3-6 (Highways Design, PRoW and WCH).<br><br>National Highways has provided further detail on its position in Applicant's Comments on Deadline 6 Submissions [REP8-010]. | CBC requests the Secretary of State to impose measures to mitigate the traffic and safety impacts of other diversion routes and incorporating them into the DCO requirements (or incorporated documents listed in Schedule 2), including the timing of any closures and any associated diversions in the context of the proposed works to Barford Road to ensure no conflict between the two. | Agreed | 15/02/22 |

| Issue                  | Document Reference  | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status     | Date     |
|------------------------|---|---|--|------------|----------|
| Draft DCO Requirements | <p>Draft Development Consent Order <b>[APP-025]</b></p> <p>First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>[APP-234]</b> (see also version 2 submitted to Examination at Deadline 6, version 3 at Deadline 9 <b>[REP9-009]</b> and version 4 at Deadline 10 <b>[TR010044/APP/6.8v4]</b>)</p> | <p>This issue is addressed in Table 3-6 (Highways, Design, PRoW and WCH).</p> <p>National Highways has provided further detail on its position in Applicant's Comments on Deadline 6 Submissions <b>[REP8-010]</b>.</p> | <p>CBC requests that access over/under the A428 for people without using their cars, in particular securing sufficient width on the bridge deck for the Barford Road either preferably through provision now or possibly through providing now for a later "bolt on" solution and requests that the Secretary of States secures this as a DCO requirement (or incorporated documents listed in Schedule 2). CBC put forward proposed wording at Deadline 6 and requests the Secretary of State to impose as a requirement.</p> | Not agreed | 14/02/22 |
| Draft DCO Requirements | <p>Draft Development Consent Order <b>[APP-025]</b></p> <p>First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>[APP-234]</b> (see also version 2 submitted to Examination at</p>   | <p>National Highways has provided further detail on its position in Applicant's Comments on Deadline 6 Submissions <b>[REP8-010]</b>.</p>   | <p>Sandy AQMA mitigation as a DCO requirement (or incorporated into documents listed in Schedule 2). CBC is putting forward proposed wording and this has been sent to NH. CBC requests the Secretary of State to impose as a DCO requirement.</p>   | Not agreed | 14/02/22 |

| Issue                  | Document Reference   | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status     | Date     |
|------------------------|--|--|---|------------|----------|
|                        | Deadline 6, version 3 at Deadline 9 [REP9-009] and version 4 at Deadline 10 [TR010044/APP/6.8v4])  |  |   |            |          |
| Draft DCO Requirements | <p>Draft Development Consent Order [APP-025]</p> <p>First Iteration Environmental Management Plan [APP-234] (see also version 2 submitted to Examination at Deadline 6, version 3 at Deadline 9 [REP9-009] and version 4 at Deadline 10 [TR010044/APP/6.8v4])</p> <p>Joint Position Statement with CBC and NH on</p> | <p>Details of working hours is explained under 'Noise and vibration - Construction and operational effects' in Table 3-4 (Environment matters).</p> <p>The use of noise barriers or enclosures during construction, where necessary, is set out in paragraph 1.4.7 of Annex B of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan [APP-234]. See also version 2 of the First Iteration EMP submitted at Deadline 6, version 3 at Deadline 9 [REP9-009] and version 4 at Deadline 10 [TR010044/APP/6.8v4].</p> <p>Amendments have been made to Requirement 19 (construction hours) the dDCO submitted at Deadline 9 [REP9-004] and Deadline 10 [TR010044/APP/3.1] following discussion with local authorities.</p> | <p>Additional noise and vibration monitoring and mitigation is requested on the matters outlined in CBC's representation dated August 2021, with the mitigation secured as a DCO requirement (or incorporated documents listed in Schedule 2), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBC requests that the working hours in the DCO requirements are updated as follows: - 8am to 6pm Monday to Fridays, 8am to 1pm on Saturdays and no working on Sundays or Bank Holidays. However, in view of the size and scale of the project, CBC would consider it would be appropriate to allow variation to these hours where particular circumstances required this and appropriate mitigation measures were in place.</li> </ul> | Not agreed | 14/02/22 |

| Issue                  | Document Reference  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date     |
|------------------------|---|--|--|--------|----------|
|                        | discussions regarding noise and mitigation measures<br><b>[REP6-046]</b>  |  | CBC requests that the proposed use of localised noise barriers is set out as forming part of the construction noise mitigation measures required under the First or Second Iteration of the Environmental Management Plan. |        |          |
| Draft DCO Requirements | Draft Development Consent Order <b>[APP-025]</b><br><br>First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>[APP-234]</b> (see also version 2 submitted to Examination at Deadline 6, version 3 at Deadline 9 <b>[REP9-009]</b> and version 4 at Deadline 10 <b>[TR010044/APP/6.8v4]</b> ) | Within the updated First Iteration EMP submitted at Deadline 6, Table 2-1: Roles and Responsibilities has been updated including responsibilities for the Community Relations Manager. | CBC requests that Table A-3 of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan is updated so that there is greater clarity and confirmation of close liaison and contact with local authorities in the document.         | Agreed | 14/02/22 |

| Issue                  | Document Reference  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date     |
|------------------------|---|--|--|--------|----------|
| Draft DCO Requirements | <p>Draft Development Consent Order [APP-025]</p> <p>First Iteration Environmental Management Plan [APP-234] (see also version 2 submitted to Examination at Deadline 6, version 3 at Deadline 9 [REP9-009] and version 4 at Deadline 10 [TR010044/APP/6.8v4])</p> <p>Joint Position Statement with CBC and NH on discussions regarding noise and mitigation measures [REP6-046]</p> | <p>An updated First Iteration EMP has been submitted at Deadline 6, 8 and 9 and 10 [TR010044/APP/6.8v4]. Consultation will continue throughout the detailed design. The relevant local planning authority and relevant local highway authority are to be consulted upon under Requirements 3 and 4 of the DCO so far as relative to their respective functions [TR010044/APP/3.1].</p> | <p>Schedule 2, paragraph 5 (Details of consultation) on page 58 – there are documents that CBC would like to be consulted on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Air Quality Management Plan</li> <li>iii. Noise Management Plan</li> <li>iv. Traffic Management Plan</li> <li>v. Detailed design of works on CBC highway</li> <li>vi. Highway lighting on any CBC highway</li> <li>vii. Noise mitigation</li> </ul> | Agreed | 14/02/22 |

| Issue   | Document Reference  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status     | Date     |
|---|---|--|---|------------|----------|
| Draft DCO Requirements<br>Rectory Farm – noise mitigation | <p>Draft Development Consent Order <b>[APP-025]</b></p> <p>First Iteration Environmental Management Plan <b>[APP-234]</b> (see also version 2 submitted to Examination at Deadline 6, version 3 at Deadline 9 <b>[REP9-009]</b>, and version 4 at Deadline 10 <b>[TR010044/APP/6.8v4]</b>)</p> <p>Joint Position Statement with CBC and NH on discussions regarding noise and mitigation measures <b>[REP6-046]</b></p> | <p>National Highways refers CBC to the discussions at a meeting held on 24 November 2021 and under Agenda item 9 in Issue Specific Hearing 5 held on 1 December 2021, in which National Highways provided further clarification of the measures considered to address the significant adverse operational noise effect identified at Rectory Farm, but not taken forward. This includes noise insulation measures at the property. National Highways has provided additional information as part of the 'Joint Position Statement with CBC and NH on discussions regarding noise and mitigation measures <b>[REP6-046]</b> submitted at Deadline 6 and in the Joint Position Statement with Central Bedfordshire Council and National Highways on Noise and Mitigation Measures - Rev 2 <b>[REP9-020]</b> submitted at Deadline 9.</p> | <p>Rectory Farm noise mitigation – CBC has put forward proposed wording and this has been sent to NH. CBC requests the Secretary of State to impose as a DCO requirement.</p> | Not agreed | 14/02/22 |



| Issue   | Document Reference  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position | Status | Date     |
|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|--------|----------|
| Draft DCO Protective Provisions                 | Draft Development Consent Order [APP-025]   | The protective provisions, as set out in Part 3 of Schedule 9 of the dDCO, that are relevant to CBC relate to its role as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). The protective provisions are appropriate for the protection of ordinary watercourses.  |                                       | Agreed | 11.02.22 |
| Draft DCO Associated consents/licenses/ permits | Draft Development Consent Order [APP-025]<br><br>Consents and Agreements Position Statement [APP-029] | <p>The Consents and Agreements Position Statement identifies the consents, licences or permits that National Highways will need to obtain outside of the dDCO in order to deliver the Scheme. This document contemplates the disapplication of specific legislation on the basis that those powers are contained within the dDCO. This approach is appropriate for the Scheme.</p> <p>Consent is required from CBC as a LLFA to disapply byelaws made under section 66 (powers to make byelaws) of the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the provisions of any byelaws made under, or having effect as if made under, paragraph 5, 6 or 6A of Schedule 25 to the Water Resources Act 1991, together with section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. Protective provisions have been included for the protection of</p> |                                       | Agreed | 11.02.22 |

| Issue                    | Document Reference | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status     | Date |
|--------------------------|--------------------|---|--|------------|------|
|                          |                    | CBC with respect to this disapplication.  |  |            |      |
| Legal agreement with CBC |                    | <p>The legal agreement provides a mechanism for handing over the local roads constructed as part of the Scheme that are to be maintained by CBC as local highway authority. The measures contained in this agreement are appropriate for the Scheme.</p> <p>a. Addressed in Table 3-6 (Highways Design, PRow and WCH), Management and Maintenance Responsibilities.</p> <p>Refer also to 9.29 Joint Position Statement with CBC submitted at Open Floor Hearing 1 submitted at Deadline 3</p> | <p>CBC requested additional obligations for the Development Consent Obligation as outlined in its representation dated August 2020 (or other legal agreements eg S278 agreements). This includes the following:</p> <p>a. An appropriate fund contained in the Development Consent Obligation or secured in some other manner in connection with the DCO should be allocated and payable to CBC for addressing resulting safety, capacity, or amenity issues. CBC would welcome a discussion with National Highways over the appropriate level of funding. In addition to the fund detailed. It is also our position that, due to the considerable amount of monitoring, management and local liaison that will be required throughout the construction period, that funding is put in place in the Development Consent Obligation or secured in</p> | Not agreed |      |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|---|---|--------|------|
|       |                    | <p>b. With regard to use of temporary traffic management or other measures, the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP6-010] has been updated (Sections 3.5.4, 3.5.5 amended and 3.5.10 added) to explain in greater detail the approach to monitoring, managing and addressing re-routing of traffic should it occur.</p> | <p>some other manner in connection with the DCO payable to CBC to cover the following for the duration of the construction works (and a subsequent reasonable period post completion to carry out any post construction monitoring):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. A CBC officer with specific responsibility for monitoring, addressing and managing local impacts, including local liaison</li> <li>ii. CCTV and /or ANPR coverage for impacted routes to enable and support monitoring and enforcement</li> <li>iii. Temporary and/or permanent signage</li> </ul> <p>b. Temporary or permanent signal control or other works are expected to be required to regulate traffic flows at the junction onto the A603 from Vinegar Hill. CBC would welcome a discussion with NH to agree an appropriate contribution to deliver these works as part of the Development Consent Obligation or a highways agreement.</p> |        |      |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|---|---|--------|------|
|       |                    | <p>c. National Highways considers further inclusion to commit to monitor and manage activities within the dDCO unnecessary as they are required under the terms of its licence to manage the Strategic Road Network (SRN). Part 4 of the licence commits National Highways to maintenance and replacement of the network and to ensure improvement. Monitoring is undertaken to achieve this. As such monitor and manage activities are limited to the SRN and cannot be extended to local roads.</p> <p>d. The proposed scheme does not preclude future development, subject to compliance with DMRB standards. National Highways will work with EWR to help develop any application they consider necessary following confirmation of selected route and station locations. National Highways welcomes the invitation to discuss further with CBC. We suggest this discussion include Bedford Borough Council due to proximity.</p> | <p>c. Monitoring and Manage as outlined in the requested amendments to the dDCO Requirements set out above.</p> <p>With regards to a) and c) above, we are further seeking that the Examining Authority secure these through the DCO, as proposed within the joint deadline 6 submission by the Local Authorities.</p> <p>d. A vehicular link off the proposed A428 route to the east of Little Barford should be provided, to enable traffic to divert off this road to the new EWR station and potentially to new homes, prior to it reaching the A1. CBC would welcome a discussion with NH regarding funding or provision in connection with the DCO.</p> |        |      |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|--|--|--------|------|
|       |                    | <p>e. Any discussions regarding funding of the local highway network would be addressed within the legal agreement. However, without any detail being provided by CBC on this point it is the position of National Highways that commuted sums will not be payable for these assets.</p> | <p>e. Article 13 (Construction and maintenance of new, altered or diverted streets and other structures) on page 13 – constructed highways etc. from completion will be maintained by the Local Highway Authority at its expense. However, CBC requests that funding for maintenance is paid by National Highways to CBC as commuted sum/s and secured by the Development Consent Obligation or other statutory agreement.</p> |        |      |

| Issue                    | Document Reference | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status      | Date     |
|--------------------------|--------------------|---|--|-------------|----------|
| Legal agreement with CBC |                    | <p>Following a meeting on 20 December 2021 between National Highways and CBC, during which amendments to the draft legal agreement were discussed, National Highways issued a revised draft on 13 January 2022.</p> <p>Comments/amendments were received from CBC on 2 February.</p> <p>CBC requested a short form 'letter agreement' in lieu of the side agreement completing by Deadline 10. The parties have now agreed this letter and the Applicant understands CBC is satisfied to rely on that letter in order to conclude the legal agreement as soon as possible thereafter.</p> | <p>Due to the likelihood of the legal agreement not being completed by the Close of the Examination, CBC have requested a legal undertaking to address the completion of the side agreement.</p> | Not agreed. | 14/02/22 |

**Table 3-2 – Compulsory Acquisition and Property Matters**

| Issue   | Document Reference   | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status         | Date |
|---|--|--|---|----------------|------|
| Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession | <p>The Statement of Reasons (SoR) [APP-030]</p> <p>Book of Reference [APP-032]</p> | <p>In order to deliver the Scheme, should the Development Consent Order be made, it would be necessary to temporarily possess and/or acquire land and/or rights owned by CBC. Land Plots in which CBC has an interest, that would be subject to the compulsory acquisition (CA) of land and/or rights are identified in the Book of Reference [APP-032] and Schedule 2 of the Statement of Reasons (SoR) [APP-030]. The extent of the land take identified is required for the Scheme or is required to facilitate or is incidental to the Scheme. National Highways is happy to continue discussions to acquire the land and rights affected through negotiation, outside the CA process.</p> | <p>As the land in question is understood to be all existing highway land, CBC does not object to the acquisition.</p> | <p>Agreed.</p> |      |

**Table 3-3 – Transport Matters**

| <b>Issue</b>                                 | <b>Document Reference</b>   | <b>National Highways Position</b>  | <b>Central Bedfordshire Council Position</b>   | <b>Status</b> | <b>Date</b>   |
|--|---|--|--|---------------|---|
| Base Year Traffic Model - Data               | Transport Assessment Report – Part 1 [APP-241]<br>Transport Assessment – Part 2 [APP-242] | The Base Year model is underpinned by good quality data that provides a sound basis for model calibration and validation.  | CBC are content with the Strategic traffic model that has been developed for the purposes of assessment of the Scheme. | Agreed        | Local Technical Review Group meeting on 26 May 2021 |
| Base Year Traffic Model – Fit for Purpose    | Transport Assessment Report – Part 1 [APP-241]<br>Transport Assessment – Part 2 [APP-242] | The Base Year has been developed in accordance with DfT TAG procedures and meets the required TAG standards for validation. It gives a reliable representation of base year conditions within the study area. It therefore provides a sound foundation for the development of future traffic flows for assessment of the Scheme. | CBC are content with the Strategic traffic model that has been developed for the purposes of assessment of the Scheme. | Agreed        | Local Technical Review Group meeting on 26 May 2021 |
| Future Year Traffic Models – Fit for purpose | Transport Assessment Report – Part 1 [APP-241]<br>Transport Assessment – Part 2 [APP-242] | The future year models fully comply with DfT TAG methods. They provide a reliable forecast of future traffic flows and the impact of the Scheme as reported in the Transport Assessment and Transport Assessment Annex.  | CBC are content with the Strategic traffic model that has been developed for the purposes of assessment of the Scheme. | Agreed        | Local Technical Review Group meeting on 26 May 2021 |



| Issue  | Document Reference  | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date  |
|--|---|---|--|--------|---|
| Future Year Traffic Model - Sensitivity Test | Transport Assessment Report – Part 1 [APP-241]<br><br>Transport Assessment – Part 2 [APP-242] | The sensitivity test carried out using the updated 2020 Uncertainty Log does not result in any significant differences in forecasts flows when compared to the results using the 2018 Uncertainty Log data. This demonstrates that the assessments for the Scheme using the 2018 Uncertainty Log data as submitted are robust and it is appropriate for the Scheme to continue to rely on the 2018 UL Data forecasts. | CBC is content that there are no significant differences between the 2018 and 2020 assessments and thus, generally agree with the traffic model that has been developed for the purposes of assessment of the Scheme.  | Agreed | Local Technical Review Group meeting on 26 May 2021 |
| Transport Assessment Methodology             | Transport Assessment Report – Part 1 [APP-241]<br><br>Transport Assessment – Part 2 [APP-242] | The Transport Assessment methodology adopted follows best practice and provides a reasonable indication of the outcomes arising from the Scheme.  | Ongoing discussions have been held with the A428 Project Team with regards to a number of remaining queries, including the validation of base models on the A1 corridor south of the Scheme.<br><br>Biggleswade North sensitivity testing. Outputs have been received, which confirms a greater degree of congestion than previously modelled. Further information has been received from the applicant team (dated 06/12/2021) and is currently being reviewed. | Agreed | 08/12/2021  |

| Issue              | Document Reference | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status     | Date     |
|--------------------|--------------------|---|--|------------|----------|
| Monitor and Manage |                    | <p>A Vissim microsimulation model was developed to provide a more detailed assessment at Sandy. The Vissim model results are considered reliable and robust. The Vissim models have been provided to CBC for review and no specific issues have been raised with the models at this time <b>[REP3-029]</b>.</p> <p>Monitor and manage is a strategy applied to the SRN only. Please refer to the Monitor and Manage Technical Note <b>[REP6-041]</b> submitted at Deadline 6.</p> <p>Following the submission of the proposals for monitoring set out in the National Highways position statement on Construction Phase Monitoring <b>[REP9-036]</b> and position statement on Operational Phase Monitoring <b>[REP9-034]</b> National Highways have extended the list for baseline monitoring to comply with GEART guidelines.</p> <p>National Highways' latest Position Statement on Operational Phase Monitoring submitted at Deadline 9 <b>[REP9-034]</b> includes St Neots Road, Sandy as one of the monitoring sites. This has been re-affirmed in an</p> | <p>Saturn vs Vissim – difference in outputs for Sandy and implications for mitigation</p> <p>The inclusion of St. Neots Road in the operational monitoring is welcomed, however the NH note <b>REP9-034</b> provides no mechanism for management or mitigation of identified impacts, with this being made the responsibility of the LHAs, as such this remains 'not agreed'. The Joint LHA position is confirmed in the Deadline 10 submission to the Rule 17 question 7.</p> | Not Agreed | 15/02/22 |

| Issue   | Document Reference  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status     | Date       |
|---|---|--|---|------------|------------|
|   |   | updated submission at Deadline 10 (Position Statement on Operational Phase Monitoring 15.02.22 [TR010044/EXAM/9.116]).   |   |            |            |
| Transport Assessment<br>Data collection methods | Transport Assessment Report – Part 1 [APP-241]<br>Transport Assessment – Part 2 [APP-242] | Sufficient data has been collected in order to inform the Transport Assessment and the Transport Assessment Annex in relation to the Scheme.   | Biggleswade North sensitivity testing has been carried out using updated survey data.   | Agreed     | 08/12/2021 |
| Transport Assessment - Sandy                    | Transport Assessment Report – Part 1 [APP-241]<br>Transport Assessment – Part 2 [APP-242] | VISSIM model outputs are considered more reliable in this instance and reveal that traffic levels through the town centre of Sandy are not predicted to significantly increase as a result of the Scheme.<br><br>As set out in the Air Quality section of this SoCG, the Saturn model is the appropriate model to use for the environmental (including air quality) work. This is because the air quality assessment covers a large area, where potential changes in traffic may occur. The SATURN model is a strategic transport model that provides national coverage with a more detailed focus on the area | Other comments for discussion and clarification:<br><br>The Strategic model identifies significant increases in traffic movements through the centre of Sandy (in the order of 3,928 vehicle movements within a 12-hour period), as a result of traffic re-routing onto St. Neots Road to avoid southbound congestion at the A1/A603 junction to the west. This is not an unexpected impact based upon the increased levels of north-south flow predicted following the completion of the A428 scheme and known capacity issues already identified at the A1/A603 junction. | Not Agreed |            |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|--|--|--------|------|
|       |                    | <p>impacted by the Scheme whereas the localised coverage of the VISSIM models that are intended to model specific local junctions would not allow a full evaluation of air quality effects on sensitive receptors over a wider area.</p> | <p>The more detailed VISSIM work (summarised in section 3.18 of the Transport Assessment Annex (APP-243)) however predicts little overall change in the operation of either the A1/A603 junction or changes in flow on St. Neots Road. Whilst it is accepted that VISSIM modelling can be more representative than strategic models when assessing congested networks, the results of the VISSIM model do currently appear counterintuitive, with increased flows on all but one arm of the A1/A603 junction (and an overall net increase of 300 vehicle movements (actual flow) through the junction in the AM peak hour between the 'Do-Minimum' and 'Do-Something' scenarios) resulting in generally improved journey times, and with minimal traffic choosing to route through Sandy to avoid the southbound A1 queues. It is also noted that NH propose that CBC rely upon the Strategic Model flows when considering issues of traffic related air quality within Sandy.</p> |        |      |

| Issue                        | Document Reference   | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status     | Date |
|------------------------------|--|--|---|------------|------|
| Transport Assessment - Sandy | <p>Transport Assessment Report – Part 1 [APP-241]</p> <p>Transport Assessment – Part 2 [APP-242]</p> | <p>There is no justification for monitoring in Sandy town centre based on traffic volume.</p> <p>Monitor and Manage is a strategy applied to the SRN only. Please refer to the Monitor and Manage Technical Note [TR010044/EXAM/9.81] submitted at Deadline 6.</p> <p>National Highways' latest Position Statement on Operational Phase Monitoring submitted at Deadline 9 [REP9-034] includes St Neots Road, Sandy as one of the monitoring sites. This has been re-affirmed in an updated submission at Deadline 10 (Position Statement on Operational Phase Monitoring 15.02.22 [TR010044/EXAM/9.116]).</p> | <p>The potential implications within Sandy, should the initial Strategic Model results be more representative than the VISSIM modelling, are significant, resulting in considerable increases in flow through the centre of the town.</p> <p>As such the Council would request that any Monitor and Manage package proposed for Sandy is extended to include assessment of traffic levels passing through the centre of the town, via St. Neots Road. Furthermore, that the requirement for improvement works under 'Monitor and Manage' would be triggered by the deterioration in operation of either the A1/A603 junction or the St. Neots Road/High Street junction.</p> <p>Whilst the Transport Assessment Annex concludes that the overall impact at the junctions within CBC is Minimal overall (Table 3-91 [APP- 243]), it is noted that this is global comparison taking into account the overall operation of the junctions and does not therefore make clear that this is partly the result of increased forecast flows on</p> | Not Agreed |      |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|----------------------------|---|--------|------|
|       |                    |                            | <p>the mainline A1 being offset against reduced flows from the local road junction approaches.</p> <p>It is noted, for example, that in Table 3-75 of the Transport Assessment Annex [APP-243], that the overall flows through the A1/A603 VISSIM model are predicted to increase by only 29 vehicles in the AM peak hour (2040 forecast), despite the much larger predicted increases in flow on the A1 forecast within the A428 strategic model (with an increase of circa 474 two-way movements on the A1 north of Sandy in the AM Peak hour).</p> <p>Similarly, it is noted in Table 3-78 of the Transport Assessment Annex [APP-243] that the modelling of the Biggleswade North roundabout junction is based upon 2040 forecast flows in which the A1 flows increase by 3% (north) and 8% (south), whilst the local road flows decrease by 17% (east) and 18% (west).</p> <p>As such, and whilst discussions with regards to the modelling in question are ongoing, it appears that the strategic model is routing local traffic away from these junctions due to</p> |        |      |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|----------------------------|---|--------|------|
|       |                    |                            | <p>increased predicted levels of delay for local road traffic.</p> <p>As such, we would be seeking reassurance that any 'Monitor and Manage' approach would also take into account the operation of the side roads as a criterion for intervention, with funding to be provided by NH to CBC secured in the Development Consent Obligation or some other manner in connection with the DCO, as the expected effect of increased flows on the A1 would be increased difficulty for drivers to exit from local road approaches. This would be applicable to all of the junctions within the CBC area covered by the 'Monitor and Manage' process.</p> <p>Monitor and manage – if based upon the definition included within the TA Annex or the proposals submitted by National Highways at Deadlines 6 and 9 is not agreed, due a lack of definition/commitment. CBC have expressed views on what we are seeking to see included within Monitor and Manage, as referred to in the joint submission by the Local Authorities for Deadline 6. Further</p> |        |      |

| Issue   | Document Reference  | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status     | Date       |
|---|---|---|--|------------|------------|
|   |   |   | clarification is provided in the Deadline 10 submission.   |            |            |
| Transport Assessment<br>Baseline Data         | Transport Assessment Report – Part 1 [APP-241]<br>Transport Assessment – Part 2 [APP-242] | Where applicable, the Base Year junctions models are underpinned by good quality data that provides a sound basis for model calibration and validation.<br><br>(Where Baseline Data is not utilised the assessment is based on outputs from the strategic model)  | CBC have now received results of the sensitivity testing from Biggleswade North roundabout, which it is agreed provides a better reflection of the base year operation of the junction.  | Agreed     | 09/12/2021 |
| Transport Assessment<br>Approach to modelling | Transport Assessment Report – Part 1 [APP-241]<br>Transport Assessment – Part 2 [APP-242] | The Transport Assessment approach to modelling follows best practice and provides a reasonable indication of the outcomes arising from the Scheme.<br><br>National Highways submitted a list of sites for construction phase monitoring within [REP9-036]. This included criteria which was based on GEART but did not fully comply because National Highways was seeking to address specific concerns raised regarding HGV volumes.<br><br>The criteria that National Highways is proposing to adopt for monitoring were presented to the Local Authorities in a meeting on 4 February 2022. Under these criteria, | Regarding the effects of the Proposed Development upon the local highway network and necessary mitigation as outlined in CBCs written representation, the degree of uncertainty arising between the various modelling approaches applied requires a more robust approach to Monitor and Manage than currently proposed.<br><br>CBC do not consider the proposals within the Technical notes submitted at Deadline 9 to adequately address the concerns raised and discussed and continue to be of the view that the proposed requirement, as detailed within the Joint LHA submission at Deadline 6 to be a more appropriate response. Further | Not Agreed |            |



| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position                           | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|--|---|--------|------|
|       |                    | <p>baseline monitoring will therefore extend to all sites where the overall traffic increase is 30% or more. Where the overall increase is between 10% and 29% there was an opportunity for the LHA's to increase the number of locations if they provide evidence to demonstrate that the sites are sensitive, using the criteria set out in GEART to justify their inclusion within the monitoring proposals.</p> <p>Following further engagement (above), National Highways have extended the list for baseline monitoring to fully comply with GEART guidelines.</p> <p>In applying the GEART guidelines National Highways notes that there is no increase in the number of sites which require monitoring post opening. National Highways maintain it is not their responsibility to intervene on local roads post opening but the OCTMP does commit to intervention during construction if mitigation can be agreed.</p> <p>Any further monitoring that would fall outside of the criteria is not on offer</p> | <p>clarification is provided in the Deadline 10 submission.</p> |        |      |

| Issue  | Document Reference  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status        | Date              |
|--|---|--|---|---------------|-------------------|
|  |   | <p>and the LHA's are encouraged to do this themselves if they receive complaints.</p> <p>National Highways are now proposing monitoring of pre-commencement of construction baseline traffic flows at Barford Road Blunham; Blackbird Street, Potton; Everton Road, Everton. Subject to agreement on the sensitivity of the location - Tadlow Road, Wrestlingworth - could also be included. This is detailed in 9.118 National Highways Statement on Construction Phase Traffic Monitoring submitted at Deadline 10. [TR010044/EXAM/9.118].</p> |   |               |                   |
| <p>Transport Assessment<br/>Presentation of results</p>        | <p>Transport Assessment Report – Part 1 [APP-241]<br/>Transport Assessment – Part 2 [APP-242]</p> | <p>The Transport Assessment results presented are a fair reflection of the results obtained from the modelling undertaken.</p>   | <p>CBC are content that the Transport Assessment [APP-241] represents a reasonable summary of the modelling work undertaken.</p>  | <p>Agreed</p> |                   |
| <p>Transport Assessment<br/>Construction impacts modelling</p> | <p>Transport Assessment Report – Part 1 [APP-241]</p>   | <p>The Transport Assessment methodology adopted with regard to impacts predicted to arise during the construction phases provides a</p>  | <p>CBC are content that the Strategic Model presents the most suitable available tool to identify construction phase impacts on the wider network. However, as a strategic model this</p> | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>09/12/2021</p> |

| Issue  | Document Reference   | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status     | Date       |
|--|--|---|--|------------|------------|
|  | Transport Assessment – Part 2 [APP-242]  | <p>reasonable indication of the impacts arising from the Scheme.</p> <p>Refer also to 9.29 Joint Position Statement with CBC submitted at Open Floor Hearing 1 submitted at Deadline 3.</p>   | <p>will by definition be less granular and as such monitoring of construction phase impacts to verify effects will be required.</p>  |            |            |
| Transport Assessment<br>Construction impacts general | <p>Transport Assessment Report – Part 1 [APP-241]</p> <p>Transport Assessment – Part 2 [APP-242]</p> | <p>The Transport Assessment methodology adopted with regard to impacts predicted to arise during the construction phases provides a reasonable indication of the impacts arising from the Scheme.</p> <p>National Highways has undertaken reasonable and proportionate traffic modelling to predict the construction impacts on the project and wider road network. Given the size of the scheme there are expected to be certain displacements of traffic and re-routeings, which will cause additional congestion and delays in certain parts of the affected road network, which National Highways intends to mitigate as far as possible, in consultation with the Local Highway Authorities. It is also acknowledged by National Highways that some of these impacts might not</p> | <p>The Transport Assessment [APP-241] identifies significant daily increases in traffic on a number of east-west routes, as traffic is predicted to be displaced from the existing A428 during the works (Phases 1 to 4).</p> <p>There are constraints on a number of the routes within the authority area which make them unsuited to accommodating significant changes in traffic flow and/or composition.</p> <p>The displacement of traffic onto local roads will therefore result in considerable and ongoing local concerns, resulting in a significant increase in the resource required from CBC to monitor/manage the effects of displaced traffic.</p> <p>CBC do not consider that the proposals put forward by NH for construction or operational phase monitoring at deadline 9 adequately</p> | Not Agreed | 09/12/2021 |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|---|--|--------|------|
|       |                    | <p>be mitigated completely during the course of the construction.</p> <p>Refer also to 9.29 Joint Position Statement with CBC submitted at Open Floor Hearing 1 submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p><b>[REP3-016]</b> Deadline 3 Submission - 9.29 Joint Position Statement on matters raised by Central Bedfordshire Council at Open Floor Hearing 1.</p> <p>National Highways submitted a list of sites for construction phase monitoring within <b>[REP9-036]</b>. This included criteria which was based on GEART but did not fully comply because National Highways was seeking to address specific concerns raised regarding HGV volumes.</p> <p>The criteria that National Highways is proposing to adopt for monitoring were presented to the Local Authorities (LHAs) in a meeting on 4 February 2022. Under these criteria, baseline monitoring will therefore extend to all sites where the overall traffic increase is 30% or more.</p> <p>Where the overall increase is between 10% and 29% there was an</p> | <p>address the concerns previously raised and discussed, CBCs proposed approach to monitoring and managing construction phase impacts is outlined in the Joint LHA Deadline 6 submission. Further clarification is provided in the Deadline 10 submission.</p> |        |      |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------|------|
|       |                    | <p>opportunity for the LHA's to increase the number of locations if they provide evidence to demonstrate that the sites are sensitive, using the criteria set out in GEART to justify their inclusion within the monitoring proposals.</p> <p>Following further engagement (above), National Highways have extended the list for baseline monitoring to fully comply with GEART guidelines.</p> <p>In applying the GEART guidelines National Highways notes that there is no increase in the number of sites which require monitoring post opening. National Highways maintain it is not their responsibility to intervene on local roads post opening but the OCTMP does commit to intervention during construction if mitigation can be agreed.</p> <p>Any further monitoring that would fall outside of the criteria is not on offer and the LHA's are encouraged to do this themselves if they receive complaints.</p> <p>National Highways are now proposing monitoring of pre-</p> |                                       |        |      |

| Issue   | Document Reference  | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position    | Status | Date     |
|---|---|---|--|--------|----------|
|   |   | commencement of construction baseline traffic flows at Barford Road Blunham; Blackbird Street, Potton; Everton Road, Everton. Subject to agreement on the sensitivity of the location - Tadlow Road, Wrestlingworth – could also be included. This is detailed in 9.118 National Highways Statement on Construction Phase Traffic Monitoring submitted at Deadline 10. <b>[TR010044/EXAM/9.118]</b> . |  |        |          |
| Transport Assessment<br>Junction Operational Assessments at:<br>Black Cat<br>Caxton Gibbet      | Transport Assessment Report – Part 1 <b>[APP-241]</b><br>Transport Assessment – Part 2 <b>[APP-242]</b> | The operational assessment modelling presented within Transport Assessment with regard to new or modified junctions provides a reasonable indication of the predicted operation of individual junctions.  | Does not fall within CBC authority area. | Closed | 25/10/21 |
| Transport Assessment<br>Wider impacts<br>Quantification of impacts:<br>A428 Wyboston Roundabout | Transport Assessment Annex <b>[APP-243]</b>   | The quantification of impacts presented within the Transport Assessment Annex is a reliable indication of the impacts arising from the Scheme.  | Does not fall within CBC authority area. | Closed | 25/10/21 |

A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvements  
Statement of Common Ground with Central Bedfordshire Council

---

| Issue  | Document Reference                          | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position    | Status | Date     |
|--|---|---|--|--------|----------|
| A428 Barford Road Roundabout   |   |   |  |        |          |
| Transport Assessment<br>Wider impacts:<br>A428 Wyboston Roundabout<br>A428 Barford Road Roundabout | Transport Assessment Annex <b>[APP-243]</b> | The operational assessment modelling presented within the Transport Assessment Annex with regard to existing junctions provides a reasonable comparison of the predicted operation of individual junctions without and with the Scheme. | Does not fall within CBC authority area. | Closed | 25/10/21 |

**Table 3-4 – Environment Matters**

| Issue   | Document Reference   | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status        | Date                 |
|---|--|--|---|---------------|----------------------|
| <p><b>General</b><br/>Description of the Scheme</p> | <p>Chapter 2, The Scheme<br/><b>[APP-071]</b></p>  | <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken to identify the likely significant effects of the Scheme on the environment.</p> <p>The western part of the Scheme is located within CBC. A description of the Scheme and its location are reported in Chapter 2, The Scheme of the Environmental Statement (ES) <b>[APP-071]</b>.</p> <p>This is considered an appropriate description of the Scheme.</p> | <p>CBC is content that the Scheme is adequately described in the ES.</p>  | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>November 2021</p> |
| <p><b>General</b><br/>Legislation and policy</p>    | <p>Chapter 5, Air quality <b>[APP-074]</b><br/>Chapter 6, Cultural heritage <b>[APP-075]</b><br/>Chapter 7, Landscape and visual effects <b>[APP-076]</b><br/>Chapter 8, Biodiversity <b>[APP-077]</b></p> | <p>National Highways considers that the ES has identified and appropriately considered all applicable legislation and policy pertaining to the following assessments undertaken as part of the EIA of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality.</li> <li>• Cultural heritage.</li> <li>• Landscape and visual effects.</li> <li>• Biodiversity.</li> <li>• Geology and soils.</li> </ul>       | <p>CBC is content that these assessments have considered all relevant legislation and policy that was in place at the time of undertaking.</p> <p><u>Matters discussed at an air quality and noise and vibration SOCG meeting with CBC on 23.07.2021</u></p> <p>Agreed for air quality and noise and vibration.</p> | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>December 2021</p> |



| Issue | Document Reference   | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position | Status | Date |
|-------|--|---|---------------------------------------|--------|------|
|       | <p>Chapter 9, Geology and soils [APP-078]</p> <p>Chapter 10, Material assets and waste [APP-079]</p> <p>Chapter 11, Noise and vibration [APP-080]</p> <p>Chapter 12, Population and human health [APP-081]</p> <p>Chapter 13, Road drainage and the water environment [APP-082]</p> <p>Chapter 14, Climate [APP-083]</p> <p>Chapter 15, Assessment of cumulative effects [APP-084]</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Material assets and waste.</li> <li>• Noise and vibration.</li> <li>• Population and human health.</li> <li>• Road drainage and the water environment.</li> <li>• Climate.</li> <li>• Assessment of cumulative effects.</li> </ul> |                                       |        |      |

| Issue   | Document Reference   | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date          |
|---|--|---|--|--------|---------------|
| <b>General</b><br>Study area definition and extents | Chapter 5, Air quality [APP-074]<br>Chapter 6, Cultural heritage [APP-075]<br>Chapter 7, Landscape and visual effects [APP-076]<br>Chapter 8, Biodiversity [APP-077]<br>Chapter 9, Geology and soils [APP-078]<br>Chapter 10, Material assets and waste [APP-079]<br>Chapter 11, Noise and vibration [APP-080]<br>Chapter 12, Population and human health [APP-081]<br>Chapter 13, Road drainage and the | <p>The study areas adopted by National Highways within the following assessments are considered to reflect current best practice and standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality.</li> <li>• Cultural heritage.</li> <li>• Landscape and visual effects.</li> <li>• Biodiversity.</li> <li>• Geology and soils.</li> <li>• Material assets and waste.</li> <li>• Noise and vibration.</li> <li>• Population and human health.</li> <li>• Road drainage and the water environment.</li> <li>• Climate.</li> <li>• Assessment of cumulative effects.</li> </ul> <p>National Highways considers that the geographical extents of the adopted study areas are appropriate to identify the likely direct and indirect effects of the Scheme on sensitive features and receptors.</p> | <p>CBC is content that the geographical extents of the adopted study areas cover the area over which direct and indirect effects of the Scheme are likely to occur.</p> <p><u>Matters discussed at an air quality and noise and vibration SOCG meeting with CBC on 23.07.2021</u></p> <p>Agreed for air quality and noise and vibration.</p> | Agreed | December 2021 |

| Issue  | Document Reference   | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status   | Date                 |
|--|--|---|--|--|----------------------|
|  | water environment<br><b>[APP-082]</b><br><br>Chapter 14,<br>Climate <b>[APP-083]</b><br><br>Chapter 15,<br>Assessment of<br>cumulative effects<br><b>[APP-084]</b>   |   |  |  |                      |
| <b>General</b><br><br>Application of<br>expert /<br>professional<br>judgements | Chapter 5, Air<br>quality <b>[APP-074]</b><br><br>Chapter 6, Cultural<br>heritage<br><b>[APP-075]</b><br><br>Chapter 7,<br>Landscape and<br>visual effects<br><b>[APP-076]</b><br><br>Chapter 8,<br>Biodiversity<br><b>[APP-077]</b><br><br>Chapter 9,<br>Geology and soils<br><b>[APP-078]</b><br><br>Chapter 10,<br>Material assets<br>and waste<br><b>[APP-079]</b> | <p>The identification of likely significant effects on sensitive features and receptors has been informed by professional judgement and the views of relevant technical specialists, where necessary.</p> <p>National Highways considers the application of professional judgement by its specialists within the following assessments to be appropriate and robust:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality.</li> <li>• Cultural heritage.</li> <li>• Landscape and visual effects.</li> <li>• Biodiversity.</li> <li>• Geology and soils.</li> <li>• Material assets and waste.</li> </ul> | <p>CBC is content with how National Highways has applied professional judgement in the assessments of effects on sensitive features and receptors undertaken and reported,</p> <p><u>Matters discussed at an air quality and noise and vibration SOCG meeting with CBC on 23.07.2021</u></p> <p>Not agreed for noise and vibration as CBC are not satisfied on the interpretation of the results.</p> <p>Not agreed for air quality as CBC are not satisfied on the interpretation of the results for Sandy.</p> | <p>Agreed for all topics apart from air quality and noise and vibration which is Not Agreed.</p> | <p>December 2021</p> |

| Issue | Document Reference  | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position | Status | Date |
|-------|---|---|---------------------------------------|--------|------|
|       | <p>Chapter 11, Noise and vibration [APP-080]</p> <p>Chapter 12, Population and human health [APP-081]</p> <p>Chapter 13, Road drainage and the water environment [APP-082]</p> <p>Chapter 14, Climate [APP-083]</p> <p>Chapter 15, Assessment of cumulative effects [APP-084]</p> <p>Joint Position Statement with CBC and National Highways on discussions regarding noise and mitigation measures [REP6-046], [REP9-020] and [TR010044/EXAM/9.86v3]</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise and vibration.</li> <li>• Population and human health.</li> <li>• Road drainage and the water environment.</li> <li>• Climate.</li> <li>• Assessment of cumulative effects.</li> </ul> <p>National Highways refers CBC to the discussions at meeting held on 24 November 2021 and under Agenda item 9 in Issue Specific Hearing 5 held on 1 December 2021, in which National Highways provided further clarification of the approach it has taken in considering measures to address the significant adverse operational noise effect identified at Rectory Farm, but not taken forward. National Highways has provided additional information as part of the 'Joint Position Statement with CBC and National Highways on discussions regarding noise and mitigation measures' [REP6-046] submitted at Deadline 6. This Joint Position Statement has been updated at Deadline 9 [REP9-020] and 10 of the Examination [TR010044/EXAM/9.86v3].</p> |                                       |        |      |

| Issue  | Document Reference   | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date          |
|--|--|---|--|--------|---------------|
|  |  | Refer to the position on 'Air Quality Construction and operational effects' regarding the effects at Sandy.   |  |        |               |
| <b>General</b><br>Assessment assumptions and limitations | Chapter 5, Air quality [APP-074]<br>Chapter 6, Cultural heritage [APP-075]<br>Chapter 7, Landscape and visual effects [APP-076]<br>Chapter 8, Biodiversity [APP-077]<br>Chapter 9, Geology and soils [APP-078]<br>Chapter 10, Material assets and waste [APP-079]<br>Chapter 11, Noise and vibration [APP-080]<br>Chapter 12, Population and | The following assessments record the assumptions applied and the approaches taken by National Highways to reduce any uncertainty resulting from any limitations encountered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality.</li> <li>• Cultural heritage.</li> <li>• Landscape and visual effects.</li> <li>• Biodiversity.</li> <li>• Geology and soils.</li> <li>• Material assets and waste.</li> <li>• Noise and vibration.</li> <li>• Population and human health.</li> <li>• Road drainage and the water environment.</li> <li>• Climate.</li> <li>• Assessment of cumulative effects.</li> </ul> National Highways considers the assumptions adopted in these | CBC is content that the assumptions recorded within these assessments are reasonable and accepts that the limitations encountered do not impact upon the validity of the reported findings.<br><br><u>Matters discussed at an air quality and noise and vibration SOCG meeting with CBC on 23.07.2021</u><br><br>Agreed for air quality and noise and vibration. | Agreed | December 2021 |

| Issue   | Document Reference   | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status        | Date                 |
|---|--|---|--|---------------|----------------------|
|   | <p>human health<br/><b>[APP-081]</b></p> <p>Chapter 13, Road drainage and the water environment<br/><b>[APP-082]</b></p> <p>Chapter 14, Climate <b>[APP-083]</b></p> <p>Chapter 15, Assessment of cumulative effects<br/><b>[APP-084]</b></p>  | <p>assessments to be reasonable and appropriate.</p>  |  |               |                      |
| <p><b>General</b></p> <p>Worst-case scenario: limits of deviation</p> | <p>Works Plans <b>[APP-009]</b><br/><b>[APP-010]</b></p> <p>Engineering Sections <b>[APP-017 to APP 022]</b></p> <p>Chapter 5, Air quality <b>[APP-074]</b></p> <p>Chapter 6, Cultural heritage <b>[APP-075]</b></p> <p>Chapter 7, Landscape and visual effects <b>[APP-076]</b></p> | <p>The following assessments have taken into account the lateral limits of deviation forming part of the Scheme design, as defined on the Works Plans <b>[APP-009]</b> <b>[APP-010]</b>, and the vertical limits of deviation defined on the Engineering Sections <b>[APP-017 to APP 022]</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality.</li> <li>• Cultural heritage.</li> <li>• Landscape and visual effects.</li> <li>• Biodiversity.</li> <li>• Geology and soils.</li> <li>• Material Assets and Waste.</li> </ul> | <p>CBC is content that these assessments have appropriately considered the worst-case scenario in relation to the potential for the Scheme design and/or its construction to deviate within the lateral and vertical extents defined on the Works Plans and Engineering Sections.</p> <p><u><a href="#">Matters discussed at an air quality and noise and vibration SOCG meeting with CBC on 23.07.2021</a></u></p> <p>Agreed for air quality and noise and vibration (for Black Cat end of Scheme).</p> | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>December 2021</p> |

| Issue | Document Reference  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position | Status | Date |
|-------|---|--|---------------------------------------|--------|------|
|       | <p>Chapter 8, Biodiversity [APP-077]</p> <p>Chapter 9, Geology and soils [APP-078]</p> <p>Chapter 10, Material assets and waste [APP-079]</p> <p>Chapter 11, Noise and vibration [APP-080]</p> <p>Chapter 12, Population and human health [APP-081]</p> <p>Chapter 13, Road drainage and the water environment [APP-082]</p> <p>Chapter 14, Climate [APP-083]</p> <p>Chapter 15, Assessment of cumulative effects [APP-084]</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise and Vibration.</li> <li>• Population and human health.</li> <li>• Road drainage and the water environment.</li> <li>• Climate.</li> <li>• Assessment of cumulative effects.</li> </ul> <p>National Highways considers that the maximum extents of possible deviation accounted for in these assessments represent the realistic worst-case assessment scenario.</p> |                                       |        |      |

| Issue                                     | Document Reference   | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status | Date          |
|---|--|---|---|--------|---------------|
| <b>General</b><br>Presentation of results | Chapter 5, Air quality [APP-074]<br>Chapter 6, Cultural heritage [APP-075]<br>Chapter 7, Landscape and visual effects [APP-076]<br>Chapter 8, Biodiversity [APP-077]<br>Chapter 9, Geology and soils [APP-078]<br>Chapter 10, Material assets and waste [APP-079]<br>Chapter 11, Noise and vibration [APP-080]<br>Chapter 12, Population and human health [APP-081]<br>Chapter 13, Road drainage and the | <p>The following application documents present the approaches to, and outcomes of, assessments undertaken to identify the likely significant effects of the construction, operational and (where relevant) the maintenance phases of the Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality.</li> <li>• Cultural heritage.</li> <li>• Landscape and visual effects.</li> <li>• Biodiversity.</li> <li>• Geology and soils.</li> <li>• Material Assets and Waste.</li> <li>• Noise and Vibration.</li> <li>• Population and human health.</li> <li>• Road drainage and the water environment.</li> <li>• Climate.</li> <li>• Assessment of cumulative effects.</li> </ul> <p>National Highways considers that the format and methods used to present the assessments undertaken are clear and unambiguous.</p> | <p>CBC is content with the formats and methods adopted by National Highways in presenting the details of the assessments undertaken.</p> <p><u>Matters discussed at an air quality and noise and vibration SOCG meeting with CBC on 23.07.2021</u></p> <p>Agreed for air quality and noise and vibration.</p> | Agreed | December 2021 |



| Issue  | Document Reference   | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status | Date              |
|--|--|---|---|--------|-------------------|
|  | water environment<br><b>[APP-082]</b><br><br>Chapter 14,<br>Climate <b>[APP-083]</b><br><br>Chapter 15,<br>Assessment of<br>cumulative effects<br><b>[APP-084]</b> |   |   |        |                   |
| <b>General</b><br><br>Route/junction<br>design selection | Chapter 2, The<br>Scheme <b>[APP-071]</b><br><br>Chapter 3,<br>Assessment of<br>Alternatives<br><b>[APP-072]</b>   | <p>National Highways has undertaken thorough and comprehensive route studies, junction appraisals and optioneering studies during the design-development of the Scheme, in pursuit of establishing its preferred design solution, as described in Chapter 2, The Scheme <b>[APP-071]</b> and Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives <b>[APP-072]</b> of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>In considering, evaluating and balancing constraints and opportunities, National Highways considers that the preliminary design of the new dual carriageway represents the optimum solution to meet the Scheme objectives.</p> | CBC is content that the studies, optioneering exercises and appraisals undertaken by National Highways are appropriate from a design perspective. | Agreed | September<br>2021 |

| Issue   | Document Reference   | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status  | Date              |
|---|--|--|---|---|-------------------|
| <p><b>General</b><br/>Approach to modelling</p> | <p>Chapter 5, Air quality [APP-074]<br/>Chapter 11, Noise and vibration [APP-080]<br/>Chapter 13, Road drainage and the water environment [APP-082]<br/>Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report [APP-252]<br/>Applicant's Comments on Deadline 6 Submissions, response to Rep6-091s [REP8-010]</p> | <p>Modelling of existing and future conditions and changes, and the effects and risks of the Scheme, has been undertaken as part of the Air quality, Noise and vibration and Road drainage and the water environment assessment.</p> <p>National Highways considers that the approaches to modelling are appropriate.</p> <p>The Saturn model is the appropriate model to use for the environmental (including air quality) work. This is because the air quality assessment covers a large area, where potential changes in traffic may occur. The SATURN model is a strategic transport model that provides national coverage with a more detailed focus on the area impacted by the Scheme. The spatial coverage is illustrated in Figure 3.2 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report [APP-252]. The VISSIM models were developed to provide a more detailed assessment of local areas, particularly with respect to assessing the detailed traffic and operational impacts of the Scheme.</p> | <p>CBC is content with the approaches applied to modelling existing and future conditions and changes, and the effects and risks of the Scheme, and that the parameters included/ considered in the modelling are appropriate.</p> <p><u>Matters discussed at an air quality and noise and vibration SOCG meeting with CBC on 23.07.202</u></p> <p>Agreed for air quality and noise and vibration except for air quality modelling at Sandy.</p> <p>For air quality modelling at Sandy, the Saturn model has been used for traffic data, but NH's highways/traffic advisors have advised that the VISSIM model is more accurate for this area that shows significantly greater traffic on the A1 adjacent to Carter Street, Sandy where 7 residential properties are exposed to increased pollution. This air quality assessment should be sensitivity tested using the traffic data from the VISSIM model.</p> | <p>Agreed except for air quality modelling for Sandy AQMA, which is not agreed.</p> | <p>09/12/2021</p> |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------|------|
|       |                    | <p>Given the localised coverage of the VISSIM models that are intended to model specific local junctions a full evaluation of air quality effects on sensitive receptors over a wider area using VISSIM models would not be possible. Additionally, the SATURN model includes traffic projections for the AM, inter peak and PM peak time periods. These can be factored to account for the full 24-hr period assessed for air quality. The VISSIM models only consider the AM and PM peak hours, which would be insufficient for the air quality assessment.</p> <p>In order to demonstrate the robustness of the SATURN on the A1 near Sandy, the modelled traffic flows were compared with the nearest available traffic monitoring site on the A1 to the south of Tempsford, just north of Sandy. The table below compares the modelled with the observed flows for the A1 south of the Tempsford Junction. This shows that modelled flows were all within 3% of observed flows across the 3 modelled time periods. This indicates a very good match</p> |                                       |        |      |

| Issue       | Document Reference | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position | Status | Date                    |                         |      |        |    |    |      |      |   |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |    |     |     |   |    |    |     |     |    |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |  |  |  |
|-------------|--------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------|--------|----|----|------|------|---|----|----|------|------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|---|----|----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|------|------|----|----|----|------|------|----|----|--|--|--|
|             |                    | <p>between modelled and observed flows.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Time Period</th> <th>Dir</th> <th>Observed Flows (veh/hr)</th> <th>Modelled Flows (veh/hr)</th> <th>Diff</th> <th>% Diff</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">AM</td> <td>NB</td> <td>1056</td> <td>1063</td> <td>7</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SB</td> <td>1032</td> <td>1046</td> <td>14</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">IP</td> <td>NB</td> <td>932</td> <td>937</td> <td>6</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SB</td> <td>906</td> <td>926</td> <td>20</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">PM</td> <td>NB</td> <td>1129</td> <td>1160</td> <td>30</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SB</td> <td>1033</td> <td>1047</td> <td>14</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>This is also addressed in the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 6 Submissions, response to Rep6-091s [REP8-010].</p> | Time Period                           | Dir    | Observed Flows (veh/hr) | Modelled Flows (veh/hr) | Diff | % Diff | AM | NB | 1056 | 1063 | 7 | 1% | SB | 1032 | 1046 | 14 | 1% | IP | NB | 932 | 937 | 6 | 1% | SB | 906 | 926 | 20 | 2% | PM | NB | 1129 | 1160 | 30 | 3% | SB | 1033 | 1047 | 14 | 1% |  |  |  |
| Time Period | Dir                | Observed Flows (veh/hr)   | Modelled Flows (veh/hr)               | Diff   | % Diff                  |                         |      |        |    |    |      |      |   |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |    |     |     |   |    |    |     |     |    |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |  |  |  |
| AM          | NB                 | 1056  | 1063                                  | 7      | 1%                      |                         |      |        |    |    |      |      |   |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |    |     |     |   |    |    |     |     |    |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |  |  |  |
|             | SB                 | 1032  | 1046                                  | 14     | 1%                      |                         |      |        |    |    |      |      |   |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |    |     |     |   |    |    |     |     |    |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |  |  |  |
| IP          | NB                 | 932   | 937                                   | 6      | 1%                      |                         |      |        |    |    |      |      |   |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |    |     |     |   |    |    |     |     |    |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |  |  |  |
|             | SB                 | 906   | 926                                   | 20     | 2%                      |                         |      |        |    |    |      |      |   |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |    |     |     |   |    |    |     |     |    |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |  |  |  |
| PM          | NB                 | 1129  | 1160                                  | 30     | 3%                      |                         |      |        |    |    |      |      |   |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |    |     |     |   |    |    |     |     |    |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |  |  |  |
|             | SB                 | 1033  | 1047                                  | 14     | 1%                      |                         |      |        |    |    |      |      |   |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |    |     |     |   |    |    |     |     |    |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |    |      |      |    |    |  |  |  |

| Issue  | Document Reference  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status            | Date                 |
|--|---|--|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| <p><b>Air Quality</b><br/>Data collection methods, baseline data and the identification and sensitivity of relevant features and receptors</p> | <p>Chapter 5, Air quality <b>[APP-074]</b></p>  | <p>The baseline conditions have been collated using desk-based and field-based techniques, and through consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>National Highways considers the scope, coverage and timing of surveys undertaken to establish the baseline conditions and sensitive features and receptors are in line with best practice and appropriate to inform the assessment of direct and indirect effects reported in Chapter 5, Air quality assessment <b>[APP-074]</b>.</p>  | <p>CBC is content that the scope and coverage of surveys undertaken to inform the assessment of air quality effects are sufficiently comprehensive.</p> <p><u>Matters discussed at an air quality and noise and vibration SOCG meeting with CBC on 23.07.2021</u></p> <p>Satisfied with use of data for air quality.</p> <p>See above comments regarding Sandy AQMA.</p>  | <p>Agreed</p>     | <p>23.07.2021</p>    |
| <p><b>Air Quality</b><br/>Construction and operational effects</p>   | <p>Chapter 5, Air quality <b>[APP-074]</b></p> <p>Applicant's Response to the Examining Authorities Third Written Questions (Q3.2.1.1) <b>[REP8-014]</b></p> <p>Sensitivity Test using 2020 Uncertainty Log Data <b>[APP-249]</b></p> | <p>The assessment has concluded that no significant effects associated with air pollution would occur through construction activities or as a consequence of traffic movements (emissions) on the road network.</p> <p>Using the traffic models and data generated for the Scheme, the air quality effects within the Sandy AQMA, as set out in Chapter 5, Air Quality <b>[APP-074]</b> of the Environmental Statement are predicted to be, at worst, imperceptible worsening, with some small improvements recorded. Predicted changes would be -0.7 to +0.2 µg/m<sup>3</sup> in annual mean NO<sub>2</sub>. An</p> | <p>The Applicant during its Air Quality Modelling (see Sensitivity Test using 2020 Uncertainty Log Data report <b>[APP-249]</b>) actually identified the potential for medium level impacts for the 7 properties that lie in the existing Sandy AQMA. However, because less than 30 properties are affected, they have simply classed this impact as "not significant". The size or scale of the impact is not the material factor as far as we are concerned – anything that likely to result in an adverse impact on the health of CBC residents at this highly sensitive location and is likely to counteract our fundamental efforts to</p> | <p>Not Agreed</p> | <p>December 2021</p> |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|--|---|--------|------|
|       |                    | <p>imperceptible change (&lt;1% of the objective value of 40µg/m<sup>3</sup>) is one so small as to not be measurable and is therefore not considered to be a worsening in air quality at these receptors. Changes of this magnitude would revert to pre-Scheme levels in less than 12 months post-Scheme opening. This is set out in more detail in the Applicant's Response to the Examining Authorities Third Written Questions (Q3.2.1.1) [REP8-014].</p> <p>These effects are not considered to be significant for air quality based on advice within the DMRB LA 105 air quality standard applied.</p> <p>As noted in the Open Floor Hearing held on 19 August 2021, a sensitivity test has also been undertaken for an update to the traffic uncertainty log. This assessment is presented in Sensitivity Test using 2020 Uncertainty Log Data [APP-249]. The purpose of the Sensitivity Test was to consider the potential impacts of updating the Uncertainty Log to determine whether design changes or further mitigation may be required. This involved comparing the traffic model forecasts using the 2020</p> | <p>improve air quality in the AQMA is not acceptable, particularly without mitigation measures to offset those adverse impacts.</p> <p>There is also a significant risk that NH's assessment under predicts the level of impact due to reliance on the Saturn model traffic data when NH is principally relying on the VISSIM model in this area that shows significantly greater traffic on the A1 in this area (see above).</p> |        |      |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--------|------|
|       |                    | <p>Uncertainty Log with the forecasts derived from the 2018 Uncertainty Log that were prepared for the assessment presented in the ES and associated documents. The Sensitivity Test concluded that the forecasts prepared using the 2018 and 2020 Uncertainty Logs were comparable and therefore the data used within the ES was considered robust. As such, the assessment presented in the ES is considered to represent the effects of the proposed Scheme.</p> <p>Even considering the Sensitivity Test, the effect on air quality due to the Scheme is not considered to be significant. Within the sensitivity test predictions only small (1-5% of the objective value) increases in annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations were predicted at 7 receptors within the Sandy AQMA. A small increase in annual mean concentrations at this number of receptors is not considered to be a significant adverse effect and therefore no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Regarding the VISSIM model please see text above regarding modelled</p> |                                       |        |      |

| Issue  | Document Reference  | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status     | Date          |
|--|---|---|---|------------|---------------|
|  |   | flows compared to measured baseline flows.  |   |            |               |
| <b>Air Quality</b><br>Construction and operational effects | National Highways' Response to Relevant Representations <b>[REP1-021]</b><br><br>EWR SOCG <b>[REP1-015]</b> | <p>Regarding cumulative air quality effects with the East West Rail (EWR) project, National Highways has responded on this matter in National Highways' Response to Relevant Representations <b>[REP1-021]</b> (see RR013au, RR-048au and RR-100au) submitted at Deadline 1. Furthermore, the East West Rail Company has confirmed in its draft Statement of Common Ground <b>[REP1-015]</b> that, at this stage, it is not considered that the EWR Project is a development that is of sufficient certainty to be relevant to the cumulative assessment for the A428 project.</p> <p>Cumulative effects with East West Rail were discussed in general at the meeting between National Highways and CBC held on 18/01/2022.</p> | <p>The Applicant has not factored in the cumulative impacts on Air Quality when combined with the EWR proposals. The Applicant needs to resolve this to ensure an accurate assessment of cumulative impacts to accompany the DCO application is reflected in its prediction of air quality impacts. The impacts on the Sandy AQMA are paramount in this respect, along with securing any necessary mitigation as a DCO requirement (or incorporated into documents listed in Schedule 2).</p> <p>At a meeting on 18/01/2022 between CBC and National Highways, CBC accepted that it fell to East West Rail to use the data from the Scheme to undertake a cumulative assessment as East West Rail progress their scheme through the consenting process.</p> | Agreed     | 18/01/2022    |
| <b>Air Quality</b><br>Embedded and essential mitigation    | Chapter 2, The Scheme <b>[APP-071]</b><br><br>Chapter 5, Air quality <b>[APP-074]</b>                       | National Highways considers that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The embedded mitigation measures mentioned in Chapter 2, The Scheme <b>[APP-071]</b></li> </ul>  | The Applicant has predicted an adverse impact on our Sandy AQMA but are not proposing to undertake any mitigation to counteract or offset   | Not Agreed | December 2021 |



| Issue | Document Reference   | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date |
|-------|--|--|--|--------|------|
|       | <p>Environmental Masterplan [APP-091] [REP9-037]</p> <p>First Iteration EMP [APP-234]</p> <p><u>V4</u><br/>[TR010044/APP/6.8v4]</p> <p>Schedule of mitigation [APP-235]</p> <p>Applicant's response to CBC's Local Impact Report [REP3-009]</p> <p>Applicant's Response to the Relevant Representation [REP1-021]</p> <p>Applicant's response to responses to ExA's 2WQ [REP5-015]</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The essential mitigation measures set out in the First Iteration EMP [APP-234] [TR010044/APP/6.8v4] are appropriate to avoid, prevent, reduce, manage, control and (where necessary) monitor the adverse effects of the Scheme.</li> </ul> <p>As set out in the Applicant's response to CBC's Local Impact Report [REP3-009], National Highways resources include a dedicated customer team who will work with the local authorities to ensure complaints are managed in a timely and effective manner. They will also provide a direct means of contact with the team and will not rely on meetings as the only means of interaction and collaboration. Frequency of meetings will be agreed in consultation with each local authority. However, we expect customer interaction may fluctuate and have the means to adjust resources according to demand. National Highways is committed to regular and timely communications regarding customer complaints and recognises resource concerns raised by CBC within the Joint position</p> | <p>that, and this should be incorporated into the draft DCO requirements.</p> <p>CBC's experience is that the failure in site dust controls that give rise to complaints tend to be because of poor implementation and management controls. Again, Annex A [APP-234] and the associated tables set out a number of management measures that will be implemented to ensure dust controls are effective and we are encouraged by this.</p> <p>Whilst the measures include a website where residents can report complaints, our experience is that residents prefer to complain to their Local Authority rather than the source of the problem. Therefore, close liaison and contact details for relevant Site Managers or other Senior Officials will need to be clearly established to deal with issues as and when they arise. Table A-3 of the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan [APP-234] says that "<i>Regular liaison would be undertaken with the relevant local authorities, this would include discussing any complaints that had been received.</i>" However</p> |        |      |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|---|--|--------|------|
|       |                    | <p>statement with National Highways . Therefore, the Applicant has suggested discussions should be held to agree the frequency of meetings. Contact details for key members of the project team will be provided to all Local Authorities including those of the dedicated Customer liaison team.</p> <p>As set out in the Applicant's response to CBC's Local Impact Report [REP3-009, response to REP2-004g] and as described in the Applicant's Response to the Relevant Representation [REP1-021], under [RR-016], using the traffic models and data generated for the Scheme, the air quality effects within the Sandy Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) are predicted to be, at worst, imperceptible worsening's, with some small improvements. These predicted effects of the Scheme are not considered to be significant for air quality based on advice within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 air quality standard applied. As such, no mitigation is required to manage air</p> | <p>regular is not defined and CBC requests greater clarity and confirmation of close liaison and contact involved in the document.</p> <p>CBC have produced an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) in order to improve air quality in the AQMA. We would contend that rather than offering no mitigation to offset the adverse impacts that they have identified as a result of this project, National Highways could use this as a starting point to identify a range of mitigation measures that could be reasonably implemented. Measures are included in CBC's written representation.</p> <p>Given the existing duties on National Highways to protect air quality, CBC are surprised and disappointed at the refusal to engage and explore further options to protect the declared AQMA and prevent an adverse impact on the AQMA and local residents.</p> <p><u>Matters discussed at an air quality and noise and vibration SOCG meeting with CBC on 23.07.2021</u></p> <p>Not agreed as above and because CBC do not think effects on Sandy</p> |        |      |

| Issue   | Document Reference                            | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status                      | Date                                |
|---|---|---|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
|   |   | <p>quality effects associated with the Scheme.</p> <p>As set out in the Applicant's response to responses to ExA's 2WQ [REP5-015], the Applicant has engaged with CBC to consider options for the management of the AQMA. National Highways will continue to engage with CBC to discuss the AQMA and review the Councils AQAP measures although, for the reasons given above (i.e. no mitigation is required to manage air quality effects associated with the Scheme), this would be undertaken outside of the DCO process. National Highways will arrange a meeting with CBC to discuss the Sandy AQMA.</p> | <p>AQMA have been avoided or mitigated.</p> <p>CBC Agreed with embedded mitigation at Black Cat roundabout.</p> <p>CBC Agreed with construction dust mitigation (essential mitigation).</p>  | <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> | <p>23/07/2021</p> <p>23/07/2021</p> |
| <p><b>Cultural Heritage</b></p> <p>Data collection methods, baseline data and the identification and sensitivity of relevant features and receptors</p> | <p>Chapter 6, Cultural heritage [APP-075]</p> | <p>The baseline conditions have been collated using desk-based and field-based techniques, and through consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>National Highways considers the scope, coverage and timing of surveys undertaken to establish the baseline conditions and sensitive features and receptors are in line with best practice and appropriate to inform the assessment of direct and</p>  | <p><u>Matters discussed at an SOCG meeting with CBC on 22.06.2021</u></p> <p>CBC is content with the scope, coverage and findings of the data collection and surveys undertaken inform the assessment of effects on the identified sensitive features and receptors.</p> | <p>Agreed</p>               | <p>June 2021</p>                    |

| Issue  | Document Reference                     | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status | Date      |
|--|--|---|---|--------|-----------|
|  |  | indirect effects reported in Chapter 6, Cultural heritage assessment [APP-075].   |   |        |           |
| <b>Cultural Heritage</b><br>Construction and operational effects | Chapter 6, Cultural heritage [APP-075] | <p>The cultural heritage assessment has concluded that construction of the Scheme would result in significant adverse effects of either moderate or large significance on the assets listed in Table 6-6 of Chapter 6, Cultural Heritage [APP-075].</p> <p>All other assets identified and assessed would experience either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slight adverse effects (not significant).</li> <li>• Neutral effects (not significant).</li> <li>• Slight beneficial effects (not significant).</li> </ul> <p>The cultural heritage assessment has concluded that construction of the Scheme would result in less than substantial harm on all assets within CBC listed in Table 6-6 of Chapter 6, Cultural Heritage [APP-075].</p> <p>The operational assessment would not result in any significant adverse effects on the assets identified within Chapter 6, Cultural Heritage [APP-075].</p> | <p><u>Matters discussed at an SOCG meeting with CBC on 22.06.2021</u></p> <p>CBC agrees with the conclusions of the cultural heritage assessment.</p> | Agreed | June 2021 |

| Issue   | Document Reference  | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status         | Date                 |
|---|---|---|---|----------------|----------------------|
| <p><b>Cultural Heritage</b><br/>Embedded and essential mitigation</p> | <p>Chapter 2, The Scheme [APP-071]<br/>Archaeology Mitigation Strategy [APP-238]<br/>First Iteration EMP [APP-234]<br/><u>V4</u> [TR010044/APP/6.8v4]<br/>Schedule of mitigation [APP-235]<br/>Updated Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [REP3-010] [REP4-030] [REP4-031] [TR010044/EXAM/9.23v3]</p> | <p>National Highways considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The embedded mitigation measures within Chapter 2, The Scheme [APP-075].</li> <li>The essential mitigation measures set out in the First Iteration EMP [APP-234] [TR010044/APP/6.8v4] and the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [APP-238]</li> </ul> <p>are appropriate to avoid, prevent, reduce, manage, control and (where necessary) monitor the adverse effects of the Scheme during its construction and operation.</p> <p>National Highways' Updated Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [REP3-010] [REP4-030] [REP4-031] [TR010044/EXAM/9.23v3] submitted at Deadlines 3, 4 and 10 of the Examination sets out the mitigation measures that would be implemented to reduce the adverse effects of the Scheme on archaeological and built heritage resources.</p> <p>This approach is considered acceptable in order to provide the appropriate mitigation for the</p> | <p>The Applicant is in possession of our comments on the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [APP-238].</p> <p><u>Matters raised within CBC's Relevant Representation</u></p> <p>CBC is aware that there is a need to design a robust and consistent mitigation strategy whether carried out as Advanced Works/Enabling Works or Main Works.</p> | <p>Agreed.</p> | <p>December 2021</p> |

| Issue   | Document Reference                                | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status | Date           |
|---|---|---|---|--------|----------------|
|   |   | archaeological and built heritage resources.  |   |        |                |
| <b>Landscape and visual effects</b><br>Data collection methods, baseline data and the identification and sensitivity of relevant features and receptors | Chapter 7, Landscape and visual effects [APP-076] | <p>The baseline conditions have been collated using desk-based and field-based techniques, and through consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>National Highways considers the scope, coverage and timing of surveys undertaken to establish the baseline conditions and sensitive features and receptors are in line with best practice and appropriate to inform the assessment of direct and indirect effects reported in Chapter 7, Landscape and visual effects assessment [APP-076].</p> | CBC is content that the scope and coverage of surveys undertaken as part of the assessment are sufficiently comprehensive to identify the likely effects of the Scheme on landscape character and visual amenity. | Agreed | September 2021 |
| <b>Landscape and visual effects</b><br>Construction and operational effects   | Chapter 7, Landscape and visual effects [APP-076] | <p>The assessment has concluded that the Scheme would result in significant adverse effects on areas of local landscape character, and on visual receptors afforded views of the landscape from locations including residential properties, local roads and PRoW.</p> <p>The assessment has concluded that the Scheme would not result in significant adverse effects on sites designated for the landscape value or importance.</p>  | CBC is content with the conclusions of the assessment and the significance of the reported effects.   | Agreed | September 2021 |

| Issue  | Document Reference   | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status        | Date                  |
|--|--|---|--|---------------|-----------------------|
| <p><b>Landscape and visual effects</b></p> <p>Embedded and essential mitigation</p>  | <p>Chapter 2, The Scheme [APP-071]</p> <p>Chapter 7, Landscape and visual effects [APP-076]</p> <p>Environmental Masterplan [APP-091] [REP9-037]</p> <p>First Iteration EMP [APP-234]</p> <p>V4 [TR010044/APP/6.8v4]</p> <p>Schedule of Mitigation [APP-235]</p> | <p>National Highways considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The embedded mitigation measures illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan [APP-091] [REP9-037].</li> <li>The essential mitigation measures set out in the First Iteration EMP [APP-234] [TR010044/APP/6.8v4]</li> </ul> <p>are appropriate to avoid, prevent, reduce, manage, control and (where necessary) monitor the adverse effects of the Scheme during its construction and operation.</p> | <p>CBC is content with the form, nature and extent of the embedded mitigation measures incorporated into the design of the Scheme, and the essential mitigation measures that would be implemented during construction of the Scheme, including associated monitoring.</p> | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>September 2021</p> |
| <p><b>Biodiversity</b></p> <p>Data collection methods, baseline data and the identification and sensitivity of relevant features and receptors</p> | <p>Chapter 8, Biodiversity [APP-077]</p>   | <p>The baseline conditions have been collated using desk-based and field-based techniques, and through consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>National Highways considers the scope, coverage and timing of surveys undertaken to establish the baseline conditions and sensitive features and receptors are in line</p>  | <p><u>Matters discussed at an SOCG meeting with CBC on 23.06.2021</u></p> <p>CBC is content with the scope, coverage and findings of habitat and species surveys undertaken as part of the assessment, including species which were scoped out of the</p>                  | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>June 2021</p>      |

| Issue   | Document Reference                       | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status        | Date             |
|---|--|---|---|---------------|------------------|
|   |  | <p>with best practice and appropriate to inform the assessment of direct and indirect effects reported in Chapter 8, Biodiversity assessment [APP-077].</p> <p>As certain surveys undertaken within the assessment were constrained or limited by factors including land access restrictions, National Highways has shared information with CBC regarding the scope, timing and coverage of surveys it plans to undertake during 2021, and prior to the commencement of construction of the Scheme.</p> | <p>assessment (as described in Chapter 8, Biodiversity [APP-077]).</p> <p>CBC is in agreement with those surveys undertaken during 2021 by National Highways, and those planned prior to construction of the Scheme in 2022, and considers these adequate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supplement desk-based surveys and field surveys undertaken between the period 2016 – 2020.</li> <li>• Update existing baseline information for habitats, species and designated sites gathered during the assessment (so that information remains current).</li> <li>• Inform applications for protected species licenses.</li> <li>• Inform the design-development of embedded and essential mitigation measures identified within the assessment.</li> </ul> |               |                  |
| <p><b>Biodiversity</b><br/>Construction and operational effects</p> | <p>Chapter 8, Biodiversity [APP-077]</p> | <p>The biodiversity assessment [APP-077] has identified that adverse and beneficial effects on habitats, species and designated sites would result from construction and operation of the Scheme;</p>   | <p><u>Matters discussed at an SOCG meeting with CBC on 23.06.2021</u></p> <p>CBC is content with the conclusions of the assessment and the significance of the reported effects.</p>  | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>June 2021</p> |



| Issue  | Document Reference  | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status        | Date             |
|--|---|---|---|---------------|------------------|
|  |   | <p>however, none of these effects would be significant.</p> <p>National Highways considers that the assessment findings accurately reflect the likely effects of the Scheme.</p>  |   |               |                  |
| <p><b>Biodiversity</b><br/>Embedded and essential mitigation</p> | <p>Chapter 2, The Scheme [APP-071]<br/>Chapter 8, Biodiversity [APP-077]<br/>First Iteration EMP [APP-234]<br/>V4 [TR010044/APP/6.8v4]<br/>Schedule of Mitigation [APP-235]<br/>Environmental Masterplan [APP-091] [REP9-037]<br/>Biodiversity Pre-commencement</p> | <p>National Highways considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The embedded mitigation measures illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan [APP-091] [REP9-037].</li> <li>The essential mitigation measures set out in the First Iteration EMP [APP-234] [TR010044/APP/6.8v4] and Biodiversity Pre-commencement Plan [APP-239] [REP8-004]</li> </ul> <p>are appropriate to avoid, prevent, reduce, manage, control and (where necessary) monitor the adverse effects of the Scheme on habitats, species and designated sites during its construction and operation.</p> | <p><u>Matters discussed at an SOCG meeting with CBC on 23.06.2021</u></p> <p>CBC agree with the biodiversity mitigation proposed as part of the Scheme.</p> | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>June 2021</p> |

| Issue  | Document Reference   | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status | Date      |
|--|--|--|---|--------|-----------|
|  | Plan [APP-239]<br>[REP8-004]   |  |   |        |           |
| <b>Biodiversity</b><br>Biodiversity net gain | Appendix 8.19 [APP-206]<br>Biodiversity Net Gain Metric 2.0 [REP3-012]<br>[REP3-013] | <p>Although the achievement of a net gain in biodiversity is not a requirement for nationally significant infrastructure projects, National Highways has sought to achieve an increase in biodiversity through the environmental measures incorporated into the design of the Scheme, as set out in Natural England's advice appended to the Scoping Opinion [APP-231].</p> <p>Using National Highways' Biodiversity Net Gain metric, a net gain of 20.5% across the Scheme has been calculated, when compared to the baseline conditions, as reported in Appendix 8.19 [APP-206].</p> <p>The calculation of biodiversity net gain also took account of Breedon Quarry being fully restored by the time of Scheme construction commencing.</p> <p>National Highways considers that the methods used to calculate biodiversity net gain are appropriate for the Scheme.</p> | <p><u>Matters discussed at an SOCG meeting with CBC on 23.06.2021</u></p> <p>CBC agreed with this position in a meeting in June 2021.</p> | Agreed | June 2021 |

| Issue   | Document Reference  | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status        | Date                  |
|---|---|---|--|---------------|-----------------------|
| <p><b>Geology and Soils</b></p> <p>Data collection methods, baseline data and the identification and sensitivity of relevant features and receptors</p> | <p>Chapter 9, Geology and soils [APP-078]</p> <p>Agricultural Technical Note – Soils and Agricultural Land Classification [REP6-029] [REP9-018]</p> | <p>The baseline conditions relating to geology and soils have been collated using desk-based information sources, and through consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>National Highways considers the scope, coverage and timing of surveys undertaken to establish the baseline conditions and sensitive features and receptors are in line with best practice, and are appropriate to inform the assessment of direct and indirect effects reported in Chapter 9, Geology and Soils assessment [APP-078].</p> <p>Due to Covid-19 restrictions in 2020/2021, it was not possible for National Highways to undertake sampling in the field to verify existing soil grades and profiles. Accordingly, the assessment has relied upon published information regarding soil grades and their distribution at a regional scale.</p> <p>National Highways undertook this sampling to confirm existing soil conditions in mid-2021, and used the information gathered to verify the conclusions of its assessment of the</p> | <p>CBC acknowledges the Covid-19 limitations placed on undertaking soil sampling, and is content that it was appropriate for National Highways to base its assessment of the effects of the Scheme on best and most versatile agricultural land on published data.</p> | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>September 2021</p> |

| Issue  | Document Reference  | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date           |
|--|---|---|--|--------|----------------|
|  |   | likely effects on best and most versatile agricultural soils and its proposed mitigation measures. A report detailing the survey findings was submitted to the Examination at Deadline 6 [REP6-029] and Deadline 9 [REP9-018].  |  |        |                |
| <b>Geology and Soils</b><br><br>Construction and operational effects | Chapter 9, Geology and soils [APP-078]  | <p>The assessment has concluded that the Scheme would not result in any significant adverse effects on locally or regionally important geological sites.</p> <p>Construction of the Scheme would result in significant adverse effects on areas of land mapped as best and most versatile at a regional scale, these being associated with the permanent loss of agricultural land.</p> | CBC is content with the conclusions of the assessment and the significance of the reported effects.  | Agreed | September 2021 |
| <b>Geology and Soils</b><br><br>Embedded and essential mitigation    | Chapter 2, The Scheme [APP-071]<br><br>Chapter 9, Geology and soils [APP-078]<br><br>Environmental Masterplan | <p>National Highways considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The embedded mitigation measures illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan [APP-091] [REP9-037] and in Chapter 2, The Scheme [APP-071].</li> <li>The essential mitigation measures set out in the First</li> </ul>  | CBC is content with the form and nature of the embedded and essential mitigation measures that would be implemented during construction of the Scheme. | Agreed | September 2021 |

| Issue   | Document Reference  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status        | Date                  |
|---|---|--|---|---------------|-----------------------|
|   | <p>[APP-091]<br/>~[REP9-037]</p> <p>First Iteration EMP [APP-234]<br/>V4<br/>[TR010044/APP/6.8v4]</p> <p>Schedule of mitigation [APP-235]</p> | <p>Iteration EMP [APP-234]<br/>[TR010044/APP/6.8v4]</p> <p>are appropriate to avoid, prevent, reduce, manage, control and (where necessary) monitor the adverse effects of the Scheme during its construction and operation.</p>   |   |               |                       |
| <p><b>Material Assets and Waste</b></p> <p>Data collection methods, baseline data and the identification and sensitivity of relevant features and receptors</p> | <p>Chapter 10, Material assets and waste [APP-079]</p>  | <p>The baseline conditions have been collated from a variety of sources including desk-based and input from consultees, and are reported in Chapter 10, Material assets and waste [APP-079].</p> <p>The baseline information collected is appropriate for this Scheme.</p> | <p>CBC is content that the scope of the assessment is sufficiently comprehensive to identify the likely effects of the Scheme on material assets and waste.</p> | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>September 2021</p> |
| <p><b>Material Assets and Waste</b></p> <p>Construction and operational effects</p>   | <p>Chapter 10, Material assets and waste [APP-079]</p>  | <p>The material assets and waste assessment concluded no significant effects in the construction and operation of the Scheme.</p>  | <p>CBC is content with the conclusions of the assessment and the significance of the reported effects.</p>  | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>September 2021</p> |

| Issue   | Document Reference  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status        | Date                  |
|---|---|--|--|---------------|-----------------------|
| <p><b>Material Assets and Waste</b></p> <p>Embedded and essential mitigation</p>  | <p>Chapter 2, The Scheme [APP-071]</p> <p>Chapter 10, Material assets and waste [APP-079]</p> <p>Environmental Masterplan [APP-091] [REP9-037]</p> <p>First Iteration EMP [APP-234] V4 [TR010044/APP/6.8v4]</p> <p>Schedule of mitigation [APP-235]</p> | <p>National Highways considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The embedded mitigation measures illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan [APP-091] [REP9-037] and in Chapter 2, The Scheme [APP-071].</li> <li>The essential mitigation measures set out in the First Iteration EMP [APP-234] [TR010044/APP/6.8v4]</li> </ul> <p>are appropriate to avoid, prevent, reduce, manage, control and (where necessary) monitor the adverse effects of the Scheme during its construction and operation.</p> | <p>CBC is content with the form, nature and extent of the embedded mitigation measures incorporated into the design of the Scheme, and the essential mitigation measures that would be implemented during construction of the Scheme.</p>  | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>September 2021</p> |
| <p><b>Noise and vibration</b></p> <p>Data collection methods, baseline data and the identification and sensitivity of</p> | <p>Chapter 11, Noise and vibration [APP-080]</p> <p>Responses to the ExA's Second Written Questions (WQ2) [REP4-062]</p>  | <p>The baseline conditions have been collated using desk-based and field-based techniques, and through consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>National Highways considers the scope, coverage and timing of surveys undertaken to establish the baseline conditions and sensitive features and receptors are in line</p>   | <p>Further baseline monitoring was due to be carried out but "postponed" due to the impacts of Covid 19. CBC has now been advised that this further monitoring will not be taking place but are unclear as to the justification for this, as there was clearly an identified need for the further monitoring in the first place. The</p> | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>November 2021</p>  |

| Issue  | Document Reference  | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status     | Date          |
|--|---|---|---|------------|---------------|
| relevant features and receptors  | National Highways response to actions arising from Issue Specific Hearing 2 [REP3-019]  | <p>with best practice and appropriate to inform the assessment of direct and indirect effects reported in Chapter 11, Noise and vibration assessment [APP-080].</p> <p>The results of the baseline noise survey have been used to support a validation exercise for the traffic noise prediction modelling.</p> <p>National Highways refers CBC to Appendix B of National Highways response to actions arising from Issue Specific Hearing 2 [REP3-019] held on 23 September 2021 provides further details of the baseline noise data review, which concluded that the 2017 data used in the assessment of Noise and Vibration [APP-080] is sufficient.</p> | <p>justification is requested from National Highways.</p> <p>CBC accept the rationale for National Highways not undertaking further monitoring as per the response to the second round of written questions (Q2.16.1.2) [REP4-062]</p>  |            |               |
| <b>Noise and vibration</b><br><br>Construction and operational effects | Chapter 11, Noise and vibration [APP-080]<br><br>Joint Position Statement with CBC and National Highways on discussions regarding noise and mitigation measures | <p>A thorough noise and vibration assessment has been undertaken for the construction and operation of the Scheme. The noise and vibration assessment concluded several significant effects in the construction and operational periods of the Scheme as described in Chapter 11, Noise and vibration [APP-080].</p> <p>The working hours as defined within Requirement 19 of the dDCO, will be</p>   | <p><u>CBC's review of SOCG at D1 and D4 of the Examination</u></p> <p>CBC are concerned about the level of construction noise impact given the duration of the construction project. The proposed hours of work are outside those that we allow for construction sites in Central Bedfordshire, i.e. starting before 8am. CBC would normally allow 8am to 6pm Monday to Fridays, 8am to</p> | Not Agreed | February 2022 |

| Issue | Document Reference   | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date |
|-------|--|---|--|--------|------|
|       | <p><b>[REP6-046], [REP9-020] and [TR010044/EXAM/9.86v3]</b></p> <p>9.93 Applicant's Comments on Deadline 6 Submissions <b>[REP8-010]</b></p> | <p>adhered to throughout Scheme construction. The following amendments to Requirement 19 (2) have been proposed following a meeting held with Cambridgeshire authorities on 11 January 2022:</p> <p>(I) deleting 'including but not' from Requirement 19 (2)</p> <p>(ii) sub clauses (k), (m), (n), and (o) would require agreement with the relevant local authority in advance of works described in these sub clauses taking place</p> <p>These proposals are set out in response to REP6-058ai on page 38 of REP8-010. These changes will be reflected in the draft DCO to be submitted at Deadline 10.</p> <p>National Highways does not accept that it is necessary to change the core working hours as set out in Chapter 2, The Scheme <b>[APP-071]</b> of the Environmental Statement, as these time periods are required in order to deliver the Scheme within the overall construction programme. A consequence of a change to the core working hours would be an extension to the construction programme. However, National</p> | <p>1pm on Saturdays and no working on Sundays or Bank Holidays. However, in view of the size and scale of the project, CBC would consider it would be appropriate to allow variation to these hours where particular circumstances required this and appropriate mitigation measures were in place and requests the draft DCO requirements to be updated in this respect. For such a major project, it will be essential to ensure that any noise impacts are robustly controlled in accordance with the provisions of BS5228:2009 Parts 1 &amp; 2 at all times and that this is a requirement of the draft DCO.</p> <p>CBC's concern for this phase of the project relate to the identification of significant adverse daytime and night-time noise impacts on a small number of receptors in our area who will see noise levels as a result of the new road scheme increase by around 9dB. The project team are not proposing any further mitigation beyond the embedded mitigation measures already identified to try and address these significant adverse impacts i.e. therefore the +9dB increase will be present even</p> |        |      |



| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status     | Date         |
|-------|--------------------|--|---|------------|--------------|
|       |                    | <p>Highways is willing to engage in discussions with CBC so that agreements can be sought when working close to sensitive locations, such as residential properties, or where there are specific activities, such as during school exams, where noise from construction could potentially be minimised. Where appropriate, discussions will be held with CBC on these matters during the detailed design stage where mitigation can be discussed in more detail. This engagement will be secured in the next revision to the First Iteration Environmental Management Plan [APP-234] [TR010044/APP/6.8v4].</p> <p>None of the properties specifically identified by CBC are predicted to experience an increase in traffic noise which results in traffic noise levels above the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL), and thus do not experience significant adverse effects in terms of the policy aims set in Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) and National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN).</p> | <p>with the embedded mitigation in place. The report states that noise bunds and barriers have been considered, but these have been discounted either because they are not considered to be effective or on cost grounds. We would contend that these are not the only mitigation measures that could or should be considered.</p> <p>Not agreed with operational effects at receptors R16, R17 and R18. Having reviewed the additional information provided by National Highways, it is clear that receptors at Rectory Farm are likely to see ambient noise levels increase by between 10.8 and 14.5dB (daytime) and by 9.3 to 10.7dB (night-time) on two of the residential facades. In both cases, this is a Major increase under the DMRB assessment methodology and is likely to impact on the amenity and quality of life of residents at this location. Although National Highways have pointed out that LA<sub>max</sub> values are not considered under the DMRB methodology, the reality is that such a substantial increase in ambient noise levels as a result of a single source is likely to have a consequent impact on LA<sub>max</sub>.</p> | Not Agreed | February2022 |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|--|--|--------|------|
|       |                    | <p>The predicted traffic noise levels at these properties are fairly low, with isolated properties being generally around the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL). Therefore, although these are not significant in terms of policy, NPSNN still requires mitigation to minimise levels to be considered, within the context of sustainable development.</p> <p>National Highways refers CBC to its response to section 10.3 of REP1-055h [REP3-008] which confirms that mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design of the Scheme to minimise adverse operational traffic noise effects due to the Scheme, however, some residual adverse effects will remain. This is acceptable within the context of sustainable development as factors other than solely noise must also be considered. The responses also sets out the noise mitigation measures it has considered to reduce the magnitude of predicted operational noise increases due to the Scheme at residential properties within the CBC area. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 and 2 The Barns, Little Barford Road</li> </ul> | <p>values from that source (e.g. from a loud motorbike or vehicle pass-by), which are considered to be relevant for night-time sleep disturbance under WHO Community Noise Guidelines (1999) and BS8233:2014. Again, we would contend that this is an adverse impact result for those receptors in particular.</p> <p>CBC requested further details from National Highways on what the actual predicted operational noise levels for the road scheme will be for the project at Receptors R16, 17 &amp; 18 that fall within Central Bedfordshire which were provided on 2 September 2021 (day time levels) and 5 October 2021 (night time levels).</p> |        |      |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--------|------|
|       |                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rectory Farm, Little Barford Road</li> <li>• Hill Farm, Station Road, Tempsford</li> </ul> <p>National Highways refers CBC to the discussions at meeting held on 24 November 2021 and under Agenda item 9 in Issue Specific Hearing 5 held on 1 December 2021, in which National Highways provided further clarification of the measures considered to address the significant adverse operational noise effect identified at Rectory Farm, but not taken forward. National Highways has provided additional information as part of the 'Joint Position Statement with CBC and National Highways on discussions regarding noise and mitigation measures [REP6-046] submitted at Deadline 6. and [REP9-020] submitted at Deadline 9. This Joint Position Statement has been updated at Deadline 10 of the Examination [TR010044/EXAM/9.86v3].</p> |                                       |        |      |



| Issue | Document Reference     | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position | Status | Date |
|-------|------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--------|------|
|       | [TR010044/EXAM/9.86v3] | <p>detailed design stage to ensure Best Practicable Means have been adopted.</p> <p>National Highways refers CBC to its response to section 10.3 of REP1-055h [REP3-008] which sets out the noise mitigation measures it has considered to reduce the magnitude of predicted operational noise increases due to the Scheme at residential properties within the CBC area. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 and 2 The Barns, Little Barford Road</li> <li>• Rectory Farm, Little Barford Road</li> <li>• Hill Farm, Station Road, Tempsford</li> </ul> <p>This response also notes that National Highways considers its approach to identifying operational noise mitigation measures is robust. To summarise, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design of the Scheme to minimise adverse operational traffic noise effects due to the Scheme, however, some residual adverse effects will remain. This is acceptable within the context of sustainable development</p> |                                       |        |      |

| Issue   | Document Reference                                       | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status        | Date                  |
|---|--|---|---|---------------|-----------------------|
|   |  | <p>as factors other than solely noise must also be considered.</p> <p>National Highways refers CBC to the discussions at meeting held on 24 November 2021 and under Agenda item 9 in Issue Specific Hearing 5 held on 1 December 2021, in which National Highways provided further clarification of the measures considered to address the significant adverse operational noise effect identified at Rectory Farm, but not taken forward. National Highways has provided additional information as part of the 'Joint Position Statement with CBC and NH on discussions regarding noise and mitigation measures' [REP6-046] submitted at Deadline 6, [REP9-020] submitted at Deadline 9. This Joint Position Statement has been updated at Deadline 10 [TR010044/EXAM/9.86v3].</p> |   |               |                       |
| <p><b>Population and Human Health</b></p> <p>Data collection methods, baseline data and the identification and sensitivity of</p> | <p>Chapter 12, Population and human health [APP-081]</p> | <p>The baseline conditions have been collated using desk-based and field-based techniques, and through consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>National Highways considers the scope, coverage and timing of surveys undertaken to establish the</p>   | <p>CBC is content that the scope and coverage of surveys undertaken as part of the assessment are sufficiently comprehensive to identify the likely effects of the Scheme on PRow and recreational users.</p> | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>September 2021</p> |

| Issue  | Document Reference   | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status | Date           |
|--|--|--|---|--------|----------------|
| relevant features and receptors  |  | baseline conditions and sensitive features and receptors (e.g. effects on users of the existing PRow network, and recreational users of the River Great Ouse) are in line with best practice and appropriate to inform the assessment of direct and indirect effects reported in Chapter 12, Population and human health assessment <b>[APP-081]</b> .   |   |        |                |
| <b>Population and Human Health</b><br>Construction and operational effects | Chapter 12, Population and human health <b>[APP-081]</b>             | <p>The population and human health assessment concluded one significant effect in the construction period as a result of the Scheme within CBC. This relates to a temporary moderate adverse effect upon recreational users of the River Great Ouse due to closure during construction. This is reported in Chapter 12, Population and human health <b>[APP-081]</b>.</p> <p>No significant effects were reported for the operation of the Scheme.</p> | CBC is content with the conclusions of the assessment and the significance of the reported effects.   | Agreed | September 2021 |
| <b>Population and Human Health</b><br>Embedded and essential mitigation    | Chapter 2, The Scheme <b>[APP-071]</b><br>Chapter 12, Population and | The embedded mitigation measures illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan <b>[APP-091]</b> <b>[REP9-037]</b> are considered appropriate to avoid, prevent or reduce the adverse   | CBC is content with the form, nature and extent of the embedded mitigation measures incorporated into the design of the Scheme, and the essential mitigation measures | Agreed | September 2021 |

| Issue   | Document Reference   | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status        | Date                  |
|---|--|---|---|---------------|-----------------------|
|   | <p>human health<br/>[APP-081]</p> <p>Environmental Masterplan<br/>[APP-091]<br/>[REP9-037]</p> <p>First Iteration EMP<br/>[APP-234]</p> <p>V4<br/>[TR010044/APP/6.8v4]</p> <p>Schedule of Mitigation<br/>[APP-235]</p> | <p>effects of the Scheme on PRoW and recreational users in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintaining connectivity between existing routes, roads and communities.</li> <li>Providing safe crossing provision over the new dual carriageway.</li> </ul> <p>The essential mitigation measures set out in the First Iteration EMP [APP-234] [TR010044/APP/6.8v4] are considered appropriate to manage and control the adverse effects of the Scheme on recreational users of the River Great Ouse and PRoW temporarily affected by construction of the Scheme.</p> | <p>that would be implemented during construction of the Scheme.</p>   |               |                       |
| <p><b>Road Drainage and the Water Environment</b></p> <p>Data collection methods, baseline data and the identification and sensitivity of relevant features and receptors</p> | <p>Chapter 13, Road drainage and the water environment<br/>[APP-082]</p>   | <p>The baseline conditions have been collated using desk-based and field-based techniques, and through consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>National Highways considers the scope, coverage and timing of surveys undertaken to establish the baseline conditions and sensitive features and receptors are in line with best practice and appropriate to inform the assessment of direct and indirect effects reported in Chapter</p>   | <p>CBC is content that the scope and coverage of surveys undertaken as part of the assessment are sufficiently comprehensive to identify the likely effects of the Scheme on road drainage and the water environment.</p> | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>September 2021</p> |



| Issue  | Document Reference   | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date           |
|--|--|--|--|--------|----------------|
|  |  | 13, Road Drainage and the Water Environment assessment [APP-082]. The baseline information collected is appropriate for this Scheme.   |  |        |                |
| <b>Road Drainage and the Water Environment</b><br>Construction and operational effects | Chapter 13, Road drainage and the water environment [APP-082]                                    | <p>The road drainage and the water environment assessment [APP-077] has identified that adverse and beneficial effects on water quality, hydromorphology, groundwater and drainage would result from construction and operation of the Scheme; however, none of these effects would be significant.</p> <p>National Highways considers that the assessment findings accurately reflect the likely effects of the Scheme.</p> | CBC is content with the conclusions of the assessment and the significance of the reported effects.  | Agreed | September 2021 |
| <b>Road Drainage and the Water Environment</b><br>Flood risk assessment                | Chapter 13, Road drainage and the water environment [APP-082]<br>Flood Risk Assessment [APP-220] | <p>The assessment has concluded that flood risk to and from the construction and operational stages of the Scheme from fluvial, surface water, groundwater and sewer flooding would be low, and accordingly there would be no significant flooding-related effects.</p> <p>National Highways considers that the assessment findings are robust.</p>  | <p>CBC is content with the findings of the flood risk assessment and recognises that the provision of a detailed maintenance plan which outlines the ownership, techniques and required frequency of maintenance is pivotal.</p> <p>CBC requests National Highways confirmation that this is secured and being provided.</p> | Agreed | December 2021  |

| Issue   | Document Reference  | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date           |
|---|---|---|--|--------|----------------|
|   |   | A detailed maintenance plan is to be provided during the detail design stage of the Scheme.   |  |        |                |
| <b>Road Drainage and the Water Environment</b><br><br>Embedded and essential mitigation | Chapter 2, The Scheme [APP-071]<br><br>Chapter 13, Road drainage and the water environment [APP-082]<br><br>Environmental Masterplan [APP-091] [REP9-037]<br><br>First Iteration EMP [APP-234]<br><br>V4 [TR010044/APP/6.8v4]<br><br>Schedule of Mitigation [APP-235] | National Highways considers that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The embedded mitigation measures illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan [APP-091] [REP9-037].</li> <li>The essential mitigation measures set out in the First Iteration EMP [APP-234] [TR010044/APP/6.8v4]</li> </ul> are appropriate to avoid, prevent, reduce, manage, control and (where necessary) monitor the adverse effects of the Scheme in relation to water quality, hydromorphology, groundwater, drainage and flood risk during its construction and operation. | CBC is content with the form, nature and extent of the embedded mitigation measures incorporated into the design of the Scheme, and the essential mitigation measures that would be implemented during construction of the Scheme. | Agreed | September 2021 |
| <b>Climate</b><br><br>Data collection methods, baseline data and the identification and | Chapter 14, Climate [APP-083]   | The baseline conditions have been collated using desk-based techniques and through consultation with stakeholders.  | CBC is content that the data used to inform the assessment is sufficiently comprehensive to identify the likely effects of greenhouse gas emissions on climate, and the resilience of the  | Agreed | September 2021 |

| Issue  | Document Reference  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date           |
|--|---|--|--|--------|----------------|
| sensitivity of relevant features and receptors         |   | National Highways considers the scope, coverage and timing of surveys undertaken to establish the baseline conditions and sensitive features and receptors are in line with best practice and appropriate to inform the assessment of direct and indirect effects reported in Chapter 14, Climate assessment [APP-083].  | Scheme to the effects of climate change.   |        |                |
| <b>Climate</b><br>Construction and operational effects | Chapter 14, Climate [APP-083]   | The assessment has concluded that no significant effects associated with greenhouse gas emissions and climate change would result from the Scheme.   | CBC is content with the conclusions of the assessment and the significance of the reported effects.  | Agreed | September 2021 |
| <b>Climate</b><br>Embedded and essential mitigation    | Chapter 2, The Scheme [APP-071]<br>Chapter 14, Climate [APP-083]<br>Environmental Masterplan [APP-091] [REP9-037]<br>First Iteration EMP [APP-234]<br>V4 [TR010044/APP/6.8v4] | National Highways considers that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The embedded mitigation measures illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan [APP-091] [REP9-037] and within Chapter 2, The Scheme [APP-071].</li> <li>The essential mitigation measures set out in the First Iteration EMP [APP-234] [TR010044/APP/6.8v4] are appropriate to reduce the temporary effects of greenhouse gas</li> </ul> | CBC is content with the form, nature and extent of the embedded mitigation measures incorporated into the design of the Scheme, and the essential mitigation measures that would be implemented during construction of the Scheme. | Agreed | September 2021 |

| Issue  | Document Reference   | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date           |
|--|--|---|--|--------|----------------|
|  | Schedule of mitigation<br>[APP-235]  | emissions, during construction of the Scheme.   |  |        |                |
| <b>Assessment of Cumulative Effects</b><br>Baseline data | Chapter 15, Assessment of cumulative effects [APP-084]<br><br>Appendix 15.1 Long list of other developments [APP-228]<br><br>Appendix 15.2 Assessment matrix [APP-229] | National Highways has undertaken an assessment of the likely significant cumulative effects of the Scheme on the environment resulting from the cumulation of effects with other existing and/or approved developments and projects. The assessment has considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing completed projects.</li> <li>• Approved but uncompleted projects.</li> <li>• Ongoing activities.</li> <li>• Plans or projects for which an application has been made and which are under consideration by consenting authorities; and</li> <li>• Plans and projects which are reasonably foreseeable.</li> </ul> Cumulative developments and projects were initially identified through a long list [APP-228], with qualifying developments | CBC is content with the developments and projects identified within both the long list and shortlist, and how these have been categorised within the assessment. | Agreed | September 2021 |

| Issue  | Document Reference  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status        | Date                  |
|--|---|--|--|---------------|-----------------------|
|  |   | <p>subsequently shortlisted [APP-229] for consideration in the assessment.</p> <p>National Highways considers that its approach to identifying other development projects, their shortlisting and subsequent inclusion in the cumulative effects assessment is robust and appropriate.</p>   |  |               |                       |
| <p><b>Assessment of Cumulative Effects</b></p> <p>Construction and operational effects</p> | <p>Chapter 15, Assessment of cumulative effects [APP-084]</p> <p>Appendix 15.1 Long list of other developments [APP-228]</p> <p>Appendix 15.2 Assessment matrix [APP-229]</p> | <p>The cumulative effects assessment has concluded that significant adverse cumulative effects would occur in relation to the effects of the following topics interacting cumulatively with the effects of other planned projects and developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 7, Landscape and visual effects [APP-076].</li> <li>• Chapter 11, Noise and vibration [APP-080].</li> </ul> <p>No significant cumulative effects have been identified in relation to other environmental topics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Highways considers that the outcomes of the cumulative effects assessment (in relation to development interactions) are accurate.</li> </ul> | <p>CBC is content with the conclusions of the assessment and the significance of the reported effects.</p> | <p>Agreed</p> | <p>September 2021</p> |

**Table 3-5 – Archaeological Matters**

| Issue                        | Document Reference  | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date          |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|--------|---------------|
| Archaeology mitigation areas | Archaeology Mitigation Strategy [APP-238] [TR010044/EXAM/9.23v3]    | <p>The extent and methodology of the all the mitigation areas within CBC have been agreed and are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site 4, Field 34 &amp; 35.</li> <li>• Site 5, Field 34.</li> <li>• Site 6, Field 35.</li> <li>• Site 7, Field 44.</li> </ul>   | <p><u>Matters discussed at an SOCG meeting with CBC on 22 June 2021.</u></p> <p>CBC agree with the methodology for the archaeology mitigation areas mentioned.</p> | Agreed | June 2021     |
| Council archaeology brief    | Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [APP-238] [TR010044/EXAM/9.23v3] | <p>A brief has been prepared by the Curators at the councils. This is designed to facilitate the production of the Site Specific Written Schemes of Investigation (SSWSIs) by the Archaeological Contractor. The contents of this brief have been taken into account when detailing the overarching scope of works in Part Two of the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>The Joint Cambridgeshire / Bedfordshire Brief for a Programme of Archaeological Investigation has been incorporated as Appendix B of the Updated Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [REP3-010]</p> | CBC note that a brief must be in place.  | Agreed | November 2021 |

A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvements  
Statement of Common Ground with Central Bedfordshire Council

---

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--------|------|
|       |                    | submitted at Deadline 3 of the Examination.<br><br>A meeting was held on 12 August 2021 with the Curators to discuss the Brief. |                                       |        |      |

**Table 3-6 – Highways, Design, Public Rights of Way and WCH**

| Issue                             | Document Reference  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status     | Date |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|------------|------|
| Highways Design General Matters   |   |  |   |            |      |
| Impact on Sustainable Development | <p>General Arrangement Plans <b>[APP-011]</b></p> <p>Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[APP-013]</b></p> | <p>East West Rail has now completed their non-statutory consultation. Until East West Rail has determined the route and locations of the proposed stations, it is not appropriate for National Highways to make or coordinate any specific provision for any new infrastructure which may be required as part of the East West Rail scheme.</p> <p>The design of Barford Road is a replacement of the existing infrastructure. The existing infrastructure does not include provision for walkers, cyclists and/or horse-riders and therefore this is not proposed in the design of the Barford Road side road diversion or over bridge.</p> <p>The preliminary design for Barford Road including the bridge crossing has been developed and agreed in</p> | <p>Failing to properly consider and make provision for pedestrian and cyclist access under and over the new A428 in this location will provide a huge barrier to that growth and its ability to come forward as a sustainable (and therefore appropriate) scheme. This is further emphasised by the recent East West Rail (EWR) consultation dated 31st March – 9th June 2021 (Section D, page 212), which proposes a new station either north or south of the A428 in this location.</p> <p>The proposed works to Barford Road have the potential to create a barrier to longer term sustainable movement North and South. Where the new dualled A428 passes under Barford Road, the bridge will enable access across the new dual carriageway for vehicles.</p> <p>Specifically, sufficient additional width is requested on the deck of the Barford Road bridge to accommodate</p> | Not Agreed |      |



| Issue                                   | Document Reference                            | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date       |
|---|---|--|--|--------|------------|
|   |   | <p>consultation with CBC as the maintaining highway authority.</p> <p>The proposed structure over the East Coast Main Line includes vehicular access through the side spans for landowners. No provision has been made for pedestrians and cyclists alongside the East Coast Main Line as there are no existing rights of way within the area.</p> <p>Details of the proposals are included within the General Arrangement Plans <b>[APP-011]</b> and the WCH provisions are included within the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans <b>[APP-013]</b>.</p> | <p>pedestrian and cycle provision and sufficient retained width is requested passing under the East-Coast Mainline Bridge to enable future pedestrian and cycle provision.</p> <p>The lack of provision is considered to be contrary to the NPPS requirements to provide sustainable infrastructure (para. 4.29) and to improve access by sustainable modes where relevant (5.208).</p>  |        |            |
| Traffic Modelling Output – Barford Road | Transport Assessment Annex <b>[APP-243]</b> . | National Highways has set out all impacts on the wider road network (including Barford Road Roundabout) within the Transport Assessment Annex <b>[APP-243]</b> . Information relating to the Barford Road Roundabout is within section 3.12.   | The diversion route for the Wyboston to Black Cat junction is considerable and the expectation is that traffic travelling between the A1 and the A428 will instead select to route via Barford Road rather than following the diversionary route. As such further consideration should be given to the monitoring of the related diversion and/or the split between diversionary signage for local and longer distance traffic. It is also noted that there are proposals for a haul | Agreed | 09/12/2021 |

| Issue  | Document Reference   | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status     | Date |
|--|--|--|---|------------|------|
|  |  |  | road crossing on Barford Road, (para 3.2.3 of the OCTMP [APP-244]). The timing of any closures and any associated diversions should also be considered in the context of the proposed works to Barford Road itself to ensure no conflict between the two. CBC would welcome discussion with NH on mitigation.   |            |      |
| Impact of Construction Phase upon the Highway Network      | Transport Assessment [APP-241] and [APP-242] and the Transport Assessment Annex [APP-243]. | National Highways has provided comprehensive construction traffic flow impacts in the Transport Assessment [APP-241] and [APP-242] and the Transport Assessment Annex [APP-243]. Results from the assessments undertaken have been presented to local councillors, officers and local forums of all the local authorities.<br><br>Further information was provided at Deadline 9 regarding the construction HGVs [REP9-035]. | Matters discussed at a meeting held on 12 August 2021. Whilst the Transport Assessment and subsequently provided construction phase flow plots identify the construction phase effects of the Scheme, CBC are not currently content that construction phase impacts have been addressed. CBC do not consider that the proposals put forward by NH for construction phase monitoring at deadline 9 adequately address the concerns previously raised and discussed, CBCs proposed approach to monitoring and managing construction phase impacts is outlined in the Joint LHA Deadline 6 submission. | Not Agreed |      |
| The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-244] | CBC Relevant Representation [RR-016b]  | The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [APP-244] sets out the temporary traffic management processes that will be followed for the safe and  | It is the view of CBC that, whilst the overarching principles of the OCTMP are supported, there are a number of elements of the plan that are not agreed, due to unknown constraints  | Not Agreed |      |

| Issue | Document Reference  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status | Date |
|-------|---|--|---|--------|------|
|       | <p>The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [APP-244]</p> | <p>efficient construction phases of the Scheme. The development of the OCTMP has been informed through discussions with the Strategic Road Users Technical Working Group which includes representatives from local authorities.</p> <p>Following a grant of development consent for the Scheme, relevant local highway authorities will have the opportunity to comment on a Traffic Management Plan, which must accord with the OCTMP [APP-244]. Requirement 11 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [APP-025] makes provision for the preparation of a Traffic Management Plan, that must be consulted upon with the relevant local highway authority before being submitted to the Secretary of State for approval. In making an application to discharge the requirement, a summary report is required to be prepared which must include the written responses from any parties consulted with.</p> <p>National Highways is committed to continuing engagement with the</p> | <p>and/or expected impacts on local communities. In particular, the proposed use of Station Road, Tempsford for any significant level of construction traffic, or extraordinary loads as detailed in APP-244 is considered to be inappropriate.</p> <p>Some additional information has been provided with regards to the potential construction traffic proposed to use Station Road (within DCO document ref. 9.32), which suggests an average of 30 HGV movements a week, but with peak periods of up to 50 movements a day. Subsequently, it has been suggested that the route could be used for a period of 9-12 months.</p> <p>As raised in previous representations, Station Road is fronted by housing and parking on the western section, with narrow sections of carriageway as you pass parked cars, whilst the eastern end narrows to a single width track, unsuited for HGVs to pass other vehicles. Based upon available census data for the level crossing, this route is also used by pedestrians accessing the PROW network and who would therefore be sharing a narrow track with HGVs. No further information has been provided</p> |        |      |

| Issue   | Document Reference  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status            | Date |
|---|---|--|---|-------------------|------|
|   |   | <p>local authority on matters relating to the outline construction traffic management plan.</p> <p>Construction access via Station Road Tempsford is required for the Cadent gas diversion works and the construction of the east abutment of the ECML structure. Cadent have not confirmed the duration of gas main diversion works and thus this access maybe required for 8 to 12 months. Once Cadent provide a detailed construction programme National Highways will share these details with the local authority and provide more clarity on how long this construction access through Tempsford will be required.</p> | <p>with regards to how this section of the route could be made safe.</p> <p>Concerns also remain that mitigation works (temporary or permanent) will be required to support the use of the A603 through Moggerhanger as a formal diversion.</p> <p>Whilst Requirement 11 makes provision for the preparation and agreement of individual Traffic Management plans, it is noted that these are expected to be substantially in accordance with the OCTMP.</p> <p>Therefore, CBC is of the view that these issues should be resolved at this stage.</p> |                   |      |
| <p>The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-244]</p> | <p>CBC Relevant Representation [RR-016b] Tempsford A603 diversion</p> | <p>The restrictions sought are sufficiently set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan as noted below.</p> <p>Chapter 3 of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-244] sets out a number of restrictions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction traffic will not be permitted to use a number of specifically identified side</li> </ul>  | <p>It is the view of CBC that, whilst the overarching principles of the OCTMP are supported, there are a number of elements of the plan that are not agreed, due to unknown constraints and/or expected impacts on local communities. In particular, the proposed use of Station Road, Tempsford for any significant level of construction traffic., or extraordinary loads as detailed in</p>  | <p>Not Agreed</p> |      |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|---|--|--------|------|
|       |                    | <p>roads for the duration of the Scheme construction phase. Appendix C of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-244] sets out the restricted routes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carriageway and lane restrictions will be used to create safe working spaces. Indicative closure times are set out in Table 3.1 within the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-244]. The indicative closures are shown as being operational for both overnight and weekend periods. Strategic diversion routes will be in place when there are closures on sections of the A428, A421 and the A1. Appendix D of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-244] sets out drawings showing the diversion routes.</li> <li>Speed restrictions and temporary speed limits (to be dealt with by temporary traffic regulation orders).</li> </ul> | <p>APP-244 is considered is considered to be inappropriate.</p> <p>Some additional information has been provided with regards to the potential construction traffic proposed to use Station Road (within DCO document ref. 9.32), which suggests an average of 30 HGV movements a week, but with peak periods of up to 50 movements a day. Subsequently, it has been suggested that the route could be used for a period of 9-12 months.</p> <p>As raised in previous representations, Station Road is fronted by housing and parking on the western section, with narrow sections of carriageway as you pass parked cars, whilst the eastern end narrows to a single width track, unsuited for HGVs to pass other vehicles. Based upon available census data for the level crossing, this route is also used by pedestrians accessing the PROW network and who would therefore be sharing a narrow track with HGVs. No further information has been provided with regards to how this section of the route could be made safe.</p> <p>Concerns also remain that mitigation works (temporary or permanent) will be required to support the use of the A603</p> |        |      |

| Issue                      | Document Reference                                     | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status     | Date |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|------------|------|
|                            |  | <p>Following the grant of development consent for the Scheme, relevant local highway authorities will have the opportunity to comment on the Traffic Management Plan, which must accord with the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-244]. Requirement 11 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [APP-025] makes provision for the preparation of a Traffic Management Plan, that must be consulted upon with the relevant local highway authority before being submitted to the Secretary of State for approval. In making an application to discharge the requirement, a summary report is required to be prepared which must include the written responses from any parties consulted with.</p> | <p>through Moggerhanger as a formal diversion.</p> <p>Whilst Requirement 11 makes provision for the preparation and agreement of individual Traffic Management plans, it is noted that these are expected to be substantially in accordance with the OCTMP.</p> <p>Therefore, CBC is of the view that these issues should be resolved at this stage.</p> |            |      |
| The Construction Programme | Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-244] | Sufficient information regarding the construction programme is contained within the Application in Chapter 2, The Scheme of the Environmental Statement [APP-071]. Further detailed construction works information will   | See CBC Written Representation dated August 2021.<br>[REP1-054 & REP1-055]   | Not Agreed |      |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------|------|
|       |                    | <p>be provided at the detailed design stage of the Scheme.</p> <p>Sufficient information for this stage is provided within the Application about the timings of closures with indicative timings for closures set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan <b>[APP-244]</b>.</p> <p>The relevant local highway authorities will have the opportunity to comment on a Traffic Management Plan, which must substantially accord with the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan <b>[APP-244]</b>. Requirement 11 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) <b>[APP-025]</b> makes provision for the preparation of a Traffic Management Plan, that must be consulted upon with the relevant local highway authority before being submitted to the Secretary of State for approval. In making an application to discharge the requirement, a summary report is required to be prepared which must include the written responses from any parties consulted with.</p> |                                       |        |      |

| Issue  | Document Reference  | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status     | Date       |
|--|---|---|---|------------|------------|
| <b>Geometry and Design</b>                                 |   |   |   |            |            |
| Design Standards for Junctions and Roads in CBC (CBC) area | Works Plans <b>[APP-010]</b><br>General Arrangements <b>[APP-011]</b><br>Engineering Sections - Part 3 <b>[APP-013]</b> & Part 5 <b>[APP-021]</b> | National Highways has used the geometrical design standards within the DMRB for the design of the proposed Barford Road and accesses. This does not include the paved width for which the below item address. | CBC has accepted in principle the proposed layout of Barford Road and accesses as per the Proposed Development, subject to detailed design.   | Agreed     | 13/09/2021 |
| Highways Geometrical Design                                | Works Plans <b>[APP-010]</b><br>General Arrangements <b>[APP-011]</b><br>Engineering Sections - Part 3 <b>[APP-013]</b> & Part 5 <b>[APP-021]</b> | A departure from DMRB standard has been proposed for the paved width cross-section of Barford Road. To keep consistent with existing carriageway in this location, the proposed carriageway width is 6.6m     | CBC has accepted the proposed paved width cross section of 6.6m.  | Agreed     | 13/09/2021 |
| Highways Geometrical Design                                | Engineering Sections - Part 3 <b>[APP-013]</b>  | National Highways propose a typical verge width 2.5m on structure along the proposed Barford Road.  | CBC does not agree this matter as the Proposed Development should accommodate any future upgrades for NMU provision and associated infrastructure (i.e. lighting) that CBC may require. | Not Agreed |            |
| Highways Assets  | Works Plans <b>[APP-009]</b> to <b>[APP-010]</b> ; General Arrangement Plans <b>[APP-011]</b> and Permanent                                       | National Highways has used the geometrical design standards within the Energy Networks Association (ENA Technical Specification 43-8 Overhead Line Clearances) and Avoiding danger                            | CBC agree with the proposed vertical clearances.<br><br>CBC will comment on specifics during the design consultation stage.   | Agreed     | 13/09/2021 |



| Issue           | Document Reference           | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status | Date       |
|-----------------|------------------------------|---|---|--------|------------|
|                 | Speed Limit Plans [APP-015]. | <p>from overhead power lines and Health &amp; Safety Executive Guidance Note GS6 (Fourth edition) for the vertical clearances between the overhead power cables and the proposed Barford Road.</p> <p>Some matters, including road junction drainage collection systems design will not be finalised until detailed design stage.</p> |   |        |            |
| Highways Assets |                              | National Highways proposes a National Speed Limit along Barford Road in keeping with the existing as shown on Sheet 3 of the Permanent Speed Limit Plans [APP-015].   | CBC agree with the proposed speed limit as shown on Sheet 3 of the Permanent Speed Limit Plans [APP-015]. | Agreed | 13/09/2021 |
| Highways Assets |                              | National Highways has proposed culverts and ditches along and across Barford Road for CBC to be the maintaining authority as outlined on the General Arrangement Plans [APP-011] and within Appendix 13.3 - Drainage Strategy Report [APP-219].   | CBC agree in principle with the proposals subject to detailed design of the structures.                   | Agreed | 13/09/2021 |

| Issue                                       | Document Reference                  | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status           | Date       |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|------------------|------------|
| Highways Assets                             | General Arrangement Plans [APP-011] | <p>National Highways is not providing lighting along the proposed section of Barford Road</p> <p>The proposed extent of lighting is shown on the General Arrangement Plans [APP-011]</p>   | <p>CBC agree with the proposed lighting strategy along Barford Road.</p> <p>Any signs or road markings are to be retro-reflective.</p>   | Agreed           | 13/09/2021 |
| Management and Maintenance Responsibilities |                                     | <p>Limits of maintenance responsibility plans have been provided to CBC.</p> <p>The maintenance and asset responsibilities to be adopted by CBC as addressed below will be detailed within the Legal Agreement relating to the proposed A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet Development Consent Order.</p> <p>Barford Road as defined in the draft DCO [APP-025] Schedule 3 and within the area of CBC will be the responsibility of CBC highways authority.</p> | <p>CBC agrees that details relating to asset handover and maintenance responsibilities will be covered within the legal agreement relating to the proposed A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet Development Consent Order. However the legal agreement is not yet agreed, and CBC are awaiting the determination of whether the Deed requires securing via the DCO. As such it is considered that this matter is still under discussion</p> <p>Per Section 4 of the Highways Act 1980, National Highways are to pay CBC for taking on any maintenance liabilities. This payment will be in the form of a commuted sum. The calculation will be based on routine maintenance and lifecycle work activities for assets and are still to be discussed length of time.</p> <p>Per Section 59 of the Highways Act 1980, CBC may recover expenses from National Highways for the diversion of extraordinary traffic onto local roads.</p> | Under Discussion |            |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status  | Date |
|-------|--------------------|--|---|---|------|
|       |                    | <p>National Highways will not pay a commuted sum in connection with the proposed new local highways (i.e. Barford Road). The proposal is a re-provision of the existing road and as such no additional maintenance liabilities are being imposed. The proposals will reduce the local authority's maintenance liability owing to it being new construction increasing the serviceability life.</p> <p><b>Structures</b></p> <p>National Highways will maintain the Barford Road bridge (overbridge) structure (up to and including the waterproofing layer) that crosses the new trunk road.</p> <p>CBC will be responsible for the maintenance of the carriageway construction above the waterproofing for the bridge structure that passes 'over' the trunk road.</p> <p><b>Drainage</b></p> <p>CBC will be the maintaining authority for the drainage assets servicing the proposed local highway network, including but not limited to the attenuation basins,</p> | <p>Per Section 277 of the Highways Act 1980, CBC may recover expenses from National Highways for maintenance activities relating to the bridge.</p> <p>National Highways are to refer to point 1.B of Section 94 of the Highways Act 1980 in relation to CBC only maintaining the highway rather than the structure.</p> <p>The designers should assess the potential drainage impact on an undefined ditch at the south-western end of the Scheme.</p> | <p>Not Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> |      |

| Issue   | Document Reference   | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position  | Status | Date |
|---|----------------------|--|--|--------|------|
|   |                      | <p>Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and culverts.</p> <p>The designers have assessed the potential drainage impact of the undefined ditch at the south-western end of the scheme. This ditch falls eastwards towards Barford Road and is picked up by the proposed drainage systems before being discharged into the River Great Ouse.</p> <p><b>Landscaping</b></p> <p>The extent of maintenance responsibility for landscape will be determined at detailed design in collaboration with CBC.</p> <p>National Highways assumes reference to Deed means Legal Agreement.</p> |  |        |      |
| Land Ownership:<br>Restoring of stopped up land | Land Plans [APP-008] | <p>The land required for, or affected by, the proposed development is shown on the Land Plans [APP-008] and will be developed further at detailed design.</p> <p>Where highways are being stopped up and there is no existing title plot associated, the half-width of the road will be restored and returned to the</p>   | Land should be returned, first, to registered owner if the land is registered and second, if not registered then to the adjacent land owners. CBC would object to land currently registered in CBCs name being transferred by virtue of NH's powers for the project to other adjacent land owners after exercising the powers. | Agreed |      |

| Issue  | Document Reference | National Highways Position  | Central Bedfordshire Council Position   | Status                           | Date |
|--|--------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|------|
|  |                    | <p>adjacent landowners, unless National Highways are seeking permanent acquisition.</p> <p>This is aligned to CBC's position.</p>   | <p>CBC would like further information of the extent of land in their title.</p>   |                                  |      |
| <b>PROW and WCH Matters</b>  |                    |   |   |                                  |      |
| Impact of the Scheme upon Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders (WCH) |                    | <p>The proposed design for the Barford Road realignment does not include provision for Walkers Cyclists and Horse riders (WCH), in line with the existing provision. It is noted that the Scheme within the jurisdiction of CBC does not affect any PRoW or NMU provision.</p>  | <p>CBC agree that the Proposed Development does not impact existing Public Rights of Way and Walking, Cycling and Horse riding network.</p>   | Agreed                           |      |
| Impact of the Scheme upon Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders (WCH) |                    | <p>As stated within Written Response <b>[REP1-055e]</b>, the proposed structure over the East Coast Main Line includes vehicular access (track width of 3.5m) through the side spans for landowners. No provision has been made for pedestrians and cyclists alongside the East Coast Main Line as there are no existing rights of way within the area.</p> <p>National Highways does not preclude the local authority from</p> | <p>CBC wishes to secure passive provision along Barford Road and under the proposed East Coast Main Line railway underbridge. See also the response to question 1.11.6.1 with regards to rights of way proposals in the vicinity of the scheme (and the Barford Road Bridge).</p> | Not agreed (e.g. Barford Bridge) |      |

| Issue | Document Reference | National Highways Position   | Central Bedfordshire Council Position | Status | Date |
|-------|--------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------|------|
|       |                    | implementing enhancement measures or contributing to the additional costs associated with any upgrades. It would be for the local authority to evidence the need for the upgrades and secure any additional land to deliver these facilities |                                       |        |      |