

Application by National Highways (formerly Highways England) for A417 – Missing Link
The Examining Authority’s written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)
Issued on 16 November 2021

The following table sets out the Examining Authority’s (ExA’s) written questions and requests for information - ExQ1. If necessary, the Examination Timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ2.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues published as Appendix C with the Rule 6 letter. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 1 (indicating that it is from ExQ1) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on Miscellaneous and General matters is identified as Q1.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team. Please contact:

A417MissingLink@planninginspectorate.gov.uk and include ‘A417 – Missing Link ExQ1’ in the subject line of your email.

A date for responses is set in the Examination Timetable for **Deadline 1 (Tuesday 14 December 2021)**.

Abbreviations used

PA2008	<i>The Planning Act 2008</i>	Hist Eng	<i>Historic England (to avoid confusion with Abbreviation for Highways England)</i>
AONB	<i>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</i>	HRA	<i>Habitats Regulation Assessment</i>
ARN	<i>Affected Road Network</i>	LIR	<i>Local Impact Report</i>
Art	<i>Article</i>	LPA	<i>Local Planning Authority</i>
ALA 1981	<i>Acquisition of Land Act 1981</i>	NMU	<i>Non-Motorised User</i>
AQMA	<i>Air Quality Management Area</i>	NE	<i>Natural England</i>
BoR	<i>Book of Reference</i>	NPPF	<i>National Planning Policy Framework</i>
BMV	<i>Best and Most Versatile Land</i>	NSIP	<i>Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project</i>
CA	<i>Compulsory Acquisition</i>	NPSNN	<i>National Policy Statement for National Networks</i>
CCB	<i>Cotswolds Conservation Board</i>	PRoW	<i>Public Right of Way</i>
CDC	<i>Cotswold District Council</i>	R	<i>Requirement</i>
dDCO	<i>draft DCO</i>	REAC	<i>Register of Environmental Assessment Commitments</i>
DMRB	<i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i>	SI	<i>Statutory Instrument</i>
EA	<i>Environment Agency</i>	SAC	<i>Special Area of Conservation</i>
EIA	<i>Environmental Impact Assessment</i>	SSSI	<i>Site of Special Scientific Interest</i>
EM	<i>Explanatory Memorandum</i>	SPA	<i>Special Protection Area</i>
EMP	<i>Environmental Management Plan</i>	SoS	<i>Secretary of State</i>
ES	<i>Environmental Statement</i>	TBC	<i>Tewkesbury Borough Council</i>
ExA	<i>Examining authority</i>	TP	<i>Temporary Possession</i>
GCC	<i>Gloucestershire County Council</i>	USI	<i>Unaccompanied Site Inspection</i>
HE	<i>Highways England</i>	WCH	<i>Walker, Cyclist, Horse-rider</i>
HGV	<i>Heavy Goods Vehicle</i>		

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the [Examination Library](#). The Examination Library will be updated as the Examination progresses.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.	Miscellaneous and General	
1.1.1.	Applicant	<p>General</p> <p>a) Does the rebranding of Highways England have any implications for the documentation submitted with the application?</p> <p>b) How should the Applicant be addressed in the Examination and subsequent report, does this have any wider impact?</p>
1.1.2.	GCC, TBC, CDC	<p>NPSNN</p> <p>a) Do you agree with the Applicant's assessment of the Proposed Development's performance against the strategic objectives of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN)?</p> <p>b) If not, where do you consider the Proposed Development would conflict with the NPSNN?</p> <p>c) Provide a high-level summary of the Council's position with regards to the three tests set out in paragraph 5.151 of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (if not forming a part of the Local Impact Report).</p>
1.1.3.	GCC, TBC, CDC	<p>Development Plan</p> <p>Could each of the local planning authorities please provide comments and any updates in relation to the Applicant's summary of the Development Plan position, including any emerging plans and plan documents set out in section 12 of the 'Case for the Scheme' [APP-417]?</p>
1.1.4.	GCC, TBC, CDC	<p>Infrastructure Delivery Plans</p> <p>In paragraph 13.1.33 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-417], there is reference to the Proposed Development being within three Infrastructure Delivery Plans. Have CIL receipts already been received and specifically set aside for the project?</p>
1.1.5.	GCC, TBC, CDC	<p>Planning Permissions</p> <p>With reference to paragraph 4.3.4 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-024] and</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Table 15-7 in ES Chapter 15 [APP-046] , could each of the local planning authorities update as to whether any new planning permissions have been granted or existing permissions/ allocations progressed within the Order limits and within 500m of the Order limits since the DCO application was submitted?
1.1.6.	Applicant	<p>Options Appraisal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Did the A417 Missing Link scheme receive full options appraisal prior to inclusion in the Road Investment Strategy? b) If so, whilst the NPSNN, 4.27, states that the Secretary of State (in such circumstances) does not need to consider option testing in this regard, 4.26 identifies there may be policy requirements, for example in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty where assessment of alternatives are required. Which alternative options are considered to be important and relevant to the ExA's decision-making process, c) which documents does the Applicant rely upon to fulfil this requirement and d) is the Applicant satisfied this assessment is sufficiently robust?
1.1.7.	Applicant	<p>Options Appraisal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) With regards to the Technical Appraisal Report [APP-425], it is stated (executive summary page 20) that between option 12 and option 30, Highway England's preference would be option 30 for a number of reasons, many of which are either highways or monetary based. How does this accord with the statement in the Design Summary Report that the landscape was a primary consideration in every design decision? b) The Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) [APP-420] states that Option 12 was developed at PCF Stage 1 as a landscape-led design. The same reassurances are not said about option 30. For what reason was option 30 conceived or designed? c) In the SAR, it states that "Those who identified their support for Option 30

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>amounted to 72% of all respondents, with an additional 8% stating their preference for Option 12." Clarify what this means.</p> <p>d) In the SAR, it states that "there is limited variation in terms of overall residual environmental impacts between Option 12 and Option 30. Option 12 and Option 30 are recording the same level of significance in relation to air quality, cultural heritage, landscape, geology and soils, materials, noise and vibration, population and human health, and climate." Landscape is not however mentioned as an environmental impact. Explain.</p> <p>e) Table 0.2 records the impacts on landscape being the same for both option 12 and option 30. Explain how this conclusion was reached.</p> <p>f) In the SAR executive summary, the reasons for selecting option 30 do not mention anything regarding 'landscape-led' approaches, with an emphasis on lower costs representing greater (monetised) benefits. Can the ExA be reassured that cost was not a prevailing or overriding factor in the decision-making process?</p> <p>g) Can the Applicant confirm if the costs identified with option 30 as appraised remain valid and whether costs have risen through evolving design, if so how does this affect the weight given to the monetised benefits?</p>
1.1.8.	Applicant, CCB	<p>Options Appraisal</p> <p>a) In its Relevant Representation (RR) [RR-021] CCB at Key question 3 refer to two detailed reports on suggested alternatives. Could the Applicant/ CCB please confirm the title and references of these reports and whether they have been submitted into the Examination?</p> <p>b) If they have not could the Applicant please submit these or explain why it is not necessary or appropriate to do so?</p>
1.1.9.	Applicant	<p>Environmental Statement</p> <p>In paragraph 2.6.105 of Chapter 2 to the Environmental Statement [APP-033] it</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>states: "No off-site works are identified. Details of any off-site works required to facilitate the development (delivered by Highways England or other parties) would be considered at detailed design where applicable."</p> <p>How are the potential effects of off-site works accounted for in the Environmental Statement and what are they?</p>
1.1.10.	Applicant	<p>Environmental Statement</p> <p>a) ES Chapter 4 [APP-035] paragraph 4.2.11 scoped out Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF). If existing services are to be retained beneath the repurposed A417, would walkers or users of any resulting pathway potentially be exposed to EMF?</p> <p>b) Would any diversions or re-routing of existing services (or laying of new connections), such as electric cables, bring them closer to existing dwellings, potentially giving rise to EMF effects?</p>
1.1.11.	GCC, TBC, CDC	<p>Environmental Statement Methodology</p> <p>Are there any concerns about the approach to EIA or the EIA methodology, with particular reference to paragraph 4.5.18 of ES Chapter 4 [APP-035]?</p>
1.1.12.	Applicant	<p>Clarification on Terminology</p> <p>There are numerous instances where the phrase "at grade" is utilised. For clarity, what does this term mean and is it the same in all instances where it appears (for example paragraph 6.2.81 of the Case for the Scheme)?</p>
1.1.13.	Applicant	<p>Lighting</p> <p>a) With regards the commitments in Table 7-4 within the Case for the Scheme [APP-417], confirm what is meant by 'permanent' with respect to lighting.</p> <p>b) Would temporary operational lights be affixed to bridges (for example under or on the edge of the Gloucestershire Way crossing) or would any form of lighting column to light the highway be erected on any part of the route?</p> <p>c) Would, via the Order, the Applicant have the ability post-consent to erect</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		lighting of any kind?
1.1.14.	Applicant	<p>COP26 Following the recent declaration of a climate emergency and the recently held COP26, does the Applicant have any comments on implications for, or any amendments needed to, the application or Environmental Statement?</p>
1.1.15.	Applicant	<p>Climate Change In addition to those risks detailed in paragraphs 14.8.7 and 14.8.8 of ES Chapter 14 [APP-045], does the Applicant consider that agricultural land (including BMV land) taken temporarily (for example, for construction compounds) would potentially suffer from deterioration (for example, if stripped and stored topsoil and subsoil is exposed in a heatwave condition)?</p>
1.1.16.	Applicant	<p>Climate Change In terms of traffic generation, congestion, speeds and journey time, would the Proposed Development represent betterment over the current baseline in terms of predicted tCO₂e from vehicular traffic?</p>
1.1.17.	Applicant	<p>Clarification on Data In Chapter 14 of the ES [APP-045] Table 14-15 suggests total construction emissions of 74,114 tCO₂e but paragraph 14.10.4 states this is 74,144. Confirm the correct figure.</p>
1.1.18.	Applicant	<p>Approach to Mitigation The Applicant's approach relies heavily on those identified issues and a series of statement commitments to mitigation contained in the Register of Environmental Assessment Commitments (REAC) set out in section 3 of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) [APP-317], however much of these mitigation approaches are set in appendices to detail such mitigation.</p> <p>However, the EMP also relies on Construction Management Plans (at section 4.3)</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>and Construction Environmental method statements (4.4) that it will prepare for certain environmental topics which shall be inserted into the EMP [APP-317]. The EMP [APP-317] is presently considered light in detail and heavily reliant on matters being resolved at the detailed stages including mitigation-specific management plans after consent would have been granted.</p> <p>The ExA is concerned that the approach fails to provide adequate details of how the Applicant intends to mitigate the impacts of the Proposed Development, and the ExA cannot be certain at this stage that mitigation measures or practices would be adequate. The Applicant is required to take note of the ExA's initial view and either provide a statement/ response here justifying the approach and explaining how the ExA's concern can be addressed, and/ or submit the additional documents required.</p>
1.1.19.	GCC, CDC, TBC	<p>Community Engagement</p> <p>The ExA is concerned that the EMP, and REAC, [APP-317] do not provide adequate and clear instructions on how the Applicant intends to liaise with the local community during construction. This comment is based on the Applicant's approach to community engagement during construction of the Proposed Development, should the SoS decide to make the Order, and whether this is adequately secured in the draft DCO.</p>
1.1.20.	Applicant	<p>Environmental Management Plan (EMP) [APP-317]</p> <p>If the intention is that the EMP is revised every six months:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How much confidence can the ExA or Interested Parties have that all the necessary mitigations will be retained and enforced throughout the relevant stage/ lifetime of the EMP? Who would determine (or be consulted in the determination of) whether the revisions would give rise to new or worse environmental effects? If a new or worse environmental effect was determined to occur as a result of

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		changes to the EMP, what would be the process following such determination?
1.1.21.	GCC, TBC, CDC	Management Plans a) Are the respective Councils content with their roles and responsibilities in reviewing management plans produced under the umbrella of the EMP? b) If not, why not?
1.1.22.	Applicant	Mitigation and Monitoring In measure AQ12 of the EMP [APP-317], would water spray/ dampening equipment, installed around the boundary of construction works closest to the sensitive and designated sites, be an effective means of suppressing dust?
1.1.23.	Applicant	Shab Hill Farm a) In measure CH7 of the EMP [APP-317], can a timescale be put on when the wall will be installed? b) In this, and other similar cases in the EMP, can trigger points be written in to ensure a timely delivery of the mitigation?
1.1.24.	Applicant	EMP Measure BD24 [APP-317] Confirm what is meant by 'high prevailing winds' and how will it be determined if the wind becomes 'high'?
1.1.25.	Applicant, GCC	Legal Agreement With regards to measure PH3 in the EMP [APP-317], what progress has been made on any legal agreement between the parties and will a completed obligation be presented to the ExA before the close of the Examination?
1.1.26.	Applicant	Embedded Mitigation a) Paragraph 1.5.1 of the EMP describes the REAC [APP-317] as "including commitments to certain key items of embedded mitigation...". Can the Applicant confirm whether all of the proposed embedded mitigation measures are included in the REAC?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		b) If not, please can the Applicant provide a table that identifies all the mitigation relied upon in the ES and the mechanism by which that mitigation is secured, as recommended in Planning Inspectorate Advice Note Seven?
1.1.27.	Applicant	Construction Programme Does the Applicant see any impediments that would extend or otherwise exacerbate the 33-month construction period (42-month overall programme including environmental preparatory works)?
1.1.28.	Applicant	Repurposing of A417 Limited information or certainty is provided on the processes of turning the existing A417 into the proposed green byway. Set out, step-by-step the actions required to convert the existing A417 to a green corridor and amenity area. How are these secured in the dDCO?
1.1.29.	Applicant, CDC, CCB	Cotswold National Park A few relevant representations have raised the prospect of the creation of the Cotswold National Park. Provide any information on any intentions or workings undertaken on any such creation to date and what, if any, the implications of the Proposed Development would have on achieving any National Park status.
1.1.30.	Applicant, Western Gateway Sub-National Transport Body	Strategic Transport Plan Explain the relevance and importance of the Strategic Transport Plan with regards to the Proposed Development, referencing the NPSNN and PA2008 where appropriate.
1.1.31.	Applicant	Drawings No structural engineering drawings have been provided for the various crossings, overbridges and overpasses, only engineering section drawings. Provide details of each of the crossings in plan, section and elevation drawing form.
1.1.32.	Applicant	Submission of Documents Can the Applicant please submit 'Clean' and 'Tracked Changes' versions of all/ any

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		amended documents at each time one is submitted to facilitate easy identification of where changes have been made (including, but not limited to, the Application Document Tracker, DCO and EM)?
1.1.33.	Applicant	Environment Act 2021 The Environment Bill was given Royal Assent on 9 November 2021 and became law. Can the Applicant please comment on the effect the provisions in the Environment Act 2021 will have on the consideration of the Proposed Development?
1.2.	Air Quality and Emissions	
1.2.1.	Applicant	Assessment Methodology Explain whether the assessment methodology for air quality is based upon the most up-to-date guidance contained within the DMRB, and what bearing it would have on the ES if it were not.
1.2.2.	Applicant	WHO Standards In September 2021 the World Health Organisation published new Global Air Quality Guidelines. Could the Applicant please set out their response to these guideline standards, setting out any implications that this may have for the consideration of this Proposed Development?
1.2.3.	Applicant	Mitigation and Monitoring State whether mitigation measures specific to demolition, earthworks, construction, and track out, such as those stated within the Institute of Air Quality Management: Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction, will be utilised to minimise and mitigate dust arisings during the construction phase.
1.2.4.	GCC, TBC, CDC	Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) a) Are the Applicant's identification and description of AQMAs within the Order limits correct and representative of the challenges faced in the respective

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>AQMA?</p> <p>b) Do concerns remain about the prospect of the objectives within the AQMAs being prejudiced by the Proposed Development and, if so, what reassurances are required?</p>
1.2.5.	Applicant	<p>Baseline Conditions</p> <p>Can the monitoring results referred to in paragraph 5.4.6 of ES Chapter 5 [APP-036], in relation the PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, be published and made available to the Examination?</p>
1.2.6.	Applicant	<p>Assessment Methodology</p> <p>a) In Chapter 5 of the ES [APP-036] with reference to paragraph 5.4.11, does the scoping out of site equipment cover result in the exclusion of diesel generators or similar apparatus that may be needed to support construction works or construction worker compounds?</p> <p>b) Is it appropriate to take these into account to determine the effects, notwithstanding that they are time-limited in duration?</p>
1.2.7.	Applicant	<p>Vehicle Emissions</p> <p>Paragraph 5.6.4 of Chapter 5 of the ES [APP-036] provides details regarding the study area used for the assessment of impacts from HGVs during the construction phase, however it is not clear whether this includes the ARN.</p> <p>a) Can the Applicant confirm if the assessment for HGV emissions has considered effects on the Affected Road Network? And if not, why not?</p> <p>b) Have the emissions from LGVs, personnel vehicles and staff vehicles within the study area been taken into account in the air quality assessment? If not, why not?</p>
1.2.8.	Applicant	<p>Vehicle Movements</p> <p>For clarity, when HGVs are referred to (such as in paragraph 5.8.5) does this purely relate to vehicles that bring/ takeaway construction and demolition materials to the</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		site or does this also include road construction vehicles (steamroller, tarmac spreader etc)?
1.2.9.	Applicant	NO₂ Thresholds Would the Proposed Development lead to any new exceedances of NO ₂ inside or outside any AQMA or Air Quality sensitive area, or would effects be constrained to affecting existing exceedances (for better or worse)?
1.2.10.	GCC, TBC, CDC	Mitigation a) Do you agree with the Applicant's position that any adverse impacts would be reduced to a negligible level by virtue of mitigation in the Environmental Management Plan? b) If not, why not and what level of impact would be experienced?
1.2.11.	Applicant, GCC, TBC, CDC	Mitigation a) Whilst paragraph 5.10.12 of ES Chapter 5 [APP-036] predicts no new exceedances of annual mean NO ₂ , receptors 50 and 51 would see a 0.5yg/m ³ increase on top of the existing exceedance of 43.7yg/m ³ . What bespoke mitigation measures could be implemented to reduce the worsening of air quality for these residents? b) For what duration is construction predicted in the locality of these receptors?
1.2.12.	Applicant	Construction Effects With reference to paragraph 5.10.16 in Chapter 5 of the ES [APP-036], does the small number of links referred to include assessment of all those likely routes that traffic would divert to avoid the construction works and delays during the construction period?
1.2.13.	Natural England	Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees Are there concerns remaining with regards to the operational phase effects of the Proposed Development upon Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.2.14.	Applicant	Reassigned Traffic What assumptions have been made in the ES when re-assigning traffic during construction works in AQMAS?
1.2.15.	Climate Emergency Policy and Planning	EIA Regulation 20 In your Relevant Representation [RR-018], you state the Proposed Development is not compliant with EIA Regulation 20. Please expand fully on where and why you believe this is the case.
1.3.	Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))	
1.3.1.	Applicant, GCC	Biodiversity Metric The ExA cannot locate a figure or appendix setting out the Applicant's assessment against the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 calculations. In this regard, can the Applicant: a) Present the calculation in full and set out the results (or direct the ExA to where the calculation exists). b) Detail how the results have influenced the approach to biodiversity net gain and mitigation. c) What effect, if any, would the re-purposing of the car park at the Barrow Wake viewpoint have on the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 calculations and, as a result, would that justify compulsory acquisition of the car park or would CA be necessary if retained by GCC and alternative management secured? d) Natural England released Biodiversity Metric 3.0 on 7 July 2021. Explain whether or not a calculation using this new metric should (or should not) be provided for this DCO application and, if so, how the Proposed Development performs against it.
1.3.2.	Applicant	Biodiversity Net Gain a) Which articles, requirements and control documents would ensure the delivery of biodiversity net gain?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		b) What monitoring measures are in place to ensure that the newly created habitat is established and successful, and over what period is this monitoring required?
1.3.3.	Applicant	<p>Biodiversity Net Gain</p> <p>a) How has the Applicant approached and balanced the matters of biodiversity net gain against land acquisition and rights interference?</p> <p>b) Is the taking of land to reinstate calcareous grassland and to compensate the loss of SSSI habitat demonstrated to comply with the tests of Compulsory Acquisition as per PA2008?</p>
1.3.4.	Applicant, Natural England, Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust	<p>Calcareous Grassland</p> <p>a) Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-046] purports to provide a gain of 72.5 hectares of calcareous grassland habitat. Is this expected delivery robust and is there evidence to suggest the full quantum stated would be successfully delivered?</p> <p>b) With reference to paragraph 2.8.48 of Chapter 2 to the ES [APP-033], is the creation of calcareous grassland possible on a bridge?</p> <p>c) Would the habitat be able to survive with potential nitrogen deposition and air pollutants emanating from the road below, given the summary in paragraph 8.8.8 of ES Chapter 8 [APP-039]?</p>
1.3.5.	Applicant, Natural England, Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust	<p>Wildlife Crossings</p> <p>a) What evidence is there to demonstrate the success/ effectiveness of wildlife crossings, such as the one proposed here for the Gloucestershire Way, from other road schemes?</p> <p>b) Is it a robust solution to protect or provide for biodiversity in this manner?</p>
1.3.6.	Applicant	<p>Wildlife Crossings</p> <p>a) Apart from the areas of crossing over the new A417, is wildlife exclusion fencing to be erected along the entire length of the new A417 to prevent animal collisions?</p> <p>b) Otherwise, how else would the wildlife crossing be promoted, and animal</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		mortality reduced?
1.3.7.	Applicant	<p>Ancient Woodland Protection</p> <p>a) Whilst a 15m wide fenced cordon around the Ancient Woodland might prevent compaction or damage, what measures are proposed to limit or reduce the effects of nitrogen deposition on the woodland flora?</p> <p>b) Paragraph 8.10.263 states there are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce the predicted increase, but could a further buffer distance be beneficial?</p>
1.3.8.	Applicant	<p>Ancient Woodland Compensation</p> <p>Paragraph 8.9.116 refers to "<i>Opportunities will be sought to expand the woodland restoration project to additional areas of Ullen Wood, in conjunction with CCB and the landowner/s. The aim would be to reduce the impact of typical threats and pressures to ancient woodland that are relevant to Ullen Wood such as browsing by deer, decline in woodland management and increasing levels of shade. Enhancement measures would aim to alleviate these pressures and improve the overall conservation status of the ancient woodland by improving woodland structure, creating variation of light conditions in the woodland and increasing diversity of the ground flora.</i>" How is it proposed this would be secured? (A planning Obligation or other legal instrument?)</p>
1.3.9.	Applicant	<p>Emma's Grove Woodland – Ancient Woodland</p> <p>a) The ExA, on its USI, were able to access Emma's Grove via the public footpaths. Could the Applicant explain what access issues it faced that prevented initial adequate survey or investigation of this land?</p> <p>b) Have the results of the 'further' survey or scoping work been undertaken at Emma's Grove Woodland to determine if it comprises Ancient Woodland? If not, why not?</p> <p>c) Should a worst-case scenario be adopted in the event that the further</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		surveys confirm the presence of Ancient Woodland?
1.3.10.	Applicant	<p>Emma's Grove Woodland – Protected Species and Habitats</p> <p>a) Has any further survey or scoping work been undertaken at Emma's Grove Woodland to determine the presence of habitats and species (for example, bats)?</p> <p>b) What worst-case scenario principles have been adopted in this instance?</p>
1.3.11.	Applicant	<p>Emma's Grove Woodland - Mitigation</p> <p>a) Would the mitigation measures detailed in ES Chapter 8 paragraph 8.9.21 be applied to Emma's Grove Woodland if it was discovered that this site did indeed comprise Ancient Woodland or would alternate measures be required?</p> <p>b) Is there sufficient margin between the Proposed Development and Emma's Grove to install such mitigation?</p> <p>c) Is there potential to implement a woodland restoration programme similar to that referred to in reference to Ullen Wood as referenced above and how could this be secured?</p>
1.3.12.	Applicant	<p>Cotswolds Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation</p> <p>a) The Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment details further analysis being required for the Cotswolds Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation. When will this analysis be carried out and will the results be available to the Examination?</p> <p>b) If not, what reassurance can the ExA have that there is no scientific doubt regarding effects and impacts on the designated asset?</p>
1.3.13.	Applicant	<p>Section 28E of the WCA 1981</p> <p>Can the Applicant comment on Natural England's concerns about the Applicant's intended dis-application of Section 28E of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 at paragraphs 54 and 55 of its letter attachment to its RR [RR-080]?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.3.14.	Applicant, Natural England, GCC, TBC, CDC and CCB	Barrow Wake Car Park What would be the effects of closing the Barrow Wake car park, taking into account the need to manage recreational pressure within the Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI and for recreational use in the area generally?
1.3.15.	Natural England	SAMM for Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI a) Would a contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring be required to manage and mitigate the increased recreational pressure on the Crickley Hill and Barrow Wake SSSI? b) If yes how would this be secured?
1.3.16.	Applicant, Natural England	Great Crested Newt Licence a) Based upon the findings of the Environmental Statement and the studies thereto, is it likely that there will be a requirement for a great crested newt license to be sought and obtained by the Applicant prior to construction? b) Has the Applicant sought a letter of no impediment?
1.3.17.	Applicant	Scheme Boundary In table 8-5, define what is meant by 'scheme boundary'. Does this mean from the edge of the limits of deviation, edge of the Order land or other definition?
1.3.18.	Applicant	Magic Maps Notwithstanding that they contain representative polygons only, could the MAGIC maps used to inform the desk study be provided so as to give a visual impression of the environmental assets in proximity to the Proposed Development?
1.3.19.	Applicant	Ash Dieback Would the effects of ash dieback affect any of the landscape and visual representations provided with the ES, or give rise to a need to provide further planting beyond that initially envisaged to screen or soften the visual effects of the Proposed Development?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.3.20.	Applicant	<p>Overbridges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What has influenced the location of the other overbridges at Stockwell and Cowley? b) Are the overbridges provided in areas where there have historically been high levels of wildlife movements observed, thus designed to meet the natural need? c) Were other locations for these overbridges considered in the optioneering stage and discounted? If so, why?
1.3.21.	Applicant, Natural England	<p>Water Features – Harm to Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Would the introduction of attenuation ponds and drainage basins in close proximity to the Proposed Development encourage wildlife into areas where the potential for harm or strike increases? b) Would it be likely species might cross the A417 in new locations to access the water features, altering the foraging and distribution habits?
1.3.22.	Applicant	<p>Water Features – Nitrogen Deposition</p> <p>How would the new attenuation ponds be protected from nitrogen deposition, to prevent any subsequent encouragement of nitrogen-tolerant species into the locality?</p>
1.3.23.	Applicant, Natural England, Wildlife Trust	<p>Edge Habitat</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is a 2m buffer between works compounds and hedgerows sufficient to maintain 'edge habitat' for wildlife as stated in ES Chapter 8 paragraph 8.9.47? b) Should this separation distance be wider to avoid noise, vibration, dust and disturbance through human activity?
1.3.24.	Applicant	<p>Works to Buildings</p> <p>Does the dDCO authorise works to buildings (such as suggested improvements to the derelict World War II structure) and, if so, when will details be known regarding</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		the works and who will be consulted over the content of those details?
1.3.25.	Applicant	<p>Bird Boxes</p> <p>a) What evidence is there to confirm that the provision of bird boxes is a successful means of attracting or supporting species such as tawny owl and kestrel?</p> <p>b) Is the provision of boxes alone sufficient to encourage the natural translocation of birds into other areas?</p>
1.3.26.	Applicant	<p>Ground Nesting Bird Habitat</p> <p>a) Will areas of grassland set aside for ground nesting birds be protected from human activity and how?</p> <p>b) Will measures be taken to discourage tracks and paths being created through frequent trampling/ use into such areas?</p> <p>c) Designated sites are referred to in individual aspect chapters where relevant, for example, European sites are identified in ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-039]. Breeding bird surveys were undertaken in April to June 2019 and wintering bird surveys were undertaken October 2018 and February 2019. Can the Applicant confirm if they will be conducting further surveys to verify the initial survey results for bird species, or provide justification as to why these would not be required?</p>
1.3.27.	Applicant, Natural England	<p>Construction Noise Effects</p> <p>Are the species of fish identified in paragraph 8.9.102 of ES Chapter 8 sensitive to noise and vibration (are they able to 'hear') and if so, would construction activities cause harm to or early displacement of these fish?</p>
1.3.28.	Applicant	<p>Translocation Sites</p> <p>a) With regards to paragraphs 8.9.74 and 8.9.93, have any agreements been reached with landowners with regards to securing suitable translocation sites?</p> <p>b) When will all receptor sites be secured, and how would the dDCO or its</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>control documents ensure such translocation agreements are binding?</p> <p>c) Would the dDCO need to authorise a 'right' to enter onto land for the purposes of translocation?</p> <p>d) How would translocation affect practices (for example, farming operations) on land in the vicinity of the receptor sites?</p>
1.3.29.	Natural England	<p>Translocation</p> <p>It is proposed (with reference to measure BD19 in the EMP) to translocate reptiles to suitable receptor sites. Would Natural England be supportive of this or could keeping populations local to the area (i.e. provision of suitable nearby compensatory habitat, perhaps with one of the attenuation ponds as a focus) be achievable?</p>
1.3.30.	Applicant	<p>Landowner Agreement</p> <p>a) With reference to measure BD40 in the EMP, what solution would be followed if the landowner's agreement was not obtained?</p> <p>b) Would the land/ trees identified be subjected to further compulsory acquisition requests?</p>
1.3.31.	Stroud District Council	<p>Beechwood SAC</p> <p>What measures would the Council require, or request be provided with regards to controlling recreational use of the Beechwood SAC, and in what form (Development Consent Obligation or a Requirement of the dDCO) should such provision be made?</p>
1.3.32.	Applicant, Natural England	<p>Land Surveys</p> <p>The ES reports some difficulties gaining access to land for surveys. To what extent does this mean that the knowledge of local ecology is not comprehensive, and are the assumptions that have been made in lieu of full survey results fair and reasonable for an informed assessment?</p>
1.3.33.	Applicant	<p>Habitats Regulation Assessment</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm that there are no additional mitigation measures relied on</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		in the HRA that are not included in the ES?
1.3.34.	Applicant, Natural England	<p>Scope of HRA The Applicant explains that it has consulted Natural England throughout the process. Point 6.16 of Table 4-1 in the Statement of Commonality [APP-419] states that in an email dated April 2021, Natural England stated it is “satisfied about the approach and conclusions of the draft HRA”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A copy of this email has not been provided in the HRA Screening Report; can a copy of the e-mail be provided for completeness? b) Could Natural England confirm that they are satisfied with the scope of the Applicant’s assessment of effects on European sites? c) Is NE content with the Applicant’s approach to the in-combination assessment? d) Are there any other sites or site features that could be affected by the Proposed Development?
1.3.35.	Applicant, Natural England	<p>Habitats Regulation Assessment The Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) published a policy paper on 1 January 2021 relating to changes to the Habitats Regulations 2017 following the United Kingdom’s (UK) departure from the European Union. Explain whether this paper has any bearing on, or implications for the Proposed Development.</p>
1.3.36.	Natural England	<p>Reptile Surveys Paragraph 2.5.8 of the Reptile Survey states that a number of surveys were undertaken in July 2019, outside of the optimal survey season and other access restrictions impacted on obtaining survey data. Provide a response as to the accuracy and acceptability of the Applicant’s assessment.</p>
1.3.37.	Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust	<p>Nature Recovery Network With reference to your Relevant Representation [RR-042], provide a high-level</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		summary of what the Nature Recovery Network comprises and what its objectives are. How important are the identified nature reserves to the overall integrity of the network?
1.3.38.	Applicant	<p>Fish ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-039] discusses absence of baseline fish data from the upper reaches of the tributary of Norman’s Brook.</p> <p>a) Can the Applicant provide further details of where the upper reaches of the tributary of Normans Brook is and explain the reason for lack of baseline data for fish species in the upper reaches of Normans Brook?</p> <p>b) Can the Applicant confirm that surveys for fish species were carried out in the upper reaches of the tributary of Normans Brook?</p>
1.3.39.	Applicant	<p>Veteran Trees ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [APP-039] describes the potential for the Proposed Development to increase nitrogen deposition on veteran trees and beech trees within the study area. A large, adverse significant effect has been determined.</p> <p>a) Can the Applicant confirm if the veteran trees/ veteran beech trees described in paragraphs 8.10.268 – 8.10.271 form part of the Cotswold Beechwoods SAC?</p> <p>b) Table 8-21 ‘summary of assessment of likely significant construction effects’ describes one of the potential impacts as “loss of three veteran trees”. Can the Applicant confirm if they are proposing to remove the veteran tress in question?</p>
1.3.40.	Applicant	<p>Other Consents Can the Applicant provide an update on the progress made towards obtaining a Letter of No Impediment regarding European Protected Species?</p>
1.3.41.	Applicant, Natural England	<p>Beechwoods SPA In the Habitats Regulation Assessment Statement to inform Appropriate Assessment</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>[APP-415] the conclusions section includes: Paragraph 10.1.2 which states that there is uncertainty of the efficacy of integral mitigation measures “and it would therefore not be robust to draw a conclusion of no adverse effect on integrity based on those measures. Therefore, additional precautionary mitigation will be provided in the form of measures to control recreational use of the SAC to address this uncertainty; and 10.1.3 which states In conclusion, there will be no significant adverse effect upon the integrity of Cotswold Beechwoods SAC as a result of the scheme, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.”</p> <p>a) Can the Applicant confirm what the ‘additional precautionary mitigation’ measures are which are proposed for the Cotswold Beechwoods SAC? The Applicant is requested to identify any factors that might affect the certainty of the implementation of the additional precautionary mitigation measures.</p> <p>b) Can Natural England confirm if they agree that there will be no adverse effects on the integrity of the Cotswold Beechwoods SAC without the additional precautionary mitigation measures?</p>
1.3.42.	Applicant	<p>Loss of Tuffaceous Vegetation Explain and justify why the proposed compensation for the loss of Tufa habitat is sufficient and justified, or suggest/ provide proposed additional compensation.</p>
1.4.	Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations	
1.4.1.	Applicant	<p>CA and TP Negotiations Provide an update of the current situation of negotiations with affected landowners and occupiers including over potential acquisition by agreement. Please complete Annex A with this information.</p>
1.4.2.	Applicant	<p>Highways England Land</p> <p>a) With reference to the Book of Reference paragraph 2.1.5 and the Lands Plans, if the existing A417 is within the ownership of Highways England and the responsibility for maintaining the road falls to them, why is there a need</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		to show it as being land acquired permanently? b) How does this affect the calculation of funds available for compulsory acquisition?
1.4.3.	Applicant	Book of Reference (BoR) In part 5 of the BoR [APP-026] plots 3/1n, 3/9b, 3/11b and 3/12 – 3/12f are identified as 'Special Category land – Open'. Can you confirm if this is a typographical error and should read 'Special Category Land – Open Space' and amend the BoR?
1.4.4.	Applicant	Book of Reference No reason or detailed description is given with regards to plot 2/33. When updating the BoR, please provide this.
1.4.5.	Applicant	Statement of Reasons In the Statement of Reasons [APP-024], should Table 2 refer only to the acquisition of rights since the temporary possession of land is set out within Table 3?
1.4.6.	Applicant	Statement of Reasons With regards to paragraphs 6.2.4, 6.2.7, 6.2.14, 6.2.18, 6.2.21, 6.2.24 and 6.2.25 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-024], give an update as to latest negotiations.
1.4.7.	Applicant	Statement of Reasons a) To confirm the statement in 7.5.39 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-024], all 10,540 square metres of 'replacement land' to be registered as common is land owned by Highways England? b) Does this figure include the 1,771 square metres of land temporarily possessed, or is this a separate figure (i.e. is the 1,771m ² restored common land in addition to or part of the 10,540-replacement land)?
1.4.8.	National Trust	Statement of Reasons With reference to paragraph 7.6.6 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-024] and its RR [RR-079] can the National Trust confirm whether it has any objection to the

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.4.9.	Applicant	<p>compulsory acquisition of any land it holds inalienably?</p> <p>Statement of Reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) In the Statement of Reasons [APP-024] section 6.6 addresses duties under the Equality Act 2010 and states the Applicant has complied with its duties under section 149 and it goes on to note the Applicant has conducted an Equality Impact Assessment explaining how. Given the comments from the National Star Foundation [RR-039 and RR-078] can you confirm whether residents and users of National Star premises and services were taken into account? b) If so, identify where and how within the documentation this is the case. c) If not please provide an updated Equality Impact Assessment to include specific reference to the users of these services and how account has been taken.
1.4.10.	Applicant	<p>Public and Private Interest Balance</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons [APP-024] states that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the CA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Set out what assessment, if any, has been made of the effect upon individual APs and their private loss that would result from the exercise of CA powers in each case. b) Demonstrate within the application that the public benefits of the Proposed Development outweigh any residual adverse effects including private loss suffered by individual landowners and occupiers. c) Demonstrate how such a conclusion has been reached and how the balancing exercise between public benefit and private loss has been carried out. d) Explain how it is demonstrated that interference with human rights in this case would be proportionate and justified. e) Explain how the proportionality test has been undertaken and explain how

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		this approach has been undertaken in relation to individual plots.
1.4.11.	Applicant	<p>Alternatives to Acquisition Could the Applicant please provide direction to the evidence that demonstrates that all of the 'reasonable alternatives to acquisition' have been explored?</p>
1.4.12.	Applicant	<p>Funding Paragraph 2.1 of the Funding Statement [APP-025] sets out the composite parts that contribute to the estimated capital cost of £439.6million. The paragraph refers to compensation payments but does not explicitly state there is an allowance of funds for blight, which appears a reasonable prospect since section 4 of the Funding Statement states some claims have already been successful. Can the Applicant confirm the amount of funds set aside for anticipated blight claims?</p>
1.4.13.	Applicant	<p>Funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) With reference to the Funding Statement [APP-025] and paragraph 2.2.12 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-417], this project is only one of those projects confirmed within the second Road Investment Strategy. In terms of the funding available to this scheme, what proportion of the funds within that strategy are ring-fenced for this project and what contingencies are there if the budget were to increase? b) Would this prejudice the delivery of other projects through reducing the amount of available funds? c) Has allowance been made for inflation in the cost estimate for the project and, if so, what is it? d) The UK has been subjected to a significant and costly pandemic and the ExA requires confirmation that the stated £27.5bn for road improvements remains available.
1.4.14.	Applicant	<p>Funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) It is stated in paragraph 2.2.12 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-417] that an

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>upper limit of cost range (£500 million) was set. At what stage was this budget set in the optioneering process and how much influence did that have on the study of alternatives?</p> <p>b) How was the upper limit of cost set, and what were the factors contributing to the setting of the limit?</p>
1.4.15.	Applicant	<p>Funding</p> <p>a) In terms of funding, what proportion of the money has been specifically set aside to deal with blight claims and compensation claims, and are the costs likely to rise?</p> <p>b) It is also noted from table 7-1 of the Statement of Commonality [APP-419] that utility diversions are agreed with various statutory undertakers and incorporated in the costs. What proportion of the money has been set aside for this and is there potential for these costs to rise?</p>
1.4.16.	Applicant	<p>Air Balloon – Loss of Accommodation</p> <p>With regards the Air Balloon Public House, what discussions are in place to compensate the loss of the dwelling (on-site staff accommodation)?</p>
1.4.17.	Applicant	<p>Air Balloon – Alternatives</p> <p>Has any option of retaining but relocating the Air Balloon Public House along the route of the proposed Air Balloon Way been considered?</p>
1.4.18.	Applicant	<p>Compensation Claims</p> <p>Is there a need within the dDCO to contain an article guaranteeing that the availability of funds to pay compensation claims, to underpin the guarantee in the Funding Statement?</p>
1.4.19.	Applicant	<p>Statutory Undertakers</p> <p>The Book of Reference includes a number of statutory undertakers with interests in land. Provide a progress report on negotiations with each of the statutory undertakers listed, with an estimate of timescale for securing agreement from them</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		and, if necessary, state whether there are any envisaged impediments to the securing of such agreements. This can cross refer to the Statements of Common Ground requested by the ExA.
1.4.20.	Environment Agency	Watercourse Rights What are the current positions of the Applicant and the Environment Agency in terms of its rights relating to watercourses?
1.4.21.	Applicant	Other Consents Since submission of the application, what progress has been made on obtaining the other necessary consents, licences or permits that are necessary for the Proposed Development?
1.4.22.	Environment Agency, Natural England, GCC, CDC, TBC	Other Consents The ES notes that the contractor appointed to undertake the construction works would need to apply for various environmental permits, discharge and other consents once detailed design is complete. Given that such applications have not been made, the Examining Authority and Secretary of State cannot be sure from the information provided if adequate avoidance or mitigation of environmental effects are possible, and therefore if all of these consents are achievable. Could the Environment Agency and the relevant local authorities with responsibilities in this area please provide an opinion on the likelihood of all such permits and consents being achieved?
1.4.23.	Applicant, Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust	Replacement Common Land Paragraph 12.10.41 in reference to the replacement common land repurposed from the A417 states it is to be planted as Calcareous Grassland Habitat, in co-ordination with Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust, who would become owner of the replacement land. Is there a written agreement or obligation to this effect and, if so, can it be provided?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.4.24.	Applicant	Affected Businesses Can the Applicant explain if Crickley Hill Tractors would be relocated? And if so, where would this be?
1.5.	Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-022]	
1.5.1.	Applicant	General Ensure, if amended versions of the DCO are submitted as the Examination progresses, that all internal references and legislative footnotes are checked and updated.
1.5.2.	Applicant	Interpretation Should the definition of "the Undertaker" be amended to take account of the rebranding of Highways England to National Highways?
1.5.3.	Applicant, GCC, TBC, CDC, CCB	Interpretation a) Is the definition of 'commence' within the dDCO, including those elements that are excluded from that description, acceptable to the Local Planning Authorities? b) Similarly, is the definition of 'maintain' acceptable to the appropriate Authorities? c) In both cases, if not, why not? d) Is the Applicant satisfied that the definition of 'maintain' is consistent with other Development Consent orders?
1.5.4.	Applicant	Interpretation Would it be appropriate to define 'adjacent' within the dDCO by a physical dimension (distance) away from the route of the preliminary design?
1.5.5.	Applicant, consenting Authorities	Article 3 a) Confirm whether consent has been given in accordance with section 150 of the PA2008 for the disapplication of the consent provisions in 3(a),(b),(c),

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(d),(i)? b) If not, which provisions need to be removed and why?
1.5.6.	Applicant	Article 3 Can the Applicant respond to concerns regarding the disapplication of section 28E of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, Article 3(h) of the dDCO and the impact of not having this provision on the implementation of the Proposed Development?
1.5.7.	Applicant	Article 4 Explain the position of Article 4 within the dDCO and comment on whether it would be better placed in the 'Principal Powers' part of the proposed Order.
1.5.8.	Applicant	Planning Permission Provide commentary on the relationship between dDCO Article 7 and s153 of the PA2008, and whether the wording as drafted obviates the need to formally change the DCO in the future.
1.5.9.	Applicant	Article 8 a) What is the rationale behind allowing the limit of deviation between points E and F to be a maximum of 5.3 metres (as detailed in Article 8(iii) in the dDCO)? b) Under Article 8, for what reason would a maximum limit of deviation need to be exceeded? c) The article contains a further element of flexibility whereby the maximum limits may be exceeded if the SoS considers that to do so would not give rise to any materially new or materially different effects. Is this extra level of flexibility necessary and if so can you justify? d) What process is in place for the SoS to consider and determine matters that arise under this provision? For example, should schedule 2 part 2 apply?
1.5.10.	Applicant	Article 10

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		a) Why is the Secretary of State's consent not required to transfer the benefit of the Order to those companies listed under Article 10(5) of the dDCO? b) Why are other utility or service providers not included in these exemptions?
1.5.11.	Applicant	Articles 14 and 18 a) Would a breach of Article 14(5) and Article 18 be a convictional offence and an offending individual charged under the terms of this Order? b) If a person were to speed, what effect does this provision have, if any, and is there recourse against the Applicant?
1.5.12.	Applicant	Article 15 a) In the context of Article 15, is it correct to use the term 'temporarily stop up'? b) Are the purposes of the Article potentially better served by a Traffic Regulation Order enforcing a temporary road closure, since stopping up is meant to prohibit any form of public access?
1.5.13.	Applicant	Article 15 a) Is the purpose and intention of Article 15 to extend beyond the period of construction for the Proposed Development? b) If so, what benefits does this article give the Applicant that would not be served by existing legislative powers?
1.5.14.	Applicant	Article 15 a) Subsection 1 permits the undertaker to stop up divert or restrict the use of any street, should this be limited to those within the order limits? b) and/ or can the Applicant provide justification for such a wide power outside of the order limits?
1.5.15.	GCC, TBC, CDC, CCB	Articles 15, 19, 21, 23 – Deemed Consent There are a number of articles which contain deemed consent provisions, i.e. if the

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		consenting authority does not respond within a certain time consent is deemed to be granted. Are the consenting departments happy with these provisions and the timescales set out?
1.5.16.	Applicant	<p>Article 17 This appears to be a very wide power to enable the undertaker to form and lay out means of access or improve access at any location within the Order limits as the undertaker requires. Can the Applicant justify the need for power wider than that available under the Highways Act (Explanatory Memorandum [APP-023] paragraph 4.69) and can the Applicant identify whether there is any DCO precedent for this?</p>
1.5.17.	Applicant	<p>Article 20 Can the Applicant please explain the need for and purpose of this article and provide legal submissions regarding the need for its inclusion in the DCO and the legislative basis upon which it is permissible? In doing so please also explain how this is intended to interact with the process in the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 and the power of the Secretary of State to issue a direction under s.55 of that Act.</p> <p>Additionally, in relation to the specific drafting, can the Applicant explain why the definition of the "Cotswold Way, national trail" and the "Cotswold Way national trail diversion" been included in the article itself but the "Cotswold Way national trail diversion report" is instead defined in article 2?</p>
1.5.18.	Applicant	<p>Article 20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is there a need for a similar article to article 20 for amendments to the route and condition of the Gloucestershire Way footpath? b) If not, why not?
1.5.19.	Applicant	Article 22

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Does Article 22 obviate the need to obtain listed building consent if such protective works are to be carried out to a listed building?
1.5.20.	Applicant	<p>Article 29 Subsection 1 states that all private rights over land subject to CA under the order are extinguished. However, subsection 2 seeks to distinguish land over which the CA is limited to the acquisition of rights and in those cases limit the power to extinguish private rights to where their continuance would be inconsistent with the exercise of the right or burden of the restrictive covenant. Should 29(1) be amended to make it clear that it applies only to the compulsory acquisition of land and not the compulsory acquisition of rights over land?</p>
1.5.21.	Applicant	<p>Restoration With reference to Article 34(4) and 35(6):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Should there be notification given to the relevant landowner or local planning authority confirming the land restoration works are completed and, if so, how would such notice be served? b) Should a new requirement be added (or a new management plan appended to the EMP [APP-317]) setting out measures and actions for effective land restoration?
1.5.22.	Applicant	<p>Article 39</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Does the Applicant intend to submit the scheme for the provision of the common land to the examination and if not, why not? b) If this is not to be provided during the Examination what is the Applicant's intended process for the submission and approval of the scheme for replacement land in 39(1), including consultation, and should this be set out within the Article to provide clarity?
1.5.23.	Applicant	<p>Article 40</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) There is a cross referencing error in Article 40(2).

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		b) How would the Applicant demonstrate that any decisions undertaken under the term of "it reasonably believes to be necessary" has been based upon a fair, impartial and expert-advised approach as opposed to an arbitrary decision by the contractor? c) Under Article 40, is compensation to be calculated using the CAVAT regime? d) Why is there no commitment to undertaking replacement planting of a similar species and scale of the tree or shrub being lost?
1.5.24.	Applicant	Article 41 a) Explain why Article 41 (removal of human remains) appears in Part 6 of the draft Development Consent Order as opposed to within Part 7. b) To reflect other made transport orders, should article 41 be a miscellaneous provision?
1.5.25.	Applicant	Article 48 Under article 48 is it appropriate that the Secretary of State is not excluded from arbitration proceedings?
1.5.26.	Applicant	Schedule 1 a) Within Schedule 1, does the Applicant consider there is any necessary/unnecessary duplication or repetition of individuals works? b) For example, is Work No.4 as described repeated in Work No.4(d) and (i) and is Work No.8 repeated as Work No.8(b)?
1.5.27.	Applicant	Schedule 3 a) Part 7 of Schedule 3 to the dDCO contains [X] to denote the date of when an Order comes into effect. What is the progress on the related Order? b) Should there be additional entries in Part 7 to reflect the revocation of clearways on the A436, as well as on the A417, with additional points added to sheet 2 of the Traffic Regulations Measures Clearways and Prohibitions Plans [APP-013]?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.5.28.	Applicant	Schedule 4 The Cotswold Way National Trail and the Gloucestershire Way footpath do not feature in the tables within Schedule 4 to the dDCO. Is there a reason for this?
1.5.29.	Applicant	Schedule 4 a) Within Schedule 4, are there any roads that are subject to only temporary closures and therefore not subject to stopping up orders? b) If so, do they need a separate Part within this Schedule?
1.5.30.	Applicant	Schedule 8 Regarding Part 3 of Schedule 4 in respect of 'Cowley Civil Parish', should the comments in column (2) be expanded to include reference to the rights of way and access plan as per the comment above it, so as to read 'Reference to Access to fields north west of new A417 mainline <i>as shown on sheet 2 of the Rights of Way and Access Plan</i> '?
1.5.31.	Applicant	Schedule 8 Explain the current positions with regard to each of the protective provisions in Schedule 8 of the dDCO and whether any unresolved disagreements remain.
1.5.32.	Applicant	Schedule 9 Should the 'Design Summary Report' be a certified document as this is a 'design led scheme' and to ensure it is given appropriate prominence in any future decisions?
1.5.33.	Applicant	Explanatory Memorandum For completeness, include an explanation of the purpose and effect of Schedules 3 to 9 of the dDCO within the Explanatory Memorandum.
1.5.34.	Applicant, GCC, TBC, CDC	Requirements – General a) Many of the requirements state that "no part" of the development is to commence until... Can the Applicant clarify what "a part" might be and

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>whether this should be defined somewhere?</p> <p>b) In the absence of any explanation, it seems to the ExA that the development could be commenced in many different “parts” and that these “parts” could vary from requirement to requirement. This could generate uncertainty about what is approved. Can the LPAs also comment on the acceptability of this?</p>
1.5.35.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 3 Natural England have suggested that 3(1) is amended to require consultation with NE before approval by the Secretary of State (see [RR-080]). How would this affect the implementation of the Proposed Development?</p>
1.5.36.	GCC, TBC, CDC	<p>Requirement 3 Are there any concerns regarding the ability of the Applicant to undertake potential noise generating activity outside of normal working hours, as listed in Requirement 3(2)(d)?</p>
1.5.37.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 3 The ExA is concerned with the wording “substantially in accordance”. “Substantially” is an interpretive word which potentially allows significant departures from the Outline CEMP and thus the ES to occur without examination. It is imprecise and not justified. Can the term ‘substantially’ be replaced with ‘must’?</p>
1.5.38.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 3 The requirement lists at (2)(e) list of management plans to be provided. A number of additional management plans are listed in measure GP5 within the EMP. Should these not also be listed in Requirement 3?</p>
1.5.39.	Applicant	<p>Requirements 3 and 5 a) Would it be more practical and accessible to have a proportion of the management plans listed in Requirement 3(2)(e) separated out into standalone documents?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>b) For example, what would be the difference between the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) submitted as part of the Environmental Management Plan in Requirement 3(2)(e), and the written landscaping scheme under Requirement 5?</p> <p>c) Could the LEMP cover all the factors in Requirement 5?</p>
1.5.40.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 4 In Requirement 4(3), what factors would govern the decision as where consultation is 'appropriate, reasonable and feasible'?</p>
1.5.41.	Applicant	<p>Ambiguous Terminology The ExA is concerned with the wording "...or other recognised codes of good practice" in Requirement 6(2). These words are uncontrolled and raise numerous questions on what the definition of "recognised" and "good practice" means and the appropriateness of such measures in dealing with landscaping works. It is imprecise and not justified. Delete the tailpiece.</p>
1.5.42.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 9 Archaeological investigations and mitigations are excluded from the definition of "commence". The ExA is concerned that such works could undermine the purpose of Schedule 2, Requirement 9 if such unregulated works had a detrimental effect on any potential archaeological remains discovered which the Requirement is seeking to protect. Justify why archaeological investigations are excluded from commencement works or otherwise explain how archaeological investigations would be regulated in the draft DCO.</p>
1.5.43.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 11 Explain how the details of the proposed crossings would be secured within the draft Development Consent Order.</p>
1.5.44.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 11</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The Design Summary Report (APP-423) does not appear to be captured within those design documents listed in Requirement 11. Should it be?
1.5.45.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Requirement 11(1) says that the authorised development must be designed in detail and carried out “so that it is compatible with the preliminary design scheme...” This is imprecise and could generate uncertainty, leading to disputes over what “being compatible with” actually means. The Applicant should consider more certain and precise drafting. b) The article permits deviations from the detailed design plans, with consent of the SoS, for amendments that do not give rise to materially new or material different environmental effects. Are amendments to the key plans necessary and permissible and can the Applicant justify the need for this level of flexibility? c) What methods and means would be used to inform the public of scheme amendments, as indicated in Requirement 11(2)? d) Would there be notices, a period for their display and would there be any consultation on the amendments?
1.5.46.	Applicant	<p>Requirement 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) In Requirement 15, which is the ‘paragraph 4’ referred in in 3(c) as there is no (4) in the requirement? b) Notwithstanding, is it appropriate to have a ‘deemed consent’ provision relating to undetermined applications by the Secretary of State? Can the Applicant demonstrate or justify how the ExA can be satisfied that the requirements secure the necessary mitigation, particularly anything EIA or habitats related, when there is a provision which could potentially mean that details get approved that do not in fact secure the mitigation? c) Is the period of 8 weeks consistent with other made Transport DCOs?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.5.47.	Applicant	General Should the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 be referenced within the dDCO in more locations other than within Article 40?
1.5.48.	Local Planning Authorities and Statutory Consultees	Explanatory Memorandum [APP-023] With regards to the justification of Article 5(2) given in the Explanatory Memorandum, are there any known local acts or legislative provisions that may be implicated by the Proposed Development?
1.5.49.	Applicant	Tailpieces The term 'reasonable satisfaction' is used frequently in the dDCO (for example, requirement 3(2)). Could more appropriate definitive wording be applied in each case?
1.6.	Geology and Soils	
1.6.1.	Applicant, Environment Agency	Hydrology a) With reference to paragraph 9.7.24 in ES Chapter 9 [APP-040], can any more certainty be given as to the relationship between the stream south of the Birdlip junction and the Churn valley? b) What conditions exist that makes its hydrological relationship difficult to ascertain?
1.6.2.	Applicant	Ground Instability a) Given the presence of disused mines in the locality, is there potential for unforeseen conduits to be present allowing the leaching of contaminants into groundwater/ controlled waters? b) Would any specific mitigation measures need to be included in the EMP [APP-317] to reduce or otherwise remove the potential for groundwater contamination through such conduits?
1.6.3.	Environment Agency	Contamination a) Are there any areas of outstanding disagreement regarding the identification,

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		management and mitigation of contamination? b) If so, what are these and what is needed to reassure that adequate protection is in place?
1.6.4.	Applicant	Phase 1 Investigations a) With reference to paragraph 9.7.31 of ES Chapter 9 [APP-040], was the post-field work monitoring completed in mid-2021? b) If so, what are the results and how do they influence or inform the Proposed Development?
1.6.5.	Applicant	Imports In accordance with the waste hierarchy, would any inert soil imports be sourced from projects where such soil was deemed a waste?
1.6.6.	Applicant	Stone Walls In Table 10-14 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-041], it states "rubble masonry/Cotswold stone walling." Can you clarify what is meant by the term 'rubble masonry', including its composition and how it would be ensured the use of such would be consistent with the character of the Cotswolds AONB?
1.6.7.	Applicant	Demolition In any demolition works to buildings, and with reference to paragraph 10.10.27 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-041], are there any known or anticipated asbestos constructions that require off-site disposal?
1.6.8.	Applicant	Site Won Materials Is there an estimate (quantity) that can be given to the amount of 'site won materials' that would not be required for re-use on site?
1.6.9.	Applicant	Land Stability a) In locations where trees would be removed, how would the road surface and structure be reinforced to protect against natural subsidence or natural re-profiling of the soil over time?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		b) Similarly, where new trees are to be planted, would an adequate margin be left between the trees and the carriageway edge to avoid damage to the Proposed Development from roots/ root systems?
1.6.10.	Applicant	Agriculture a) How will the effect of the construction compounds on agricultural land be minimised? b) What measures and working practices will be introduced to avoid contamination of the compound areas and adjacent land, and how will this be secured as part of the DCO? c) Would any treatment of waste soils and other material be carried out in the compounds and, if so, what measures would be secured to control and mitigate the potential effects of these operations? d) How will the restoration of the compound sites and condition monitoring of these and adjacent land be secured as part of the DCO? e) What would trigger remedial works and how would this be secured/ verified?
1.7.	Heritage	
1.7.1.	Historic England	Statement of Common Ground It is noted that matters within the Statement of Common Ground as relate to Cultural Heritage are marked as 'not agreed' in Table 5-1 of the Statement of Commonality [APP-419]. Is the position reconcilable or are there fundamental matters of dispute that are unlikely to be resolved through Examination?
1.7.2.	Applicant	Setting of Assets a) What specific measures would be taken to mitigate the location specific effects on the settings of the heritage assets subject to significant adverse effects? b) What opportunities for improving or better presenting the asset have been

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		taken?
1.7.3.	Historic England	<p>Assessment Criteria</p> <p>a) Do Historic England agree with the assessment criteria as listed in Table 6-4 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-037]?</p> <p>b) Does this represent a proportionate and appropriate approach?</p>
1.7.4.	Applicant	<p>Iron Age Farmstead</p> <p>In Chapter 6 [APP-037] paragraph 6.7.40 refers to previous excavations establishing the remains of an Iron Age farmstead which now lies beneath the existing A417. Is this in the section to be repurposed? And could this be better revealed or is it better left covered?</p>
1.7.5.	Applicant	<p>Temporary Compounds</p> <p>Paragraph 6.8.9 ES Chapter 6 [APP-037] suggests temporary compounds and lighting would not have a significant effect on a designated asset? Can it be clarified, with reference to the nearest listed building, the length of time that 'temporary' compounds would be in place for?</p>
1.7.6.	Applicant	<p>Temporary Compounds and Other Accesses</p> <p>Will compounds, haul roads and accesses (permanent and temporary) be subject to archaeological trenching to determine where, if any, protective fencing should be erected and/ or micro-siting options to avoid loss, removal or compaction of the assets?</p>
1.7.7.	Applicant	<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>a) For the mitigation measures listed in 6.9.2, who makes the decision as to what level of mitigation is imposed?</p> <p>b) Is this in consultation with the LPA or Historic England?</p>
1.7.8.	Applicant, Historic England	<p>Paleoenvironmental Deposits</p> <p>In paragraph 6.8.7 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-037] there is reference to</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		paleoenvironmental deposits being affected by hydrological changes. There are however no further references to this within the context of this ES Chapter (other than a brief mention at 6.10.17 discounting any effect). Why is this considered sufficient consideration of the matter and please explain any effects?
1.7.9.	Historic England, Conservation Officers/ County Archaeologist in GCC, TBC, CDC	<p>Impacts on Heritage Assets</p> <p>a) Do you agree with the summaries contained in Tables 6-6 and 6-8 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-037]? b) Are there any specific entries into that table where either the setting, the nature of the impact, magnitude of impact or significance of effect are disputed? c) If so, which entries and why?</p>
1.7.10.	Historic England	<p>Assets Affected</p> <p>The Applicant states that of the 36 resources that lie within the DCO Boundary described in ES Appendix 6.2 Archaeological assessment [APP-341], 18 would be directly impacted by the scheme. Of the 219 non-designated resources that lie outside of the DCO Boundary, an adverse effect would occur at two assets. Do you consider that any assets have been mis-graded by the Applicant or should be included as being either directly or adversely affected?</p>
1.7.11.	Applicant	<p>Archaeological Assets</p> <p>How will sub-surface archaeology within the areas HE intends to purchase be protected after construction activities?</p>
1.7.12.	Applicant	<p>Archaeological Assets</p> <p>What would be the procedure followed to investigate and protect unforeseen cultural heritage finds made during the course of the works and what would happen in the event of major finds fundamentally affecting the progress of the works?</p>
1.7.13.	GCC	<p>Archaeological Works</p> <p>What is the County Archaeologist's view on the findings on the construction impacts</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		and effects on known archaeological assets set out in Chapter 6 of the ES [APP-037]?
1.7.14.	Applicant	<p>Vibration Effects How would the effects of vibration on below ground heritage assets incurred during construction, either directly or arising from haulage or compound activities, be monitored and harm prevented?</p>
1.7.15.	Historic England	<p>Group Value</p> <p>a) To understand your Relevant Representation [RR-047], explain what is meant by: “the harm caused should be assessed within the holistic historic landscape not just as individual assets.”</p> <p>b) Is there a case for assigning a ‘Group Value’ to the assets because they share a communal wider setting?</p>
1.7.16.	Applicant	<p>Assessment Limitations ES Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage [APP-037] explains that approximately 10% of the area within the DCO boundary has not been surveyed. Can the Applicant confirm where the areas are (potentially illustrated on a map) which have not been surveyed (as stated in paragraph 6.5.1 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-037]) and why it is appropriate not to survey these areas?</p>
1.7.17.	Historic England	<p>Trial Trenching</p> <p>a) Are Historic England satisfied with the Applicant’s conclusions and confidence derived from the trial trenching as stated at paragraph 6.7.42 of Chapter 6 [APP-037] such that they conclude ‘<i>there is a high degree of confidence that the archaeological potential within the DCO Boundary is understood to the degree required for an appropriate impact assessment to be carried out, and for comprehensive mitigation to be designed</i>’?</p> <p>b) If not please explain why and set out your position.</p>
1.7.18.	Applicant	Effect on Significance

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The categorisation of magnitude of impact and significance of effect is in the context of the Environmental Statement terminology however there is no indication of how this relates to 'substantial' or 'less than substantial' effects in policy terms, albeit paragraph 6.4.5 (in the context of magnitude of impacts) states: ' <i>It also reflects guidance on 'substantial harm' and 'less than substantial harm' in the NPPF and established methodologies in the DMRB</i> '. Can the conclusions be clarified to confirm the position in respect of the policy tests and whether any harms identified would be 'substantial' or 'less than substantial'?
1.8.	Landscape and Visual	
1.8.1.	Applicant	<p>Alternatives Table 2-1 [APP-033] states this is a landscape-led highways improvement scheme. What would the landscape implications have been if the route and corridor of the existing A417 were developed as an alternative compared to the re-routing of the network through undeveloped fields?</p>
1.8.2.	Applicant	<p>LVIA Methodology Please confirm how the visual assessments relating to identified residential receptors referred to in ES Chapter 7 [APP-038] were undertaken. Was professional judgement and the nearest or the most representative publicly accessible location used, or were individual occupants contacted for access and assessment?</p>
1.8.3.	Applicant	<p>LVIA Methodology ES Chapter 7 [APP-038], paragraph 7.5.12 identifies a number of typical maximum heights of temporary features during construction, including compounds and portacabins of 1 – 2 storeys, and stockpile height of 10-15m for excavated geological material. Can the Applicant confirm:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Whether the maximum permitted heights of temporary features will be secured within the DCO (as it is not uncommon for construction compounds to be several storeys high which could change the temporary landscape and

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>visual impacts); and</p> <p>b) Why the Applicant considers it necessary to generate stockpiles up to 15m in height, as this has the potential to generate additional landscape, visual and health and safety issues?</p>
1.8.4.	Applicant	<p>LVIA Methodology</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 [APP-038] paragraphs 7.5.1 and 7.5.3 indicates that a number of features are not included within the photomontages or Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). The list of features not included contains large infrastructure such as the 37m wide Gloucestershire way crossing. Can the Applicant confirm:</p> <p>a) the justification for not including these features within the photomontages and ZTV (it is noted that the photomontages were prepared based on a previous design iteration); and</p> <p>b) that revised photomontages based on the current design will be submitted to the examination, including, where required, relevant updates to ES Chapter 7 [APP-038]?</p>
1.8.5.	Applicant	<p>Scope of the ES</p> <p>Within the Landscape and Visual Chapter of the ES [APP-038], there are instances where an aspect is proposed to be scoped out of the assessment with limited supporting evidence. Can the Applicant provide additional information on their decision to scope out the following:</p> <p>A. Landscape Receptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 7-11, AONB LCA 7B Bisley plateau; • Table 7-11, AONB LCT 10 High Wold Dip Slope Valley; • Table 7-11, AONB LCA 10A Middle Churn Valley; • Table 7-11, AONB LCT 18, Settled Unwooded Vale; and • Table 7-11, LCA 18A, Vale Of Gloucester Fringe.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>B. Visual receptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Community of Birdlip, Table 7-12 notes that “Parts of the community may experience direct views, large changes which may appear dominant or form a noticeable feature in views or their visual resource at close proximity from locations to the north and east of Birdlip”. Can the Applicant provide a justification for not including the assessment within the main ES chapter, as it has currently been scoped out and is reported in Appendix 7.5 [APP-352], despite the assessment indicating that it is of a medium sensitivity with a potentially moderate adverse effect during construction, which therefore may require scoping into the assessment in order to consider mitigation measures? • For the community of Cold Slad, Table 7-12 indicates that this is to be scoped in, however the assessment is presented within Appendix 7.5 [APP-352] and the accompanying text appears to indicate that the Applicant has decided to scope this out. Can the Applicant provide clarification as to the intended location of this assessment?
1.8.6.	National Trust, CCB	<p>Attenuation Features</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) A number of attenuation features are proposed in the Order land. Do you consider the number, design and layout of these to be compatible with the special qualities of the AONB? b) If yes, how and why? c) If not, why not and what are the implications?
1.8.7.	GCC, TBC, CDC, CCB	<p>Landscape Mitigation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Does the Applicant’s landscape-led approach go far enough to secure adequate mitigation for the Proposed Development? b) If not, which aspects of the proposed landscaping mitigation are deemed insufficient or requiring work and why?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.8.8.	National Trust, Natural England, GCC, TBC, CDC, CCB	<p>Compliance with NPSNN</p> <p>Notwithstanding any disputes over landscaping and the effectiveness thereof, what are the parties' views of how the Proposed Development complies with the National Policy Statement for National Networks specifically in regard to development within an AONB?</p>
1.8.9.	Applicant	<p>Construction Impacts</p> <p>The construction phase is estimated to be a period of 33 months.</p> <p>a) During the construction, would tall vehicles (cranes, telescopic cranes etc) be required (for example in the construction of bridges) or other large machinery (for construction of retaining walls in cut-ins) be present along the course of the Proposed Development?</p> <p>b) How long are these anticipated to be in situ, and have they been taken into account when conducting the LVIA?</p>
1.8.10.	Applicant, Natural England, CCB, GCC, TBC, CDC	<p>Viewpoints</p> <p>a) Clarify what consultation was undertaken with stakeholders on the locations of viewpoints used for photomontages and whether agreement was reached. If agreement was not reached, provide details of the differences between parties.</p> <p>b) Do you have any comments on the presentation of baseline photographs and visualisations?</p> <p>c) Are additional viewpoints required and, if so, show these using maps and explain the rationale as to why such viewpoints need evidencing?</p>
1.8.11.	Applicant	<p>Lighting Proposals</p> <p>a) In paragraph 7.4.67 it states the scheme is not proposed to be lit. Does this mean that the road underneath the bridge for the Gloucestershire Way will be unlit?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		b) Would there be a need for pedestrian lighting on the bridges for safety? c) If lighting is required, have the implications of this on bat species been assessed?
1.8.12.	Applicant	Zone of Theoretical Visibility What would be the visual impact consequences by the additional 12 metres of the Gloucestershire Way crossing, which were not taken into account in the ZTV?
1.8.13.	Applicant	Zone of Theoretical Visibility Section 2.6 of ES Chapter 2 [APP-033] provides details of the physical characteristics and construction activities required for the Proposed Development. Details are provided regarding the mainline, side roads and structures. Table 2.3 provides details of the structures which are required for the Proposed Development, which consists of two underpasses, two crossings, one underbridge and two overbridges. Paragraph 2.6.40 states that "details of surfacing, signage and other arrangements would be determined with GCC at the detailed design." a) Will there be a commitment to a height limit for gantries and signage-bearing structures? b) Additional vertical structures are not included in the projected ZTV because their location or number are not known at this stage. At what stage will these elements be known and what are the anticipated effects/ visibility of such structures? c) Is there a commitment that these will not be lit?
1.8.14.	Applicant	Tranquillity a) How would gantries and other vertical structures impact on tranquillity? b) Is it the Applicant's case that there would not be any increased adverse effect on tranquillity by way of erecting these features, or will further landscaping or design mitigation need to be incorporated into the detailed design to minimise localised impacts?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.8.15.	GCC, TBC, CDC, CCB	<p>Adverse and Beneficial Effects</p> <p>a) Is there agreement on the scope of adverse and beneficial effects listed in paragraph 7.12.13 and 7.12.14 of ES Chapter 7 [APP-038]? b) Are there any areas of dispute? c) Would the benefits, taken as a whole, outweigh the purported adverse effects, or how do the authorities suggest these effects are balanced?</p>
1.8.16.	Applicant	<p>Landscape Works</p> <p>Annex D to the EMP [APP-317] contains a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan. The Plan is not however referenced as influencing the written landscaping scheme in requirements 5 or 6. Why is this?</p>
1.8.17.	Applicant	<p>Good Design</p> <p>a) Set out the approach taken for scheme design in response to these criteria as they relate to landscape architecture, visual appearance and integration with the public realm. b) Set out the design approach to the proposed overbridges and underpasses, and explain how they constitute good design.</p>
1.9.	Noise and Vibration	
1.9.1.	GCC, TBC, CDC	<p>Methodology</p> <p>a) Are there any concerns about the assessment methodology set out in section 11.4 of ES Chapter 11 [APP-042], or is it accepted to be appropriate and proportionate to the Proposed Development? b) Are you satisfied with the thresholds and criteria in respect of National Star College given its sensitive occupation?</p>
1.9.2.	Applicant	<p>Enhancement</p> <p>a) With reference to paragraph 11.9.10, how would judgement calls be made as to whether there are 'opportunities' for enhancements? b) Would the judgements involve consultation with all relevant authorities and</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>consultees?</p> <p>c) Would an enhancement in one discipline potentially give rise to another effect beyond the scope of the ES? (For example, as per paragraph 11.9.10, if extension of screening would provide noise improvements, could that extension negatively affect views and vistas that may be important, but not considered affected under the current Proposed Development?)</p>
1.9.3.	Applicant	<p>Night Noise</p> <p>Should there be a schedule either in the EMP of the dDCO setting out the locations where overnight working is to take place, the hours of use for such working and limiting the noise emissions arising during this time?</p>
1.9.4.	Applicant	<p>SOAEL and LOAEL</p> <p>Provide a more detailed explanation of paragraph 11.4.26 in ES Chapter 11 [APP-042] in respect of the underlined word 'may.' What are the reasons why the effects may not be identified in the assessment as likely significant adverse effects?</p>
1.9.5.	Applicant	<p>Noise Insulation</p> <p>a) With reference to 11.10.114, for those addresses that exceed the criteria to be eligible for noise insulation, how great an exceedance beyond NIR. LA 111 would each property experience?</p> <p>b) What type of noise insulation would be used and how would it perform in terms of reducing noise beyond the NIR. LA 111?</p> <p>c) Has the insulation to be provided been budgeted for in the Funding Statement?</p> <p>d) Does the dDCO contain a provision enabling the Applicant to enter onto land for the purposes of providing noise insulation into these properties?</p> <p>e) If noise insulation is required to a listed building, would the Applicant be submitting for approval an application for Listed Building Consent on behalf of the affected receptor?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.9.6.	Applicant	<p>Temporary Noise In paragraph 11.5.6 of ES Chapter 11 [APP-042], explain what is anticipated in using the term “may be temporarily higher” with reference to a duration of time and the level of noise above that predicted.</p>
1.9.7.	Applicant	<p>Study Area Is the study area of 300 metres a standard approach for all types of terrain, or do allowances need to be made to recognise the undulating landscape, rock escarpments and prevailing winds, with the potential for noise to carry, echo or be conveyed over a greater distance?</p>
1.9.8.	Applicant	<p>National Star College In paragraph 11.6.10 it states only those receptors within 300 metres are presented in the report. With reference to the National Star College’s Relevant Representations [RR-039 and RR-078], could the specific vibration information be published?</p>
1.9.9.	Applicant	<p>National Star College</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> With reference to paragraph 11.10.37, what is meant by “construction noise impacts would be applied where it is agreed to be appropriate”? Does the DCO, or the EMP [APP-317], contain specific secured provisions for mitigation to the National Star College or are these subjects of ongoing discussions? If subject to discussions, can the ExA expect to see a resolution prior to the close of the Examination?
1.9.10.	Applicant	<p>Mitigation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Why are the measures listed below paragraph 11.10.54 not currently committed or secured in the EMP [APP-317]? For what reasons would mitigation, designed to improve conditions at noise sensitive receptors, not be implemented? With reference to measure NV1 in the EMP [APP-317], why is the contractor

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>being given discretion (“the contractor may offer”) in instances where noise exposure exceedances still occur?</p> <p>d) There appears a tension between EMP paragraph 4.2.1(a) and 4.2.2 insofar as who is responsible for obtaining evidence that noise levels breach the relevant British Standard. Is it the case, as implied in 4.2.2, that members of the public would have to obtain their own evidence and present it to the contractor for consideration as to their eligibility for noise insulation?</p> <p>e) What progress has been made in respect of measures to mitigate the significant effects identified for properties at Stratton and Leckhampton Hill (paragraph 11.10.120 of ES)?</p>
1.9.11.	Applicant	<p>Operational Vibration Assessment</p> <p>The condition of the road surface is a significant factor in determining the likelihood of ground-borne vibration impacts. Ground-borne vibration is scoped out of the assessment as it is assumed that the new road surface will be adequately maintained to be free of irregularities over the long-term assessment period. Is the maintenance regime secured in order to ensure that ground-borne noise will not become a problem over the lifetime of the Proposed Development?</p>
1.9.12.	Applicant	<p>Road Surfacing</p> <p>Paragraph 11.5.10 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-042] states that a lower noise surface would be used on all new and altered roads in the Proposed Development.</p> <p>a) Can the Applicant confirm what further details regarding surfacing will be agreed with Gloucestershire County Council at the detailed design as stated in paragraph 2.6.40 of ES Chapter 2 [APP-033]?</p> <p>b) Would this be a thin surface course system or equivalent?</p> <p>c) Would this be for the entire length of the new A417 including slip roads and roundabouts?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		d) What other options are there for road surfacing and how do they compare in terms of noise reduction performance (tabulate if necessary)?
1.10.	Socio-economic effects	
1.10.1.	Applicant	<p>Effects on Residence</p> <p>For those properties listed in Table 12-22 of ES Chapter 12 [APP-043], or indeed other residences within the wider study area, would there be any temporary loss of access to a property (requiring road-plates to be laid) or any displacement of parking (temporary or permanent) during construction or operation?</p>
1.10.2.	Applicant	<p>Employment and Skills Plan</p> <p>a) What is the anticipated total number of workers required during construction and, as a percentage, how many of these would likely be 'imported' from the non-local area?</p> <p>a) Is there a need/ requirement for an Employment and Skills Plan to be adopted in this instance to benefit the local workforce? If not, why not?</p>
1.10.3.	Applicant	<p>Lighting</p> <p>a) Would any cranes, telescopic boom lifts, piling rigs etc need to be fitted with aviation safety lighting to avoid potential hazards to aircraft? And</p> <p>b) If so has this been assessed in terms of night-time landscape and visual effects?</p>
1.10.4.	Applicant	<p>Scale of Effect</p> <p>With the rest of the A417 already in dual carriageway, how would the economic growth potential be 'unlocked' in Gloucester/ Gloucestershire through the Proposed Development, involving a 3.4 mile stretch only?</p>
1.10.5.	Applicant	<p>Community Infrastructure</p> <p>What consideration has the Applicant given to using planning obligations or contributions as part of the Proposed Development to secure benefits to the local</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		communities? (For example, for education, open space, local sourced workforce, apprenticeships, highways, healthcare.) Please explain your intentions in this regard and, if none are proposed or intended, provide justification for the approach and position.
1.10.6.	Applicant	Public Footpaths a) Can the Applicant explain how effective reinstatement of affected public rights of way has been secured in the dDCO? b) What would be the timescale for reinstatement? c) How would it be determined that the affected public rights of way had been reinstated to the same condition and quality for users as was present prior to construction?
1.10.7.	Applicant	Assessment of Effects Has the Gloucestershire Way Long Distance Footpath been omitted in error from Table 12-27? If not, why does it not feature in the list?
1.10.8.	Applicant	Public Rights of Way (PRoW) In paragraph 12.10.126 of ES Chapter 12 [APP-043], could clarity be given in this bullet list to the number of PRoW that would be temporarily diverted (i.e. a breakdown on the 18 PRoW)?
1.10.9.	FlyUp Limited	Loss of Business In your Relevant Representation [RR-037], you refer to the viability of the business being prejudiced by the Proposed Development. Are you able to quantify the % of business lost/ revenue not taken as a likely potential effect of the Proposed Development if no mitigation is put in place?
1.11.	Traffic and Transport	
1.11.1.	Applicant	Transport Report a) Is there a reason why transport related data and assessment is undertaken within a Transport Report [APP-426] as opposed to be a bespoke chapter

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>within the Environmental Statement and not therefore concluded within the ES?</p> <p>b) Does this reduce the weight that can be given to its findings?</p>
1.11.2.	Applicant, GCC, TBC, CDC	<p>General</p> <p>a) Are you satisfied that the traffic modelling and underlying assumptions remain valid and reasonable in the light of the Covid pandemic?</p> <p>b) Please justify and explain your reasoning.</p>
1.11.3.	Applicant	<p>Cotswold Way National Trial Crossing</p> <p>Explain the rationale as to why the Cotswold Way National Trail crossing of the A417 is significantly less in scale compared to the Gloucestershire Way crossing.</p>
1.11.4.	Applicant	<p>Clearways</p> <p>a) Do additional points need to be added to Sheet 2 of Doc 2.7b (Traffic Regulations Measures Clearways and Prohibitions) so as to split the revocation of clearways on the A417 and A436?</p> <p>b) Does this also give rise to a need to modify Part 7 of the draft Development Consent Order to allow for two entries to reflect the revocation of clearways on the A436, as well as the A417?</p>
1.11.5.	Applicant	<p>Journey Saving Times</p> <p>a) It says in paragraph 2.2.2 of ES Chapter 2 [APP-033] that delays of 20 minutes or more are being experienced. Where is the proof of this?</p> <p>b) Tables 7-1, 7-2, 7-3 and 7-4 in the Transport Report indicate that journey time savings may be in the region of 3-4 minutes and, in some cases, there may not be any savings at all resulting in a journey time increase. Given the delays of 20 minutes currently being experienced, what benefit would truly come from the scheme?</p>
1.11.6.	GCC	<p>South West Regional Traffic Model</p> <p>a) Is the South West Regional Traffic Model the appropriate traffic model for this</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Proposed Development?</p> <p>b) What, if any, are the shortcomings of the model that the ExA should be aware of and how would these affect or influence interpretation of the results obtained by the Applicant?</p>
1.11.7.	GCC	<p>'Do Something' Scenarios</p> <p>a) With reference to Tables 4-3 to 4-6 in The Case for the Scheme [APP-417], do you consider the 'Do-Something' scenarios (with the Proposed Development in place) to be realistic projections?</p> <p>b) Given that some journey times would reduce (in the region of 3-4 minutes in general) but others might increase (in the region of 1 minute), what are your conclusions on the overall benefits of the Proposed Development?</p> <p>c) Given the reduction in journey times by 3-4 minutes, how likely is it that (as the Applicant asserts in the Transport Report [APP-426], paragraph 7.3.19): "At the local level, traffic is forecast to re-route away from existing known rat runs including via Elkstone towards Cheltenham and also via Birdlip Hill towards Gloucester"?</p>
1.11.8.	Applicant	<p>Public Transport</p> <p>Explain how the Proposed Development has taken into account the existing bus stop in Birdlip and whether any part of the Proposed Development, or any Development Consent Obligations associated with it, would address or improve that bus stop.</p>
1.11.9.	Applicant	<p>Air Balloon Roundabout</p> <p>Paragraph 7.3.11 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-417] suggests that the main problem in congestion terms is the Air Balloon Roundabout. Paragraph 7.3.56 suggest that localised solutions, focusing on the roundabout were discounted due to concerns over buildability. What concerns, technical or otherwise emerged, would be experienced in terms of buildability and are these concerns fully resolved in the current Proposed Development?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.11.10.	Applicant	<p>Additional Crossing – A417 between Bentham Lane and Grove Farm</p> <p>a) With reference to paragraph 6.3.17 of the Statement of Commonality [APP-419], has any further consideration be made to providing an additional crossing to the A417 between Bentham Lane and Grove Farm?</p> <p>b) Would such a crossing be practical either at ground level or via footbridge?</p>
1.11.11.	Applicant	<p>Construction Effects – Dry-stone Walls</p> <p>a) What proportion of construction traffic movements are anticipated to arise directly in relation to construction of dry-stone walls?</p> <p>b) Will temporary compounds and temporary haul roads be created in order to facilitate or support the construction of the walls?</p> <p>c) If yes to (b), where is evidence that such temporary works have been assessed in the ES?</p>
1.11.12.	Applicant	<p>Construction Traffic Management Plan</p> <p>For table 2-1, add a column indicating the length (duration) of time that the traffic management measures are anticipated to be in place. Also indicate, through colour coding, the sequencing of these works and whether any are concurrent or consecutive.</p>
1.11.13.	Applicant	<p>Embargoes</p> <p>Would or should traffic management measures be removed during Christmas and Easter holiday periods, in addition to purely the bank holiday weekends?</p>
1.11.14.	Applicant	<p>Bus Routes</p> <p>a) Would traffic management measures and/ or diversion routes affect the regularity or reliability of existing bus services on the A417 and, if so, what measures would be used to mitigate the potential effects on these services from customer discouragement/ loss of service?</p> <p>b) Have the bus operators been consulted and commented?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.11.15.	Applicant	<p>Construction Worker Travel Plan</p> <p>a) Would temporary car parks for construction workers be established within each of the identified compounds and, if so, how many spaces would be provided?</p> <p>b) Would construction workers be encouraged to utilise public transport and/ or car-pooling in order to attend the works area?</p> <p>c) Would communal vehicles (LGVs) run from the construction compounds to deliver workers to the relevant section of the Proposed Development under construction at any given time?</p> <p>d) Do these provisions need to be secured within a Construction Workers Travel Plan?</p>
1.11.16.	Applicant	<p>Consultation</p> <p>a) Has Gloucestershire Police been consulted over the likely effects of the Proposed Development on traffic and the proposed mitigation measures?</p> <p>b) If so, please provide direction to any responses received.</p>
1.11.17.	Applicant	<p>Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs)</p> <p>The Transport Report does not directly reference movements of AILs. Is it the case that none are anticipated or needed to facilitate construction of the Proposed Development?</p>
1.11.18.	Applicant	<p>Emergency Services</p> <p>During the construction phase, what measures would be in place to ensure freedom of movement for the emergency services?</p>
1.11.19.	Applicant	<p>Daglingworth</p> <p>Notwithstanding the proposed traffic route diversions in the Transport Report, how does the Applicant consider traffic flows and driver behaviour on local roads will change within the parish of Daglingworth during the construction phase of the Proposed Development?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.11.20.	Applicant, GCC	<p>Leckhampton Hill Paragraph 7.3.27 of the Transport Report [APP-426] states that Leckhampton Hill would experience an increase in traffic as a result of the Proposed Development. Appendix J to the ComMA report does not provide great detail on this. Provide a Technical Note describing the effects upon traffic flow, queue, delay and overall performance of Leckhampton Hill as a result of the proposed new Ullenwood roundabout junction and whether any effects are considered to be adverse or severe in nature compared to the current baseline.</p>
1.11.21.	Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Cycling Campaign	<p>Public Rights of Way</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Whilst you may wish to prepare a Written Representation, following your initial Relevant Representation [RR-015], the ExA are unclear as to the case put in the RR. Are you supporting or objecting? b) Are the mitigation measures proposed by the Applicant with respect of public rights of way acceptable? c) If not, why not?
1.11.22.	GCC	<p>Road Safety Audit Has the road safety audit adequately considered the impacts on local country roads in terms of the nature of their speed, usage and the type of traffic that actively uses them?</p>
1.11.23.	Applicant	<p>Traffic Mitigation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Has a condition survey been undertaken to assess the quality and condition of all local country roads that are either directly or indirectly affected by the route (during the construction phase)? b) If not, why not? c) If so, are any localised mitigation or improvement measures required to sustain the condition of these roads when accommodating additional diverted traffic?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.11.24.	Gloucestershire Ramblers	<p>Rights of Way</p> <p>a) Please provide a table listing all those rights of way and footpaths where you consider the proposed changes would not be beneficial and, where relevant, provide reference to any related conflict with the DMRB.</p> <p>b) If there are elements of improvements of betterment, these can be drawn to the ExA's attention.</p>
1.11.25.	Applicant	<p>Re-purposed A417</p> <p>a) Paragraph 2.4.5 of the Statement of Reasons [APP-024] refers to the de-trunking of the A417. Can you confirm the length of the de-trunked section in metres?</p> <p>b) The same paragraph refers to 'some lengths' of the existing road would be used for various purposes including a route for 'walkers, cyclists and horse riders', 'lower-class public roads' and 'replacement land'. Please provide a table of the lengths of the various sections of road to be put to the various purposes.</p>
1.11.26.	Birdlip and Cowley Parish Council, Daglingworth Parish Council	<p>Local Roads</p> <p>The ExA had the opportunity, on its USI, to travel local roads surrounding the A417. Please describe your experiences of the routes along these roads that drivers have been using to circumvent the current traffic issues faced on the A417 (with maps if necessary), the type of vehicles using the local roads and their frequency. Provide any evidence to support such assertions.</p>
1.11.27.	Applicant	<p>The A435</p> <p>The Transport Report does not make detailed reference to the A435 or the Seven Springs junction in terms of modelled traffic or how it could/ would perform as an early diversion route to bypass roadworks on the A417. However, the A435 appears briefly in the EMP [APP-317] as a potential route. Can the Applicant explain the extent of assessment that has been undertaken for the A435, whether such an</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		assessment is necessary and how the Seven Springs junction may perform with increased traffic as a result of the construction period for the Proposed Development?
1.11.28.	Applicant	Work No.1(d) What optioneering exercises were undertaken to determine the location and size of the four public lay-bys being provided by the scheme and what advantages do the designed positions have that other locations on the route may not?
1.11.29.	Applicant	Barrow Wake Car Park Provide justification on the design choice of using a roundabout on the B4070 at the entrance to the Barrow Wake car park. Would a smaller priority junction serve the purpose?
1.12.	Water Environment and Flood risk	
1.12.1.	Environment Agency	Hydrology a) Explain fully the concerns regarding hydrology in relation to the crossover of the principal aquifers of the Cotswold Jurassic Limestone. b) What potential effects on the Bushley Buzzard SSSI could occur? c) Should different modelling have been used to evidence the Applicant's conclusion and why would such modelling be more appropriate than that carried out to date?
1.12.2.	Applicant	Drainage a) With reference to Article 4 of the dDCO, who is responsible for maintaining culverts and keeping them clear at all times? b) Is Highways England imposing the responsibility onto existing landowners from whom rights, and land, is being acquired? c) Do the provisions of Article 4 allow the Applicant to interfere with existing private land drainage systems and not be responsible for maintenance and/or replacement of such systems?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.12.3.	Applicant, Environment Agency	<p>Scope of Assessment</p> <p>a) Provide an overview of the 'complexities' of the hydrogeological regime in the study area and why these complexities present conditions that are 'beyond the scope' of the EIA, as referred to by the Applicant in paragraph 13.4.49 of ES Chapter 13 [APP-044].</p> <p>b) Are the effects of the Proposed Development on the hydrogeological regime unquantifiable or unknown as a result?</p>
1.12.4.	Applicant	<p>Assessment of Effects</p> <p>Clarify whether a worst-case scenario has been adopted when assessing the impacts of the Proposed Development on flooding, or changes to surface water flow and, if so, justify the adopted worst-case scenario assessed.</p>
1.12.5.	Environment Agency	<p>Assessment Limitations</p> <p>Is it appropriate for the Applicant to have referred to the Environment Agency's "PPGs" that were withdrawn in 2015?</p>
1.12.6.	Applicant	<p>Tracer Test</p> <p>What importance, if any, are the results of the tracer test reported in paragraph 13.7.25 insofar as they prove a differential connection to that stated in the WFD water body delineation?</p>
1.12.7.	Environment Agency	<p>Karst Features</p> <p>Are there any concerns regarding karstic features within the Order Land or adjacent land that are known to the EA, or any specific mitigation measures (other than grouting of voids and fissures) that should be employed by the Applicant?</p>
1.12.8.	Environment Agency	<p>Nitrate Vulnerable Zones (NVZ)</p> <p>For clarity, is there any need for the Proposed Development to achieve 'nutrient neutrality' in respect of potential effects upon NVZ designations?</p>
1.12.9.	Environment Agency, Severn Trent Water	<p>Water Quality</p> <p>a) Are you satisfied that all measures to protect the Source Protection Zones for</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>drinking water will be undertaken and that there is no risk to the water quality?</p> <p>b) Are there any abstraction companies operating in the area and have they been engaged?</p> <p>c) If not, why not?</p>
1.12.10.	Applicant	<p>Drainage</p> <p>a) ES Chapter 13 [APP-044] does not appear to specifically reference the effects of temporary works compounds on surface water or hydrology. Provide evidence of where the effects are considered and what, if any, mitigation applies to these.</p> <p>b) Relative to paragraphs 13.9.14ff, are the number of drainage basins shown on the Works Plans indicative or actual?</p> <p>c) What justification is there for the location and number of basins shown?</p>
1.12.11.	Applicant	<p>Climate Change</p> <p>a) In respect of high precipitation risks reported in table 14-20, what would the designed mitigation and management measures be for ensuring that underpasses and tunnels (the effective tunnel created under the Gloucestershire Way green bridge) were protected from flooding and that anyone trapped by flooding in such areas could be safely evacuated?</p> <p>b) How would surface water run-off from the green bridges be managed and diverted into available watercourses given the impermeable nature of their constructed bases?</p>
1.12.12.	GCC	<p>Drainage Adoption</p> <p>Are GCC in agreement to adopt all highway drainage except for the mainline and junction slip road aspects, as proposed in paragraph 4.2.1 of Appendix 13.10 [APP-406]?</p>
1.12.13.	Applicant, GCC	Existing A417

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Would there be any benefit, considering climate change, in retaining the existing drainage features under the repurposed A417 in assisting with land drainage or surface water attenuation?
1.12.14.	Applicant, GCC	<p>Finished Road Surface</p> <p>Would any part of the Proposed Development be at risk from the pooling or puddling of surface water and, if so, how would the drainage of these areas be managed so as to lower the risk of aqua-planing based accidents?</p>
1.12.15.	Applicant	<p>Private Water</p> <p>a) Would the Proposed Development result in the disruption of any private water supplies used for agricultural purposes (including irrigation and water for animals) or to private residential properties?</p> <p>b) If so, what alternative arrangements (e.g. tankering) are proposed to ensure water supplies would be maintained for the duration of any disruption and how are these secured in the dDCO?</p>
1.12.16.	Applicant	<p>River Dunt</p> <p>The Relevant Representation from Councillor Julia Judd [RR-023] references effects on aquifers at Seven Springs in Andoversford, that feeds the River Dunt. Apart from a mention (of Seven Springs) at paragraph 13.7.31 in ES Chapter 13 [APP-044], the cited water environment does not feature in the ES. Explain the relevance and importance of the River Dunt and its contributing features to the Proposed Development and what, if any, effects are predicted upon it.</p>
1.12.17.	Applicant	<p>Environmental Permits</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 [APP-044]: Road Drainage and the Water Environment identifies that Environmental Permits for dewatering or discharge of waters may be required. Can the Applicant confirm if Environmental Permits for dewatering or discharge of waters will be required and what progress has been made towards securing any such permits?</p>

ANNEX A

**A417 MISSING LINK
 LIST OF ALL OBJECTIONS TO THE GRANT OF COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OR TEMPORARY POSSESSION POWERS
 (EXQ1: QUESTION [1.4.2])**

Obj No. ⁱ	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref No ⁱⁱ	RR Ref No ⁱⁱⁱ	WR Ref No ^{iv}	Other Doc Ref No ^v	Interest ^{vi}	Permanent/ Temporary ^{vii}	Plot(s)	CA? ^{viii}	Status of objection

ⁱ Obj No = objection number. All objections listed in this table should be given a unique number in sequence.

ⁱⁱ Reference number assigned to each Interested Party (IP) and Affected Person (AP)

ⁱⁱⁱ Reference number assigned to each Relevant Representation (RR) in the Examination library

^{iv} Reference number assigned to each Written Representation (WR) in the Examination library

^v Reference number assigned to any other document in the Examination library

^{vi} This refers to parts 1 to 3 of the Book of Reference:

- Part 1, containing the names and addresses of the owners, lessees, tenants, and occupiers of, and others with an interest in, or power to sell and convey, or release, each parcel of Order land;
- Part 2, containing the names and addresses of any persons whose land is not directly affected under the Order, but who "would or might" be entitled to make a claim under section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, as a result of the Order being implemented, or Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, as a result of the use of the land once the Order has been implemented;
- Part 3, containing the names and addresses of any persons who are entitled to easements or other private rights over the Order land that may be extinguished, suspended or interfered with under the Order.

^{vii} This column indicates whether the Applicant is seeking compulsory acquisition or temporary possession of land/ rights

^{viii} CA = compulsory acquisition. The answer is 'yes' if the land is in parts 1 or 3 of the Book of Reference and National Grid are seeking compulsory acquisition of land/ rights.