

A417 Missing Link
TR010056

8.14 Response to Cultural Heritage
Issues Raised

Planning Act 2008

APFP Regulation
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009

Volume 8

January 2022

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms
and Procedure) Regulations 2009**

A417 Missing Link

Development Consent Order 202[x]

Response to Cultural Heritage Issues Raised

Regulation Number:	
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010056
Application Document Reference	8.14
Author:	A417 Missing Link

Version	Date	Status of Version
C01	January 2022	Deadline 2

Table of contents

	Pages	
1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of this document	1
1.2	Structure of this document	1
2	Response to Rule 17 Request for Further Information	2
2.1	Adequacy of ES Chapter 6	2
2.2	Undiscovered heritage assets	5
2.3	DAMS and OWSI	6
2.4	Construction programme	7
2.5	Holistic approach	7
3	Response to Written Representations with Cultural Heritage Concerns	9
3.1	Key cultural heritage themes	9
3.2	Compliance with NPSNN and NPPF policies and EIA regulations	9
3.3	Cultural heritage baseline	10
3.4	Assessment methodology including effects on heritage assets and their settings/holistic approach to the landscape	13
3.5	Paleoenvironmental deposits	19
3.6	Construction risks and mitigation	20
3.7	Consideration of cumulative effects	21
3.8	Responses in Update in ES Errata and Update	22
4	Conclusion	22

Table of Tables

Table 2-1	National Highways response to Assets raised within 1.7.9 of Historic England - Responses to ExQ1 (REP1-139)	4
Table 3-2	National Highways response to Historic England's issues with some of the setting descriptions	15

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This document has been prepared by National Highways (the Applicant) for submission to the Examining Authority (ExA) under Deadline 2 of the Examination of the A417 Missing Link Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
- 1.1.2 This document provides responses to the Examining Authority's request for further information from the Applicant under Rule 17 of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedures) Rules 2010, on the 17 December 2021 (PD-009).
- 1.1.3 This document also provides the Applicant's response to Written Representations with cultural heritage concerns, submitted to the ExA by Interested Parties at Deadline 1. These include:
- Historic England (REP1-142)
 - Council for British Archaeology (REP1-033)
 - National Trust (REP1-098)
 - Joint Councils (Gloucestershire County Council, Cotswold District Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council) (REP1-135)

1.2 Structure of this document

- 1.2.1 National Highways has reviewed the Rule 17 letter and Written Representations submitted to the ExA.
- 1.2.2 Accordingly, this document is structured as follows:
- Chapter 2: Response to Rule 17 Request for Further Information
 - Chapter 3: Response to common cultural heritage themes raised in Written Representations
 - Chapter 4: Conclusion

2 Response to Rule 17 Request for Further Information

2.1 Adequacy of ES Chapter 6

Summary of matter raised in Request for Further Information

- 2.1.1 In the Request for Further Information, the ExA has noted the concern expressed regarding the adequacy of information contained in ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (Document Reference 6.4, APP-037) in respect of heritage assets. In particular, Historic England has suggested that the potential impact upon the archaeological record was not adequately assessed prior to submission of the ES (including the Archaeological Assessment missing key sites, the omission of a full Desk-Based Assessment, limited geophysics and evaluation and no geo-archaeological investigations). It goes on to note that the lack of pre-determination evaluation and survey of the archaeological resource means that there is a large amount of work to be undertaken post-consent and pre-construction.
- 2.1.2 The ExA has asked for an explanation of how the evidence submitted in the Environmental Statement (ES) is adequate and can be used to underpin any conclusions the ExA may arrive at and in its recommendation to the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of State's decision to meet the obligations and tests in the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN).
- 2.1.3 The ExA would like to understand why Chapter 6 cannot be updated and why further evaluation is not possible within the timeframe of the Examination. The ExA also wants to understand the rationale behind this conclusion and why Historic England was told further work will not be undertaken.

National Highways response

- 2.1.4 National Highways rejects the assertion that the baseline data supporting the ES was insufficient to assess the impact of the scheme of heritage resources. The desk based data gathering included all sources of information commonly referred to when compiling a Desk Based Assessment (Document Reference 6.4, APP-341):
- National Heritage List England data for designated heritage assets
 - Gloucestershire Historic Environment Record data for non-designated assets, finds reported under the Portable Antiquities Scheme, and other non-spatial data
 - Aerial Photographs held by Historic England's Aerial Photograph Research Unit
 - Historic England Archives
 - Historic Ordnance Survey Mapping
 - Gloucestershire Archives
 - Lidar data specifically generated for the A417 project
- 2.1.5 With the exception of areas discussed at 2.1.7 and 2.1.8, the entire area of the DCO boundary was subject to geophysical survey and trial trenching. There was a very high concordance between the geophysical survey results and the trial trenching, and as a result National Highways has a high degree of confidence that

all significant archaeological sites have been identified in these areas and have been assessed in the ES.

- 2.1.6 Table 5-1 Matters outstanding between HE and Highways England of the Statement of Commonality (Document Reference 7.3, APP-419) provides a summary of the baseline surveys undertaken, including the geophysical survey and trial trenching.

Update to geophysics survey

- 2.1.7 During the design process some isolated areas were identified that lay outside of the original geophysical survey; this was a result of changes to the draft DCO boundary. Trenching was possible in these areas, however it was not possible to mobilise a specialist team to undertake geophysics before submission of the DCO application, due to a very high demand for archaeological surveys nationwide. These areas will be surveyed during spring 2022 and the survey reports will be provided to Historic England and GCC. A plan to show these areas is being produced and will be submitted at Deadline 3.

Outstanding cultural heritage surveys

- 2.1.8 In one area of the scheme, at Shab Hill junction and adjacent to Birdlip Radio Station, no surveys have been undertaken. This area covers 11 hectares, or 5.5% of the DCO boundary. The ground cover in this area is very uneven, with long grass, and these conditions make it impossible for a geophysical survey to be carried out. Ideally, this grass would have been cut and scrub cut back; however, as this area had been identified as habitat for reptiles and Roman snails, this could not be achieved. For the same reason, trial trenching could not be undertaken ahead of submission of the DCO application, and also cannot be undertaken during the examination period.
- 2.1.9 Shab Hill is therefore an area of risk in terms of the potential for significant unidentified archaeology to be present. It is proposed that this area will be investigated ahead of construction in line with Annex C Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Overarching Written Schemes of Investigation (DAMS/OWSI) of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Document Reference 2.1, APP-320), once vegetation clearance has taken place. However, National Highways will also consider options for removal of vegetation and undertaking geophysical survey during 2022.

Omission of key assets from ES Chapter 6

- 2.1.10 In terms of Historic England's comment that that an asset - Cowley Roman settlement - was omitted from the assessment in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 6 Cultural heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037), this is incorrect. Historic Environment Record data obtained from GCC did not include reference to the site of a Romano-British settlement that was excavated in advance of the construction of the existing Cowley roundabout. These remains in themselves are no longer extant and therefore cannot be impacted by the scheme.
- 2.1.11 However, the remains identified in that excavation do not represent the entirety of the settlement. The geophysical survey and trial trenching undertaken to inform the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) identified extensive remains of this settlement to both the west and east of the existing A417. These results can be seen in Appendix 6.4 Figures 39 and 40 (Document Reference 6.4, APP-343),

and Appendix 6.5, Part 3 of 4, Figures 24 to 30 (Document Reference 6.4, APP-346).

- 2.1.12 The impact of the scheme on the Cowley Roman settlement has been assessed in ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage Section 6.10.14, bullet 3 (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037), and specific detailed excavation of these remains is proposed in Annex C DAMS/OWSI of the Environmental Management Plan (Document Reference 2.1, APP-320).

Consideration of trial trenching in the ES

- 2.1.13 In specific response to point 1.7.1 made by Historic England's in their Responses to ExQ1 (REP1-139), trial trenching was undertaken during the six months prior to the submission of the DCO application. This was monitored weekly by National Highways and GCC (with Historic England attending virtually though on-line messaging with GCC) and recorded in ES Appendix 6.5 Trial Trenching Report (Document Reference 6.4, APP-344 - APP-347). As such National Highways were able to review the assessment on an ongoing basis and incorporate the results of the trenching into the findings of the ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037).
- 2.1.14 With respect to Historic England's comment at 1.7.9 that a full Desk Based Assessment was not included in the application, this is correct: there is no specific requirement for this specific document to be provided for a DCO application. However, we note that all documentary sources that would form the basis of a DBA were consulted and included in Section 6.7 of the ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037), and in ES Appendices 6.1, 6.2, and ES Figures 6.1 to 6.4. National Highways considers that the desk-based baseline is appropriate, and was sufficient to inform the surveys undertaken, and the assessment as a whole. Further in 1.7.9 Historic England stated that a number of assets had been omitted from Chapter 9. National Highway's response to the observation presented in the Table 2-1.

Table 2-1 National Highways response to Assets raised within 1.7.9 of Historic England - Responses to ExQ1 (REP1-139)

Asset	National Highways response
39 Milestone (Gloucestershire Historic Environment Record (GHER) 13139)	This is not included in the table as it would be demarcated and protected during construction (Chapter 6, 6.9.9). National Highways have avoided any impact with embedded mitigation in place, therefore there is no need to refer to this in the assessment.
105 Mesolithic microlith found near Shab Hill (GHER 13043)	This is a single find spot and is not an archaeological 'site'. It is no longer present on site and cannot experience impacts, therefore, this was not included in the assessment.
116 Possible Long Barrow (GHER 35060)	This is discussed in paragraph 6.10.12 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037).
121 Scatter of Roman-British Pottery (GHER3810) close to Roman site in Area 2 Field B (Location reference from Appendix 6.5 Trial Trenching Report)	This represents a findspot of pottery, likely indicative of settlement. The area was investigated by trial trenching and was found to be a Roman-British/post-Roman settlement. Confirmation of the settlement being present supersedes the record indicating the potential for a settlement being present. This site was therefore excluded.

Asset	National Highways response
132 Prehistoric and Romano-British cropmarks (NMR 1399006), now known to include an Iron Age cross-dyke (Area 2 Field D)	This is discussed in paragraph 6.10.12 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037).
175 Rectilinear cropmark (GHER 14846). Not identified through Trial Trenching (Appendix 6.5).	This is discussed in paragraph 6.10.12 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037).
248 Cropmarks west of Harding's Barn (GHER 4321)	This is discussed in paragraph 6.10.12 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037).
252 Milestone (GHER 9869)	The milestone sits outside of the DCO boundary and would not experience impacts; therefore this was not included in Table 6-8 of of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037).
253 Iron Age Enclosure, linear and pits (GHER 4698)	This is erroneously excluded from paragraph 6.10.12 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037).

2.2 Undiscovered heritage assets

Summary of matter raised in Request for Further Information.

- 2.2.1 In the Request for Further Information, the ExA stated that if there is reasonable doubt about archaeological interests and a high probability that the site may include as yet undiscovered heritage assets, how can the ExA be in a position to make a proper and informed decision about the full effects of the scheme on heritage assets and weigh these in the balance.

National Highways response

- 2.2.2 It is impossible to entirely rule out the presence of undiscovered archaeology; the only means by which all archaeology can be identified is for all topsoil to be stripped under archaeological supervision, and any archaeology that is present to be investigated. This is the approach that will be applied to the entire DCO boundary. Should unexpected archaeological remains be encountered, these will be recorded in line with the Strip-Map-Sample methodology set out within the DAMS/OWSI.
- 2.2.3 National Highways is committed to undertaking the archaeological investigations required in the area for which no geophysics or trial trenching data is available, and provision for this will be explicitly included in the DAMS/OWSI.
- 2.2.4 National Highways notes that additional Ground Investigation will be undertaken during 2022, and this will be subject to a detailed geo-archaeological watching brief. Information gathered from this survey will be fed into the DAMS/OWSI. The DAMS/OWSI is also being written taking into account specialist advice from Historic England's Regional Scientific Advisor.
- 2.2.5 In response to Historic England's response at Ref 1.7.17 of Historic England's Summary of Written Representation (REP1-139) regarding confidence in the results National Highways notes Historic England's advice that the 'amount of evaluation work undertaken should be proportionate to the importance of the site affected and the impact of the proposed development on its significance (Preserving Archaeological Remains 2016, paragraph 1.1'.

- 2.2.6 We agree with the principles of this advice but would note that additional factors come into play when comparing a 'traditional' developer-led development to a NSIP proposed by a public body such as National Highways. In particular, we would draw attention to the fact that the majority of land within the DCO boundary is in private ownership, and in most cases, these are active farms and other businesses. Therefore, National Highways must strike a balance between obtaining sufficient information to assess the impacts of the scheme, manage construction risk, and design appropriate mitigation whilst also ensuring that any investigations do not unduly disturb stakeholders, and deliver best value for public funds.
- 2.2.7 These constraints necessarily require a different approach to a developer led project, where the developer will own the land and therefore have unrestricted access to land for pre-planning surveys.
- 2.2.8 That being the case National Highways are required to balance these constraints using professional judgement, based on the particular circumstances of a project. For the A417, the results of the geophysics were very clear, and therefore there was a high likelihood that they provided a good indication of where extensive archaeological remains would be present; this assessment was confirmed by the trial trenching, and Historic England recognise this in their response 6.7.42, Paragraph 6 .
- 2.2.9 National Highways notes and agrees with Historic England's comments regarding the difficulty in investigating small pits and other dispersed features that may be present, but which are not readily identified by geophysics. However, we would also note that no amount of trenching can provide a 'full understanding' of such features, or in fact any archaeological site; only stripping top soil from an entire area under archaeological supervision will expose the full extent of such features.
- 2.2.10 It is for this reason that the mitigation proposed by National Highways sets this as the baseline approach for the entire DCO boundary, with specific areas of potential being identified for strip map sample, or detailed excavation. The overall strategy for mitigation is still in the process of agreement and discussion with Historic England and GCC. National Highways welcomes their ongoing positive engagement with this process and makes the commitment to agree and implement a robust and proportionate mitigation strategy which fully meets consultee expectations.
- 2.2.11 In light of the above, National Highways considers that the ExA can make a proper and informed decision about the full effects of the scheme on heritage assets and weigh these in the balance.

2.3 DAMS and OWSI

Summary of matter raised in Request for Further Information

- 2.3.1 In the Request for Further Information, the ExA ask what confidence can the ExA (and Secretary of State have) that there is adequate protection of undiscovered remains if the DAMS and OWSI approach is followed.

National Highways response

- 2.3.2 National Highways notes that Historic England have identified 2 sites, a prehistoric enclosure and the Roman settlement at Cowley, which they consider

to be of potential national (schedulable) value. Impacts upon these sites cannot be avoided, and through the DAMS/OWSI Historic England have agreed that detailed, research focused excavation, analysis and publication is appropriate mitigation for these impacts. A third site, a roman settlement at Shab Hill will be preserved in situ within the landscape design.

- 2.3.3 In the event that unexpected archaeological remains that are similarly considered to be of national significance by Historic England, preservation in situ will be the preferred approach to mitigation. It is accepted however that this is unlikely to be possible within many parts of the DCO boundary. In those cases, mitigation will consist of the highest level of mitigation as described above.

2.4 Construction programme

Summary of matter raised in Request for Further Information

- 2.4.1 In the Request for Further Information, the ExA ask how would the risk that significant undiscovered remains are indeed uncovered be mitigated, and what consequences could this have on the construction programme. The ExA also question the 9 month pre-construction time period to handle archaeological matters, given the concerns expressed by Historic England.

National Highways response

- 2.4.2 National Highways notes that the 9 month preconstruction period covers only those areas in which high archaeological potential is already known, and where specific mitigation is proposed in the DAMS/OWSI. We note that this 9 month period is not fixed, and we would welcome the advice of HE and GCC with regard to a time period that would provide them, and the ExA, with greater surety that these works can be completed without overlap with the construction period.
- 2.4.3 ES Chapter 2 The Project (Document Reference 6.2, APP-033) para 2.9.20 reports that the construction programme is currently estimated and would be finalised by the contractor in advance of the works. This currently estimates construction works to be at least 33 months, commencing nine months after the start of environmental preparatory works, giving an overall construction period of 42 months. At the point the detailed construction programme is produced, sufficient flexibility will be incorporated to ensure that the requirements of the DAMS/OWSI with regard to unexpected archaeological discoveries can be implemented. The detail of this approach will be held by the delivery partner, and subject to approval by National Highways, Historic England and GCC.

2.5 Holistic approach

Summary of matter raised in Request for Further Information

- 2.5.1 In the Request for Further Information, the ExA noted that Historic England, and other Interested Parties, have referred to a holistic approach to assessing the historic relationship between heritage assets and the landscape in which they sit (including setting).

National Highways response

- 2.5.2 National Highways consider that the approach taken within the EIA is entirely compliant with LA106 and established professional practice. We are not aware of

any previous scheme for which 'holistic' assessment has been requested by Historic England, or where this has been undertaken. We note that there is also no published Historic England guidance for 'holistic' assessment. We note also that historic landscape is considered in two chapters of the ES; in a wide context in Chapter 6 and by individual landscape elements, including walls, hedgerows, woodland in Chapter 7.

2.5.3 Further details on this are provided in section 3.4 of this response.

3 Response to Written Representations with Cultural Heritage Concerns

3.1 Key cultural heritage themes

- 3.1.1 This chapter provides National Highways' response to key themes or matters raised on cultural heritage in the Written Representations for which it is considered the ExA may benefit from further clarification or where we consider a point needs correction.
- 3.1.2 Written Representations with cultural heritage concerns were made by the following:
- Historic England (REP1-142)
 - Council for British Archaeology (REP1-033)
 - National Trust (REP1-098)
 - Joint Councils (Gloucestershire County Council, Cotswold District Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council) (REP1-135)
- 3.1.3 The National Trust Written Representation Annex B is a report by the Countryside and Community Research Institute of the University of Gloucestershire (UoG), commissioned by the National Trust to look more holistically at cultural heritage, historic and natural landscape, understanding the landscape significance and the effects of the proposed road scheme. The full report can be viewed in Annex B of their written representation (REP1-098).
- 3.1.4 The report is titled *Commissioned report supporting 4.1.2 that a holistic approach should be taken for scheme mitigation that overlays cultural heritage, historic environment, and natural environment to understand the significance of the landscape, and therefore, mitigation proportionate to the significance.*
- 3.1.5 The key cultural heritage themes are:
- Compliance with NPSNN and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) polices and Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA regulations)
 - Cultural heritage baseline
 - Assessment methodology including effects on heritage assets and their settings/holistic approach to the landscape
 - Palaeoenvironmental deposits
 - Construction risks and mitigation
 - Consideration of cumulative effects

3.2 Compliance with NPSNN and NPPF polices and EIA regulations

Summary of matters raised in Written Representations

- 3.2.1 Some Written Representations have expressed concerns that the assessment fulfils the requirements of the NPSNN and NPPF polices and EIA regulations.

National Highways response

- 3.2.2 As noted in Appendix D Draft Statement of Common Ground with Historic England in the Statement of Commonality (Document Reference 7.3, APP-419),

ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037) follows the methodology in DMRB LA106 Cultural heritage assessment. National Highways considers that the ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage and its associated appendices which include the surveys undertaken to characterise the archaeology present within the DCO Boundary, fully meet the requirements of the NPSNN and EIA Regulations.

- 3.2.3 The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1, APP-417) provides an assessment of the scheme against the requirements of the NPSNN. In accordance with Paragraph 4.15 of the NPSNN, the ES includes an assessment of effects on Cultural heritage. Further details are provided in Appendix D Draft Statement of Common Ground with Historic England in the Statement of Commonality (Document Reference 7.3, APP-419).
- 3.2.4 Para 7.3.81 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1, APP-417) states “A review of the residual significant adverse effects expected to result from the scheme, as reported in the ES (Volume 6), has identified that there are residual adverse significant effects relating to landscape, cultural heritage, biodiversity and noise during construction and operation of the scheme, and other residual adverse significant effects during construction only. However, it can be demonstrated that Highways England has actively sought to avoid or moderate such detrimental effects through the incorporation of appropriate mitigation, the adoption of a landscape-led approach to the design of the scheme, and through making substantial changes to the scheme design where reductions in adverse effects could be achieved.”
- 3.2.5 Para 7.3.82 then states “It is therefore considered that it is demonstrated and evidenced that exceptional circumstances do exist for development of the scheme within an AONB, in accordance with the tests contained in Paragraph 5.151 of the NPSNN.” The Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1, APP-417) also states in para 10.2.4 ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037) details the assessment undertaken by Highways England relating to heritage impacts of the scheme. Whilst only one designated heritage resource is within the DCO Boundary of the scheme – a scheduled monument known as Emma’s Grove – there are numerous designated heritage resources within 1km of the scheme ...”
- 3.2.6 Para 10.2.6 states “The significance of the identified heritage assets is described in ES Appendices 6.1 to 6.4 (Document Reference 6.4). This includes a description of any contribution made by the setting of heritage assets and is provided at a level of detail which is proportionate to the asset’s importance.”
10.2.8 It is therefore considered that the requirements of Paragraphs 5.126 and 5.127 of the NPSNN are met.
- 3.2.7 Chapter 11 of the Case for the Scheme (Document Reference 7.1, APP-417) demonstrates that the scheme complies with the relevant policy considerations of the NPPF in so far as they are important and relevant.

3.3 Cultural heritage baseline

Summary of matters raised in Written Representations

- 3.3.1 Some Written Representations have expressed concern over the adequacy of the baseline provided in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 6 (Document

Reference 6.2, APP-037) and its supporting appendices (Document Reference 6.4):

- ES Appendix 6.1 - Designated Assets: Value (Sensitivity) (APP-340)
- ES Appendix 6.2 - Archaeological Assessment (APP-341)
- ES Appendix 6.3 - Historic Landscape Characterisation (APP-342)
- ES Appendix 6.4 - Geophysical survey report (APP-343)
- ES Appendix 6.5 - Trial Trenching Report (APP-344 - APP-347)

National Highways response

- 3.3.2 National Highways considers that the baseline information is sufficiently robust and follows the methodology in DMRB LA106 Cultural heritage assessment.
- 3.3.3 The baseline information consists of a detailed archaeological baseline that includes consideration of designated assets, non-designated data obtained from Gloucestershire Historic Environment Records (HER), and historic maps for the purposes of identifying historic hedgerows. An assessment was also made of extant ridge and furrow. Following this, field surveys were undertaken in the form of a geophysical survey and trial trenching.
- 3.3.4 National Highways wishes to highlight that this baseline archaeological assessment is not an Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment according to Chartered Institute for Archaeologists standards and guidance, and was not intended to be. It formed the initial desk-based baseline which was then supplemented by settings assessments, historic landscape characterization and assessment, assessment and mapping of LiDAR features, and a programme of archaeological field investigation, as described below.
- 3.3.5 Data provided by Gloucestershire County Council Historic Environment Record did not suggest any specific areas of interest related to the Palaeolithic or Mesolithic periods. National Highways acknowledges that the edge of high ground overlooking a valley or plain were often used by Mesolithic hunter-gatherer communities. National Highways are continuing to develop the mitigation strategy for the scheme in consultation with Historic England and GCC, and awareness of potential for unexpected remains, including Mesolithic, will form part of the document.
- 3.3.6 Trial trenching undertaken to test the results of the geophysical survey showed a very strong correlation between the results (either positive or negative) and the archaeology that is present. In these areas we have a high degree of confidence that all areas of significant archaeological remains have been identified. These will be targeted by specific areas of excavations, which are being agreed with Historic England and Gloucestershire County Council (GCC). National Highways accept the possibility that discrete archaeological features could be present; it is impossible to identify all archaeological features without entirely removing topsoil from the whole site.
- 3.3.7 A narrative on the geophysical survey and trial trenching is recorded in the draft Statement of Common Ground with Historic England, in Appendix D of the Statement of Commonality (Document Reference 7.3, APP-419).

Geophysical survey

- 3.3.8 Geophysical survey data was obtained for just over 90% of the DCO Boundary. The remaining less than 10% of the DCO Boundary is spread over a number of

small land parcels, to which access was unavailable due to existing vegetation and ecological constraints.

- 3.3.9 ES Appendix 6.4 Geophysical Survey Report (Document Reference 6.4, APP-343) notes that “The geophysical survey was undertaken between 9 September and 28 November 2019.” and “The site comprises 91.6 ha across 31 land parcels currently utilised for mixed agricultural purposes.”
- 3.3.10 National Highways is aiming to achieve 100% geophysical survey prior to construction, overgrown ground cover permitting.

Trial trenching

- 3.3.11 Following the geophysical survey, as stated in para 6.7.41 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037) “A programme of trial trenching to determine the presence, extent, significance, and level of survival of buried heritage resources was undertaken between September 2020 and March 2021 to inform the environmental impact assessment.” The scope of the trenching was defined in discussion with consultees.
- 3.3.12 The geophysical survey enabled the location of the trenches to be determined. Para 6.7.42 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037) states “The trenches were designed to target areas where geophysical survey had suggested the presence of archaeological remains, and areas where the geophysical survey suggested either no archaeological remains or features likely to be geological in origin. In areas where no geophysical survey had been undertaken, the layout of the trenches was random.”
- 3.3.13 ES Appendix 6.5 Trial trenching report (Document Reference 6.4, APP-344 to APP-347) notes that a total of 323 trenches were excavated.
- 3.3.14 ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037) notes that “The trial trenching demonstrated a very high concordance between the geophysical survey results and the actual conditions on the ground. A very small number of archaeological features were found in areas where no archaeological features were predicted by the geophysics, or where archaeological features had been misinterpreted as geological. As a result, 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.”
- 3.3.15 Trial trenching data for areas in which access was unavailable due to existing vegetation and ecological constraints represents less than 10% of the DCO Boundary spread over a number of small land parcels.
- 3.3.16 These located archaeological remains within the DCO Boundary with a high degree of accuracy and support the Annex C Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Overarching Written Schemes of Investigation (DAMS/OWSI) of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Document Reference 2.1, APP-320)
- 3.3.17 It is the intention of National Highways to provide the Joint Councils with regular updates of the results of the ongoing geophysics and geotechnical survey work.

3.4 Assessment methodology including effects on heritage assets and their settings/holistic approach to the landscape

Summary of matters raised in Written Representations

- 3.4.1 Some Written Representations have expressed concern that the DMRB LA106 methodology used to undertake the cultural heritage assessment is insufficient. It has also been raised that the statements of significance consider assets as individuals and does not provide sufficient discussion on the significance the setting makes and interrelationships of the natural and historic environment with other assets.
- 3.4.2 Some Written Representations have expressed concerns about the assessment of the historic landscape, stating this has not been sufficiently interpreted or understood.
- 3.4.3 The application of Historic England's guidance *The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (GPA3) (2nd Edition) December 2017* has also been raised as an additional concern.

National Highways response

General methodology - DMRB LA106 Cultural heritage assessment

- 3.4.4 National Highways wrote DMRB LA106 Cultural heritage assessment in full consultation with Historic England. National Highways apply DMRB to all highway infrastructure projects to ensure consistency of approach across applications. It is noted that concerns regarding DMRB LA106 have not been raised on any other scheme.
- 3.4.5 Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037) describes the value of heritage assets within the study area and assesses the impact of the proposed scheme upon them. National Highways is confident that the level of value assigned to each is correct and that the results of the assessment reported in the ES are robust. ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Effects (Document Reference 6.2, APP-038), considers specific elements of the county HLC data, including hedgerows, wall, and woodlands.
- 3.4.6 As noted in Appendix D Draft Statement of Common Ground with Historic England in the Statement of Commonality (Document Reference 7.3, APP-419), National Highways considers that the statements of significance identify the key relationships and aspects that contribute to the significance of each asset, and where there are interrelationships between assets or asset types, these have been described.

Historic landscape characterisation

- 3.4.7 National Highways considers that the methodology used (as detailed within ES Appendix 6.3 Historic Landscape Characterisation (Document Reference 6.4, APP-342)) for the assessment of historic landscape characterisation (HLC) is appropriate and recognises the key aspects of the historic landscape within which the scheme sits. This methodology was designed for and applied to HS2 Phase 2, and met with approval from consultees on that project, including Historic England. The approach, considering historic landscape at a larger scale and excluding individual archaeological sites, also aligns with that taken by Gloucestershire

County Council in their own 2007 Historic Landscape Characterisation for the Cotswolds AONB and Wye Valley AONB. Specifically, Section 2.3 of that report states:

2.3 Limited time depth and discrete archaeological features

It is clear that the present landscape is the result of many influences, including human impact on the environment. In the case of both areas covered by the two HLC projects, this is usually considered to have begun during the mesolithic [sic] period, from c. 12,000 BP. It is recognised that many areas of landscape contain features from a number of different periods, and that any characterisation based on the adopted system was likely to be heavily biased in favour of identifying visible medieval and post-medieval landscape features. This was considered to be acceptable for the following reasons:-

- *The present form of the landscape within the area covered by the two HLC projects is actually largely made up of features and enclosure patterns which are the result of medieval and post-medieval landuse influences.*
- *Earlier features, such as prehistoric funerary mounds, relict field boundaries or hillforts, whilst clearly a part of the present landscape, rarely influence its current character at the scale at which the landscape was characterised in this project. These are likely to survive as discrete features within a landscape, the broad structure of which has resulted from medieval and post-medieval processes. Consequently no attempt was made to separately categorise these features, although the methodology is flexible enough to have included any which were found to have had a significant impact on the present landscape.*

Some medieval and post-medieval landscape features, such as rabbit warrens, small areas of piecemeal quarrying or moated sites, were also not separately designated. Although these features may have been indicative of the historic processes which had formed the present landscape (e.g. rabbit warrens and piecemeal quarrying were most common in areas of former long-term open pasture), it was felt that, individually, they were at too small a scale to warrant separate designation within this project. They were often recognised as attributes of the Primary Types in which they were found

Designated heritage assets - Crickley Hill, The Peak, Emma's Grove

- 3.4.8 National Highways accepts that reference to the Peak was erroneously excluded from the setting description for Crickley Hill. This has been updated in the ES Update and Errata document for Deadline 2 (Document Reference 6.7). This relationship was however described in paragraph 6.10.9 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037) which states:

Peak Camp (45), a resource of medium value. Though currently wooded, Peak Camp was located to take advantage of views to the west from the escarpment, and towards a contemporary prehistoric enclosure on Crickley Hill. These views today contain modern infrastructure including the A417, M5 and other modern development that forms the urban curtilage of Gloucester to the west. Despite this, the location of Peak Camp, and views from it make a positive contribution to its significance.

- 3.4.9 National Highways disagrees that the grouping of The Peak, Emma’s Grove and Crickley Hill are of national significance. The Peak was excavated between 1980 and 1981, which confirmed that it was a Neolithic enclosure and contemporary with the earliest phase of activity at Crickley Hill. The excavation found no evidence of Bronze Age activity. As a result, while the monument would have been known to the builders of Emma’s Grove, there is no evidence that they are related, save for their topographical location.
- 3.4.10 In the case of the relationship between the Neolithic phase at Crickley Hill and The Peak however, the contemporary phasing of the monuments clearly links them in function. A case could be made that The Peak is of national significance because of this relationship, although we would note that despite this relationship being established for 40 years Historic England have not, to our knowledge, considered it as a candidate for scheduling.
- 3.4.11 The legal status of the monument notwithstanding, we consider that the impact of the scheme on The Peak would remain slight adverse according to DMRB methodology, even if the resource were considered to be of high significance.

Non-designated heritage assets

- 3.4.12 National Highways agrees that the demolition of the Air Balloon Public House would result in the loss of the existing facility, as reported within ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037) as a likely significant effect. Wherever possible, National Highways has worked to avoid the need to demolish property or businesses during scheme design. However, the need to demolish the Air Balloon Public House is unavoidable.
- 3.4.13 Whilst the Air Balloon Public House is not a Listed Building, National Highways has agreed that to mitigate its demolition, the building would be subject to Level 3 recording prior to and during its demolition, according to the standards set out in Historic England’s guide Understanding Historic Buildings. This is to be secured as part of the environmental management plan (construction stage) under Requirement 3 of Schedule 2 to the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, APP-022).

Historic England’s guidance on setting (PGA 3)

- 3.4.14 Historic England’s Deadline 1 Submission - Responses to ExQ1 acknowledges that National Highways has followed its guidance on setting, stating “The table produced as 6.4 ES Appendix 6.1 Designated Assets: Value (Sensitivity) describes the assets their setting and their value (sensitivity) this equates to Steps 1 and 2. Steps 3 and 4 are then included within Chapter 6 (6.9, 6.10 and Table 6-6).” They also confirm that they agree with the magnitude of effects and significance of effects reported in ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037). Historic England have identified issues with some of the setting descriptions and nature of impacts in response to ExQ1 question 1.7.9, parts b) and c). A response to these is provided in Table 3-3.

Table 3-2 National Highways response to Historic England’s issues with some of the setting descriptions

Ref	Historic England Written Representation	National Highways response
1.7.9 part b) and c)	1. Coberley Long Barrow – Setting – no discussion of relationship to other long barrows in the area	National Highways note Historic England’s position on this and concur

Ref	Historic England Written Representation	National Highways response
Bullet 1	(Crippets to the west and West Tump, which is further south and outside the DCO study area). The barrows location overlooking Coldwell Bottom is not mentioned. Coldwell is a shallow valley which has tufa springs. Long Barrows are often associated with water. Its location over-looking the Churn is included in the scheduling description. It is not included in the settings assessment in Chapter 6, although it is mentioned in Appendix 6.1 Table 1-1 Description of Asset.	with the elements of setting that are described. These elements would not affect the outcome of the assessment in the ES, as the scheme would not alter the relationship of the barrow to these features.
1.7.9 part b) and c) Bullet 2	2. Crickley Hill Camp– Setting – The relationship between Crickley Hill Camp to Peak Camp is not discussed under Setting and is not mentioned in Appendix 6.1 but it is mentioned under Nature of Impact in Table 6-6.	Reference to the Peak will be included in the ES errata.
1.7.9 part b) and c) Bullet 3	3. Peak Camp is a Neolithic enclosed settlement in a similar landscape location to Crickley Hill Camp. It was occupied at the same time as Crickley Hill and is of High Value due to its age and rarity. The Camp did not develop into an Iron Age settlement so will have better preserved Neolithic remains with no later intrusions.	The Peak will be ascribed High Value in the ES errata. This would not alter the outcome of the assessment in the ES based on the DMRB methodology. A minor adverse impact on a high value asset or resource, can result in either a slight or moderate adverse effect. Our professional judgement is that would remain slight adverse.
1.7.9 part b) and c) Bullet 4	4. The Setting description also does not mention the Post-Roman phase of occupation at Crickley Hill Camp. This is a significant phase as it contributes towards the understanding of the end of the Roman Empire and emergence of British territories prior to the Saxon invasions. The findings during the evaluation east of Shab Hill Barn of some post Roman and possible Saxon occupation (Appendix 6.5, pp32-35 Area 2 Field B) may be linked to that on Crickley Hill.	Noted. National Highways considers that including the post Roman phase at Crickley Hill would not alter the outcome of assessment in the ES.
1.7.9 part b) and c) Bullet 5	5. The current experience of the monument includes the views over the vale along the A417 across to Peak Camp and Emma's' Grove Barrows. That experience is impacted on by the noise from the current road, especially on the southern side of the camp. There is no mention of this within Table 6-6 or Appendix 6.1. The Noise assessment for Crickley Hill was voided due to high winds and the summary in Chapter 11 Appendix 11.2 – Baseline Noise Survey Results, 2.6 p.vii states 'noise climate dominated by A417. In Chapter 11, the change in noise caused by the scheme is assessed as being not significant. There is therefore no real change to the current situation (6.2 ES Chapter 11, 11.10.96). The site will still be impacted by a high level of noise from the road. This means there is no enhancement or reduction in the harm caused by the noise.	National Highways notes Historic England's position, and agrees that the improved A417 will be unlikely to provide an improvement in noise or enhancement to Crickley Hill.
1.7.9 part b) and c) Bullet 6	6. The widening of the current road below Crickley Hill from a two lane, with crawler lane to a four-lane dual carriageway, with crawler lane, will also increase the visual impact of the road on the	Noted. This concurs with the results of the assessment in the ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037), detailed in Table 6-6

Ref	Historic England Written Representation	National Highways response
	<p>resource. Currently the road is well screened by the topography and the mature trees either side of the road. It is clear from the visualisations even at 15 years the road will be very visible from the southern side of the monument (6.3 ES Figure 7.10 - Photosheets and Visualisations - Part 3 of 8 Image 28 of 92). The introduction of vehicle movement as well as no reduction in noise levels will cause harm to the significance of the monument.</p>	<p>Scheduled monuments (high value) which identifies a Slight Adverse significant effect.</p>
<p>1.7.9 part b) and c) Bullet 7</p>	<p>7. Crippets long Barrow – Setting – the description states there will be long views to the north. The barrow lies just below the crest of a hill with views to the south and west. The ZTV clearly shows that the road would be visible from the site looking to the south. (6.3 ES Figure 7.1 and 7.2 just north of Viewpoint 17). There is no mention of the other long barrows (Coberley and West Tump) or its relationship with the Neolithic settlement on Crickley Hill. There is no mention of its association with the springs to the west, most long barrows have an association with water.</p>	<p>This is a misreading of the ES. The setting description in Table 6-6 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037) states that the barrow would have had long views to the north. Indeed, despite being located slightly to the south of the crest of the hill, the barrow is clearly visible from the north, and would have been a far larger and more visible structure of bright Cotswold stone when it was constructed. Its position at the top of the scarp slope suggests that this location and view was important, although as for all prehistoric monuments, there will never be a definitive understanding of the motives of the builders.</p> <p>Regarding intervisibility with the scheme, this is a misinterpretation of the ZTV. The barrow is surmounted by a stand of tall (approx. 10-15m) fir trees, and it is these that can be seen on the ZTV. The trees in the hedgerow surrounding the field containing the barrow are also shown, but notably the field itself has no visibility.</p> <p>The relationship between prehistoric barrows is described for each asset (including Coberley and West Tump); reference to specific sites would not make a difference to the outcome of the assessment, as there are no specific connections beyond the spatial relationship already described in the ES.</p> <p>The reference to a potential relationship with nearby springs is noted, however this is an element of the setting of the barrow that would not be altered by the scheme, and would therefore not influence the outcome of the assessment.</p>
<p>1.7.9 part b) and c)</p>	<p>8. Three Bowl Barrows known as Emma's Grove Barrows – Setting – The Setting does not include</p>	<p>National Highways notes and concurs with the elements of setting described</p>

Ref	Historic England Written Representation	National Highways response
Bullet 8	<p>an assessment of the contribution the topographic location makes to its significance. The barrows are located on southern side of a dry valley leading up from Vale to Wold and now the route of A417/A436. They overlook a tufa spring and a former Holy Well (St Catherine's Well, marked on the Tithe Maps, but gone by the 1st Edition OS) to the east. It is thought that barrows are placed in the landscape in areas that have unusual landscape features, to make them stand out and to have them associated with special places. No mention of the reduction in noise is made although this is implied with the removal of the current A417. The association with other now lost Barrows as part of a group along the scarp edge (Barrow Wake) is not mentioned. The current level of noise from the A417 that you experience when visiting the barrows is not described. Crickley Hill Camp had Bronze Age occupation and these barrows may hold the remains of peoples who occupied the site. They are clearly visible from the Camp.</p>	<p>by Historic England, and accepts that these should have been included in the overall description in the ES. However, whilst not described explicitly, these elements did influence the professional judgement applied to the assessment, and therefore the outcome of the assessment in the ES remains valid.</p>

3.4.15 As noted in Appendix D Draft Statement of Common Ground with Historic England in the Statement of Commonality (Document Reference 7.3, APP-419), National Highways has reviewed Historic England guidance and does not consider that a tabular format is inherently less able to describe setting than a narrative.

3.4.16 To provide reassurance that step 5 of the guidance will be followed, a new commitment, reference CH8, has been added to ES Appendix 2.1 Environmental Management Plan (Document Reference 6.2, APP-317).

The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (GPA3) (2nd Edition) December 2017 published by Historic England, recommends "It is good practice to document each stage of the decision-making process in a non-technical and proportionate way, accessible to non-specialists."

National Highways would submit all settings assessments to the local Historic Environment Record, in accordance with Step 5 (Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes) of GPA3.

3.4.17 This is secured by Requirement 3 of the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, APP-022).

Cultural heritage opportunity

3.4.18 The National Trust agrees that the Cotswold Way crossing will enhance people's ability to physically connect Crickley Hill, Emma's Grove and Barrow Wake, that it will be a gain for landscape connectivity (compared to having no crossing in this location) and will present an opportunity to enhance people's understanding of the historic environment and landscape setting (subject to detailed scheme design). This is documented in Table 4-1 of Appendix G Draft Statement of Common Ground with the National Trust of the Statement of Commonality (Document Reference 7.3, APP-419).

- 3.4.19 National Highways has considered further the wider potential to enhance public recreational heritage access (through the proposed Cotswold Way crossing) and heritage interpretation. A new commitment, reference CH9, has been added to ES Appendix 2.1 EMP (Document Reference 6.4, APP-317 Rev 1).

Signage and interpretation boards (as noted in BD53 and L27) would be situated in areas along the PROW network such on the Air Balloon Way entrances to the Cotswold Way crossing, and Gloucestershire Way crossing to educate the public regarding the heritage of the area.

3.5 Paleoenvironmental deposits

Summary of matters raised in Written Representations

- 3.5.1 The Joint Councils, National Trust and Historic England have expressed concerns that there is insufficient consideration of paleoenvironmental deposits being affected by hydrological changes.

National Highways response

- 3.5.2 In response to Historic England's response to 1.7.8 of Historic England's Summary of Written Representation (REP1-139) regarding palaeo-environmental deposits, the cultural heritage assessment in ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037) has been undertaken in consultation with other environmental disciplines. In the case of waterlogged deposits and deposits where hydrological changes could occur, no areas were identified by the hydrological specialists where this would be likely to occur.
- 3.5.3 National Highways state in paragraph 6.10.17 of ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP037) that ES Chapter 13 (Road drainage and the water environment) and in particular the hydrological assessment in ES Appendix 13.7 (Document Reference 6.4, APP-403) has concluded that there are no areas of the scheme in which waterlogged deposits would be adversely affected, and therefore the significance of effect of the scheme on preserved palaeo-environmental material would be neutral.
- 3.5.4 The conclusion is reached as the hydrological assessment in ES Appendix 13.7 (Document Reference 6.4, APP-403) concludes that the potential for the scheme to intercept groundwater is at the top of the groundwater table and would be seasonal (during the winter). This could shorten the pathway from ground to stream, which may allow a component of groundwater to enter the tributary more rapidly, however, the drainage design is managed so that all intercepted groundwater remains within the catchment of the respective receiving water.
- 3.5.5 National Highways presented the groundwater modelling to the Environment Agency on 1 March 2021 as documented in Appendix B Draft Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency in the Statement of Commonality (Document Reference 7.3, APP-419). The Environment Agency have confirmed in their Responses to ExQ1 (REP1-058) that the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment combined with a sound conceptual understanding of the groundwater regime in the underlying aquifers and ongoing groundwater and surface water monitoring will provide the necessary protection to all important water features. The Environment Agency are content that surface and groundwater monitoring will be used to validate the conclusions of the assessment and are satisfied with this approach.

- 3.5.6 In particular, the Environment Agency note in response to 1.12.1: Hydrology of their Responses to ExQ1: *“We are satisfied with the modelling approach undertaken and after full consultation with NH and their consultants we all agreed to the approach adopted as detailed within the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment.”* In response to 1.12.3, the Environment Agency go onto say they are satisfied that potential drawdown impacts from dewatering have been assessed and the conceptual modelling approach taken has been deemed sound.
- 3.5.7 This is the evidence base on which ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037) assesses that there are no areas of the scheme in which paleoenvironmental deposits would be adversely affected by hydrological changes.

3.6 Construction risks and mitigation

Summary of matters raised in Written Representations

- 3.6.1 Some Written Representations have expressed concerns about the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Document Reference 6.4, APP-317 Rev 1) and Annex C Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Overarching Written Schemes of Investigation (DAMS/OWSI) of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Document Reference 2.1, APP-320).
- 3.6.2 The Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy will provide certainty that adequate additional assessment and evaluation work is undertaken in order to inform any final archaeological mitigation design for the scheme.
- 3.6.3 Some Written Representations have expressed concerns that there is a high risk of unexpected and significant archaeological discoveries coming to light during construction which will add considerable programme time and cost risk to the scheme.

National Highways response

- 3.6.4 National Highways is committed to ensuring that a robust programme of archaeological mitigation is implemented that will enable significant archaeological remains, both known and unknown, to be recorded ahead of and during construction.
- 3.6.5 Archaeological surveys have been undertaken to inform the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, APP-022) and Annex C Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Overarching Written Schemes of Investigation (DAMS/OWSI) of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Document Reference 2.1, APP-320). These surveys were designed in consultation with Historic England and Gloucestershire County Council. These bodies will continue to be consulted post-consent. This mitigation will comprise detailed archaeological investigations, to be undertaken prior to construction, and archaeological monitoring and recording during construction. Additionally, areas will be identified for protection and preservation during construction.
- 3.6.6 National Highways recognises that it is inherent in any scheme that unexpected archaeological discoveries could come to light during construction. However, as the trial trenching confirmed a high degree of concordance between geophysical anomalies, apparent blank areas, and the presence/absence of archaeological remains observed, NH is confident that the likelihood of encountering unexpected

nationally significant archaeological remains where geophysics and trial trenching have been completed is low.

- 3.6.7 National Highways recognises that there are areas where survey could not be completed due to ecological constraints, and in those locations there is a higher chance of encountering significant unexpected archaeological remains. This will be mitigated following the detailed archaeological mitigation strategy (DAMS) detailed in section 2.2 Approach to mitigation of ES Appendix 2.1 EMP Annex C Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Overarching Written Schemes (Document Reference 6.4, APP-320).
- 3.6.8 National Highways has engaged with Historic England and the Joint Councils in designing mitigation for the scheme and will continue to develop this strategy to address their concerns as far as is practicable.

Draft DCO

- 3.6.9 Requirement 3(2)(e) Environmental Management Plan (Construction Stage) of Schedule 2 to the draft DCO secures Annex C Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Overarching Written Schemes of Investigation (DAMS/OWSI) of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Document Reference 2.1, APP-320). As its title states, this provides the overarching written schemes of investigation for the scheme. This provides the outline/structure for the “archaeological framework strategy” and “sub-written schemes of investigation” in Requirement 9.
- 3.6.10 Requirement 9(1) and Requirement 9(2) require a scheme of mitigation reflecting the mitigation measures in ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037), and support the detail required “for each area and each phase,” basically implementing “sub-written schemes of investigation” in accordance with Annex C of the EMP.

3.7 Consideration of cumulative effects

Summary of matters raised in Written Representations

- 3.7.1 It was raised by the Council for British Archaeology that the environmental statement does not consider the cumulative contribution of the scheme to the overall environmental effects of the whole A417 route.

National Highways response

- 3.7.2 The cumulative effects are addressed in ES Chapter 15 Assessment of Cumulative Effects (Document Reference 6.2, APP-046) for the scheme as a whole, in line with DMRB LA104 Environmental assessment and monitoring and Planning Inspectorate (PINS) Advice note 17 Cumulative Effects Assessment. DMRB LA104 states that the cumulative assessment should reflect the scheme and the surrounding environment over which effects are reasonably thought to occur, taking into account cumulative effects. It is considered that it would not be reasonable or proportionate to consider effects for the whole A417 route. This is in accordance with The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and NPSNN, paragraph 4.3.

3.8 Responses in Update in ES Errata and Update

- 3.8.1 Some of the responses to Written Representations with cultural heritage concerns, submitted to the ExA by Interested Parties at Deadline 1 noted some oversights and updates with respect to ES Chapter 6 Cultural heritage (Document Reference 6.2, APP-037). Responses to these are reflected in the ES updates and errata (Document Reference 6.7, Rev 1) and an amended version of the Heritage Designation Plans (Document Reference 2.12, Rev 1).

4 Conclusion

- 4.1.1 Through this document, National Highways has provided responses to the Examining Authority's request for further information from the Applicant under Rule 17 of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedures) Rules 2010, on the 17 December 2021 (PD-009). National Highways has also provided the Applicant's response to Written Representations with cultural heritage concerns, submitted to the ExA by Interested Parties at Deadline 1.
- 4.1.2 National Highways will continue to engage positively with the Interested Parties on all matters that are still subject to discussion throughout the Examination process. This will be reflected in updates to the Statement of Common Ground with the Joint Councils in Appendix A of the Statement of Commonality (Document Reference 7.3 Rev 1, REP1-006) at future deadlines of the Examination.