

A12 Chelmsford to A120 widening scheme

TR010060

9.65 Errata to the Environmental Statement

Rule 8(1)(k)

Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure)
Regulations 2010

Volume 9

July 2023

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning
(Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

A12 Chelmsford to A120 widening scheme

Development Consent Order 202[]

Errata to the Environmental Statement

Regulation Number	Rule 8(1)(k)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010060
Application Document Reference	TR010060/EXAM/9.65
Author	A12 Project Team and National Highways

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 1	June 2023	Final for Deadline 6
Rev 2	12 July 2023	Final for Deadline 8

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1
2	Summary of Addenda and Errata	1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Summary of addenda and errata for the Environmental Statement	2
-----------	---	---

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 The purpose of this report is to communicate addenda and errata to the Environmental Statement for the A12 Chelmsford to A120 widening scheme (the proposed scheme), which came to light following submission of the Environmental Statement to the Planning Inspectorate on 12 August 2022. This report applies to the non-technical summary, the main chapters, technical appendices and figures, and the Habitats Regulations Assessment report.
- 1.1.2 The addenda and errata identified here include typographical errors, inconsistencies between different parts of the Environmental Statement, and omissions. They are by nature very minor and for that reason, in most cases, it is not proposed to re-issue corrected versions of the relevant documents. Some of these errata have already been addressed through submission of revised documents to the Development Consent Order (DCO) Examination Library for the proposed scheme and some documents will be reissued before the end of the examination.
- 1.1.3 This report does not address design changes to the proposed scheme which is subject to a separate consultation process and environmental assessment. A separate environmental addendum will be submitted to the Examining Authority by 30 May 2023 as part of a submission document to request these six design changes to the proposed scheme.

2 Summary of Addenda and Errata

- 2.1.1 Table 2.1 sets out the following information:
- A unique line reference
 - A reference to the original document containing the addendum or erratum
 - The nature of the addendum or erratum
 - An explanation of the required revision, and where appropriate the revised text and concluding statement. Where this includes text revisions, deleted text is in red and marked with a strikethrough (~~deleted text~~) and new text is in blue font and underlined (new text).
 - A cross reference to the document reference number for the original document and subsequent revisions in the Examination Library for the proposed scheme.
- 2.1.2 The relevant documents are arranged in numerical order, with the main Environmental Statement chapters, followed by the appendices and the figures.
- 2.1.3 In addition to the Environmental Statement, we have also included the Habitats Regulations Assessment report, as the same erratum applies to both this document and Chapter 9 Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement.

Table 2.1 Summary of addenda and errata for the Environmental Statement

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
1	Chapter 2, The Proposed Scheme, paragraph 2.4.13, bullet 6	Incorrect number of dwellings	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The bullet states that with regards to the Crown Estate land at Feering – the emerging Section 2 Local Plan for Braintree allocates land south of Feering as a strategic growth location for up to 750 houses and business areas. The figure of 750 dwellings should be 795.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>The 6th bullet should read as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Crown Estate land at Feering – the emerging Section 2 Local Plan for Braintree allocates land south of Feering as a strategic growth location for up to 750<u>795</u> houses and business areas.” 	APP-069
2	Chapter 3, Alternatives, Table 3.4, 'ecology mitigation areas', page 29	Incorrect cross reference to sheet number	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The text relating to the changes to ecology mitigation at Junction 21 (north of A12 corridor) refers to sheet 6 of the General Arrangement plans, but should refer to sheets 4 and 5.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>The last sentence under the sub-heading Junction 211 (north of the A12 corridor) should read as follows:</p> <p>“This layout has been included within the proposed scheme design, and is shown on sheet 6<u>sheets 4 and 5</u> of the General Arrangement Plans [TR010060/APP/2.9].”</p>	APP-070 updated in AS-030

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number				
3	Chapter 7, Cultural Heritage	Revision of assessment	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The assessment of the Rivenhall long mortuary enclosure Scheduled Monument (Asset 399) was reviewed at the request of Historic England during the DCO examination.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>The revised assessment was provided in the Applicant's Comments on Written Representations [REP3-009]. Corrections to the Environmental Statement are not provided here.</p> <p>Concluding statement</p> <p>The assessment was changed from a neutral significance of effect to slight adverse (not significant) on setting during construction and operation.</p>	APP-074 updated in REP3-009				
4	Chapter 9, Biodiversity, Table 9.1, Page 6	Omission of a record of a meeting with Natural England	<p>Explanation</p> <p>One meeting held with Natural England in relation to badger sett locations was not included in Table 9.1.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>Add a row to Table 9.1 on page 6 following the last entry for Natural England.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Stakeholder</th> <th>Details</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Natural England</td> <td>Discretionary Advice Service meeting held 25/03/2021</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Stakeholder	Details	Natural England	Discretionary Advice Service meeting held 25/03/2021	APP-076
Stakeholder	Details							
Natural England	Discretionary Advice Service meeting held 25/03/2021							

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant presented photographs of two options for the location of one of the artificial badger setts, and agreement was reached about the preferred location. Otter couches on the Rivenhall Brook were also discussed, licensing and mitigation was discussed. 	
5	Chapter 9, Biodiversity, Table 9.3, third column, second paragraph, page 19 Entry for Essex County Council.	Change in design for Domsey Brook Bridge	<p>Explanation</p> <p>During detailed design, the proposals for incorporating baffles into the channel under Domsey Brook Bridge were removed. The purpose of the baffles is to reduce flow velocity and improve conditions for fish passage. However, it proved to be impractical to construct baffles at this location and any baffles would be unlikely to slow down flow velocity as the channel is already relatively flat.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>The revised text should read as follows.</p> <p>“Mitigation measures include creating a narrow stage-one channel along Domsey Brook to facilitate fine sediment entrainment and flush the fine sediment observed to be aggrading at the outlet downstream; and sediment augmentation to replicate pool-riffle sequences resulting in improved habitat diversity; and the introduction of baffles at the base of the culvert to improve flow dynamics, facilitate sediment conveyance and promote fish passage.”</p> <p>Concluding statement</p>	APP-076

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			There is no change in assessment on fish and aquatic ecology. The assessment of impacts is based on a larger scale of the brook and not the very localised position of the proposed mitigation, the baffles would not change the hydrological conditions significantly, and other factors have a bigger influence on fish movements, in particular the change in light conditions between the channel and the culvert.	
6	Chapter 9, Biodiversity, Table 9.4, Row 5.32	Word omission	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The word “qualify” was omitted from the sentence.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>The text in row 5.32, third column, third paragraph of Table 9.4 should read as follows</p> <p>“(i.e. trees not formally designated, but assessed as part of A12 field surveys to qualify as veteran trees)”</p>	APP-076
7	Chapter 9, Biodiversity, Table 9.12	Error in location of Perry’s Wood	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Table 9.12 incorrectly states that Perry's Wood is adjacent to the Order Limits. The nearest distance between the Order limits and Perry’s Wood is approximately 270m.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>The entry for Perry’s Wood should read as follows.</p>	APP-076

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks				Application document number
			Site	Approximate distance from the proposed scheme (m)	Approximate distance from the construction ARN (m)	Approximate distance from the operational ARN (m)	
			Perry's Wood	Adjacent to the Order Limits 270	N/A – more than 200m	5	
			<p>Concluding statement</p> <p>The air quality modelling is accurate as it has assumed the correct location for Perry's Wood. Therefore no change to the assessment.</p>				
8	Chapter 9, Biodiversity, Table 9.15	Error in status of Red kite	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Red kite is listed as a “probable breeder” in Table 9.15 in Chapter 9: Biodiversity, but “possible breeder” in Appendix 9.5: Breeding Bird Survey Report [APP-129] in Table 6.5 and Table C.4. The entry in Chapter 9 is incorrect.</p> <p>Revised Text</p> <p>Table 9.15 in Chapter 9 should be amended to “possible breeder”.</p>				APP-076

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks				Application document number
			Species name	Conservation status	Breeding status	SPA and RAMSAR sites where a species is listed as a qualifying species	
			Red kite <i>Milvus milvus</i>	Schedule 1	Probable <u>Possible</u> breeder	-	
			<p>Concluding statement</p> <p>A probable breeder is a more conservative status than a possible breeder, so the assessment was more conservative. The assessment concluded that there were no significant effects on Schedule 1 species, so the difference in breeding status would not change the outcome of the assessment.</p>				
9	Chapter 9, Biodiversity, Section 9.9	Omission of information	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Dust deposition is not identified as a potential effect in section 9.9, although dust mitigation measures and construction dust impacts are discussed in sections 9.10 and 9.11.</p> <p>Revised Text</p> <p>A new paragraph should be added preceding paragraph 9.9.10 to read:</p>				APP-076

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			<p>“There is also potential for changes in air quality due to dust deposition during construction. In accordance with Table 2.58a of DMRB LA105, the proposed scheme would be classed as a type of project with a ‘large’ risk of construction dust potential. Receptors up to 100m from the construction activity would potentially high dust construction risk, and receptors 100-200m would have a low dust construction risk.”</p> <p>Concluding statement</p> <p>Mitigation to manage the risk of dust deposition during construction was included within the standard mitigation outlined within paragraph 9.10.23 of Chapter 9 and no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>The effect of dust deposition on the various biodiversity receptors was discussed where appropriate within the relevant paragraph of Section 9.11, for example paragraphs 9.11.11 and 9.11.21 assess the effects of dust on Whetmead LNR/LWS and Brockwell Meadows LNR/LWS respectively, therefore there would be no change to the assessment of effects and no new significant effects would arise.</p>	
10	Chapter 9, Biodiversity, paragraph 9.10.22	Error regarding location of boundary	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The compass directions to the boundary were incorrect.</p> <p>Revised Text</p> <p>Paragraph 9.10.22 should read as follows:</p> <p>“Fencing would also be used where necessary (and where this would not conflict with requirements for other species and with road user safety) to minimise the risk of wildlife mortalities. Fencing would be</p>	APP-076

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			erected along the eastern western boundary of Whetmead LNR where the site meets with proposed scheme to prevent mortality of wildlife.” Concluding Statement There is no change to the assessment on Whetmead LNR.	
11	Chapter 9, Biodiversity paragraph 9.11.6	Error regarding the loss of shelterbelt during construction	Explanation Paragraph 9.11.6 refers to a shelter belt around Coleman’s Reservoir which would remain intact and act as a buffer between wild birds on the reservoir and the proposed scheme. However, about an 80m section will be removed during construction and replanted. This error was dealt with in the response to the Examiner’s Question 3.0.9 in REP2-025, pages 36-38. Concluding Statement The error does not result in a change to the ecological impact assessment.	APP-076 See correction in REP2-025
12	Chapter 9, Biodiversity, paragraph 9.11.9	Error regarding area of new habitats	Explanation The areas of new habitats as mitigation for Whetmead are not correct. The correct areas are provided on page 441 of Appendix 9.24 Applicant’s Comments on Written Representations [REP3-009]. Revised text Paragraph 9.11.9 should read as follows: “Whetmead LNR and LWS would be adversely impacted through permanent loss of 0.89ha of semi-natural broadleaved woodland	APP-076 updated in REP3-009

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			<p>habitats adjacent to the A12 on the western boundary of the LNR. This loss would occur during site clearance to enable widening of the existing A12 carriageway and construction of a retaining wall. This would be mitigated through provision of approximately 2ha of new habitats in an area immediately south of and outside the site as detailed in Section 9.10 of this chapter, <u>0.8ha of woodland planting provided within an existing gap along the western boundary of the plot immediately to the west of the ecological mitigation area, where it provides the benefit of visual screening of the widened A12, and 0.1ha of wet woodland would be planted around the attenuation pond in this area (as shown on Figure 2.1 Environmental Masterplan, Part 1, Sheet 8 of 21 [APP-086]).</u></p> <p>Concluding statement</p> <p>The 2ha referred to in the original text includes the nearby ecological mitigation area. This paragraph has been revised to address mitigation for the woodland only and does not change the assessment.</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan will be updated and submitted to the Examination Library following resolution of the change application.</p>	
13	Chapter 9, Biodiversity paragraph 9.11.11	Omission of justification of construction dust impacts	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Further detail could be provided in relation to construction effects of dust on Whetmead LNR/LWS so that text in paragraph 9.11.11 is consistent with the level of detail for other designated sites for example Brockwell Meadows in paragraph 9.11.21.</p> <p>Revised text</p>	APP-076

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			<p>Paragraph 9.11.11 should be revised to read:</p> <p><u>“Construction activities can give rise to emissions of dust from within the Order Limits and through trackout, which could cause damage to vegetation. There is potential for adverse impacts to arise from the deposition of construction dust at sensitive receptors. Chapter 6: Air quality, of the Environmental Statement [TR010060/APP/6.1] summarises the construction dust assessment undertaken to determine the construction dust risk potential for ecological receptors, as per DMRB LA 105. Whetmead LNR/LWS is within the 0-50m distance band so the site is assessed as being at high risk of dust deposition. However, with standard construction phase mitigation measures in place, it is unlikely there would be air quality effects resulting from construction dust. Chapter 6: Air quality, of the Environmental Statement [TR010060/APP/6.1] has concluded that it is unlikely there would be significant adverse air quality effects resulting from construction dust with standard construction phase mitigation measures in place, and so Whetmead LNR/LWS would not be impacted through this pathway.”</u></p> <p>Concluding statement</p> <p>The assessment of construction dust on the Whetmead LNR/LWS remains unchanged.</p>	
14	Chapter 9, Biodiversity, paragraph 9.11.218	Error in data presented	<p>Explanation</p> <p>There is an error in the calculation of total reptile habitat to be cleared. The text states 123.5ha. This is comprised of 86.66ha of grassland,</p>	APP-076

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			<p>44.78ha of woodland and forest, and 23.06ha of heathland, which add up to 154.5ha.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>Text in paragraph 9.11.218 should read as follows</p> <p>“The area of suitable reptile habitat to be cleared totals 123.5ha<u>154.5ha</u>, comprising 86.66ha of grassland, 44.78ha of woodland and forest, and 23.06ha of heathland and scrub.”</p> <p>Concluding statement</p> <p>This error does not change the outcome of the assessment with respect to reptiles and would not result in any new significant effects. As detailed within REP3-012 Technical Note on Ecological Mitigation following implementation of the landscaping scheme there would be a series of high quality habitat parcels along the length of the proposed scheme (the reptile receptor sites) which would act as stepping stones across the landscape. These would be connected by habitats such as the grassland along the new road verges and around attenuation ponds allowing the movement of reptiles between the core habitat parcels. This would ensure the favourable conservation status of reptiles.</p>	
15	Chapter 10: Geology and Soils: Table 10.6	Error in data presented	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Errors were identified in the calculations of agricultural land classification (ALC) grades following corruption of the original data. This mainly affects unsurveyed agricultural land which was mistakenly identified as estimated grade 3a land in a number of locations. Together with confirmation of estimated ALC grades in some locations following a review of the survey data (see Deadline 4 Submission - 6.3 -</p>	APP-077 as updated in REP4-019

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number																																																							
			<p>Environmental Statement - Appendix 10.2 - Agricultural Land Classification Survey Report Part 1 - (Tracked Changes) - Rev 2 [REP4-019]), this has resulted in revisions to the ALC quantification in Table 10.6.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>Table 10.6 is repeated below showing the original data and the revisions for the area and percentage of land within the Order Limits.</p> <p>Table 10.6 Updated Agricultural Land Classification grades</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="862 738 1751 1316"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="862 738 1167 802"></th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1167 738 1451 802">Area (ha)</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1451 738 1751 802">Percentage of Order Limits</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="862 802 1167 858">ALC grade/subgrade</th> <th data-bbox="1167 802 1296 858">Original</th> <th data-bbox="1296 802 1451 858">Updated</th> <th data-bbox="1451 802 1599 858">Original</th> <th data-bbox="1599 802 1751 858">Updated</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="862 858 1167 906">Grade 2</td> <td data-bbox="1167 858 1296 906">76.2</td> <td data-bbox="1296 858 1451 906">79.5</td> <td data-bbox="1451 858 1599 906">9.1</td> <td data-bbox="1599 858 1751 906">9.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="862 906 1167 954">Estimated grade 2</td> <td data-bbox="1167 906 1296 954">4.3</td> <td data-bbox="1296 906 1451 954">4.3</td> <td data-bbox="1451 906 1599 954">0.5</td> <td data-bbox="1599 906 1751 954">0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="862 954 1167 1002">Subgrade 3a</td> <td data-bbox="1167 954 1296 1002">227.9</td> <td data-bbox="1296 954 1451 1002">237.8</td> <td data-bbox="1451 954 1599 1002">27.3</td> <td data-bbox="1599 954 1751 1002">28.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="862 1002 1167 1050">Estimated subgrade 3a</td> <td data-bbox="1167 1002 1296 1050">89.3</td> <td data-bbox="1296 1002 1451 1050">45.8</td> <td data-bbox="1451 1002 1599 1050">10.7</td> <td data-bbox="1599 1002 1751 1050">5.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="862 1050 1167 1098">Subgrade 3b</td> <td data-bbox="1167 1050 1296 1098">133.6</td> <td data-bbox="1296 1050 1451 1098">141.1</td> <td data-bbox="1451 1050 1599 1098">16.0</td> <td data-bbox="1599 1050 1751 1098">16.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="862 1098 1167 1145">Estimated subgrade 3b</td> <td data-bbox="1167 1098 1296 1145">11.5</td> <td data-bbox="1296 1098 1451 1145">10.9</td> <td data-bbox="1451 1098 1599 1145">1.4</td> <td data-bbox="1599 1098 1751 1145">1.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="862 1145 1167 1193">Unsurveyed agricultural land</td> <td data-bbox="1167 1145 1296 1193">1.6</td> <td data-bbox="1296 1145 1451 1193">38.7</td> <td data-bbox="1451 1145 1599 1193">0.2</td> <td data-bbox="1599 1145 1751 1193">4.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="862 1193 1167 1241">Non-agricultural land</td> <td data-bbox="1167 1193 1296 1241">290.7</td> <td data-bbox="1296 1193 1451 1241">290.4</td> <td data-bbox="1451 1193 1599 1241">34.8</td> <td data-bbox="1599 1193 1751 1241">34.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="862 1241 1167 1316">Total</td> <td data-bbox="1167 1241 1296 1316">835.2</td> <td data-bbox="1296 1241 1451 1316">848.5</td> <td data-bbox="1451 1241 1599 1316">100.0</td> <td data-bbox="1599 1241 1751 1316">100.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Area (ha)		Percentage of Order Limits		ALC grade/subgrade	Original	Updated	Original	Updated	Grade 2	76.2	79.5	9.1	9.4	Estimated grade 2	4.3	4.3	0.5	0.5	Subgrade 3a	227.9	237.8	27.3	28.0	Estimated subgrade 3a	89.3	45.8	10.7	5.4	Subgrade 3b	133.6	141.1	16.0	16.6	Estimated subgrade 3b	11.5	10.9	1.4	1.3	Unsurveyed agricultural land	1.6	38.7	0.2	4.6	Non-agricultural land	290.7	290.4	34.8	34.2	Total	835.2	848.5	100.0	100.0	
	Area (ha)		Percentage of Order Limits																																																								
ALC grade/subgrade	Original	Updated	Original	Updated																																																							
Grade 2	76.2	79.5	9.1	9.4																																																							
Estimated grade 2	4.3	4.3	0.5	0.5																																																							
Subgrade 3a	227.9	237.8	27.3	28.0																																																							
Estimated subgrade 3a	89.3	45.8	10.7	5.4																																																							
Subgrade 3b	133.6	141.1	16.0	16.6																																																							
Estimated subgrade 3b	11.5	10.9	1.4	1.3																																																							
Unsurveyed agricultural land	1.6	38.7	0.2	4.6																																																							
Non-agricultural land	290.7	290.4	34.8	34.2																																																							
Total	835.2	848.5	100.0	100.0																																																							

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
16	Chapter 10: Geology and Soils: paragraph 10.9.4	Error in data presented	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Due to the ALC grade errors explained in line 16 above, incorrect acreages are cited in paragraph 10.9.4.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>Paragraph 10.9.4 should read as follows:</p> <p>“Table 10.13 details the predicted areas of permanent and temporary land-take by ALC grade, noting that surveyed and estimated ALC grades have been combined in this table. It is anticipated that approximately 460471ha of agricultural land, including 332306ha of BMV land (excluding unsurveyed agricultural land where ALC grades are unknown), would be permanently sealed by the proposed scheme or otherwise lost to agricultural production by, for instance, the creation of borrow pits. This includes land where maintenance access must be maintained which would place restrictions on agricultural use. An additional 8587ha of agricultural land, including at least 6361.1ha of BMV land (excluding unsurveyed agricultural land where ALC grades are unknown), is anticipated to be temporarily acquired for the proposed scheme.”</p>	APP-077
17	Chapter 10: Geology and Soils: Table 10.13	Error in data presented	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Due to the ALC grade errors explained in line 16 above, Table 10.13 should be revised.</p> <p>Revised text</p>	APP-077

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number																																																																				
			<p>Table 10.13 Updated permanent and temporary land-take by ALC grade should be revised as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="857 533 1760 1321"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Land acquisition type</th> <th rowspan="2">ALC grade/subgrade</th> <th colspan="2">Area (ha)</th> <th colspan="2">Order Limits (%)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Original</th> <th>Updated</th> <th>Original</th> <th>Updated</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="6">Permanent</td> <td>Grade 2</td> <td>69.0</td> <td>75.8</td> <td>8.3</td> <td>8.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Subgrade 3a</td> <td>263.5</td> <td>230.5</td> <td>31.3</td> <td>27.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Subgrade 3b</td> <td>126.2</td> <td>128.5</td> <td>15.1</td> <td>15.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsurveyed agricultural land</td> <td>1.5</td> <td>36.2</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>4.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-agricultural land</td> <td>244.1</td> <td>243.6</td> <td>29.2</td> <td>28.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total agricultural land-take</td> <td></td> <td>460.2</td> <td>471.1</td> <td>55.1</td> <td>55.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="5">Temporary</td> <td>Grade 2</td> <td>8.0</td> <td>8.0</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>0.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Subgrade 3a</td> <td>55.0</td> <td>53.1</td> <td>6.6</td> <td>6.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Subgrade 3b</td> <td>21.5</td> <td>23.4</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>2.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unsurveyed agricultural land</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-agricultural land</td> <td>46.7</td> <td>46.7</td> <td>5.6</td> <td>5.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Land acquisition type	ALC grade/subgrade	Area (ha)		Order Limits (%)		Original	Updated	Original	Updated	Permanent	Grade 2	69.0	75.8	8.3	8.9	Subgrade 3a	263.5	230.5	31.3	27.2	Subgrade 3b	126.2	128.5	15.1	15.1	Unsurveyed agricultural land	1.5	36.2	0.2	4.3	Non-agricultural land	244.1	243.6	29.2	28.7	Total agricultural land-take		460.2	471.1	55.1	55.5	Temporary	Grade 2	8.0	8.0	1.0	0.9	Subgrade 3a	55.0	53.1	6.6	6.3	Subgrade 3b	21.5	23.4	2.6	2.8	Unsurveyed agricultural land	0.1	2.5	0.0	0.3	Non-agricultural land	46.7	46.7	5.6	5.5	
Land acquisition type	ALC grade/subgrade	Area (ha)				Order Limits (%)																																																																		
		Original	Updated	Original	Updated																																																																			
Permanent	Grade 2	69.0	75.8	8.3	8.9																																																																			
	Subgrade 3a	263.5	230.5	31.3	27.2																																																																			
	Subgrade 3b	126.2	128.5	15.1	15.1																																																																			
	Unsurveyed agricultural land	1.5	36.2	0.2	4.3																																																																			
	Non-agricultural land	244.1	243.6	29.2	28.7																																																																			
	Total agricultural land-take		460.2	471.1	55.1	55.5																																																																		
Temporary	Grade 2	8.0	8.0	1.0	0.9																																																																			
	Subgrade 3a	55.0	53.1	6.6	6.3																																																																			
	Subgrade 3b	21.5	23.4	2.6	2.8																																																																			
	Unsurveyed agricultural land	0.1	2.5	0.0	0.3																																																																			
	Non-agricultural land	46.7	46.7	5.6	5.5																																																																			

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks					Application document number												
				Total agricultural land-take	84.5	86.9	10.1	10.2												
18	Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration, Table 12.15, page 36	Error in street name	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Receptor 17 (R17) is identified as being located at 44 Market Street. This should be 44 Market Lane. This error is also within Table 12.25 and paragraph 12.11.11.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>Change entries from “44 Market Street” to “44 Market Lane”.</p> <p>Table 12.15 should read as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Receptor ID</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Receptor ID</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Receptor ID</th> <th>Location</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>R2</td> <td>Boreham – Fitzwalter Road</td> <td>R17</td> <td>44 Market Street Lane</td> <td>R33</td> <td>Prested Hall Cottages</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Receptor ID	Location	Receptor ID	Location	Receptor ID	Location	R2	Boreham – Fitzwalter Road	R17	44 Market Street Lane	R33	Prested Hall Cottages	APP-079
Receptor ID	Location	Receptor ID	Location	Receptor ID	Location															
R2	Boreham – Fitzwalter Road	R17	44 Market Street Lane	R33	Prested Hall Cottages															
19	Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration, Table 12.15, page 36	Incorrect name of receptor	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Receptor 10 (R10) is named as 'Rock Cottages'. This should refer to the general area of 'The Vineyards'.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>Table 12.15 updated as follows.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Receptor ID</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Receptor ID</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Receptor ID</th> <th>Location</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>R10</td> <td>Rock Cottages The Vineyards</td> <td>R25</td> <td>Davey House</td> <td>R41</td> <td>Marks Tey Hall</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Receptor ID	Location	Receptor ID	Location	Receptor ID	Location	R10	Rock Cottages The Vineyards	R25	Davey House	R41	Marks Tey Hall	APP-079
Receptor ID	Location	Receptor ID	Location	Receptor ID	Location															
R10	Rock Cottages The Vineyards	R25	Davey House	R41	Marks Tey Hall															

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
20	Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration, paragraph 12.9.29, page 46	Error listing the incorrect construction activity	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The bullet points in paragraph 12.9.29 state that the impacts at certain receptors are due to “retaining wall piling and structures piling”. The construction activity causing these impacts should be “vibratory compaction for structures backfilling” for all three bullet points.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>Paragraph 12.9.29 should read as follows:</p> <p>“Vibratory compaction for structures backfilling is where vibration may be generated and there are no representative equations within BS 5228-2:2009+A1:2014 (British Standards Institution, 2014b) for this activity. It is possible that this activity may generate levels of vibration that would cause Moderate or Major impacts. These impacts may occur at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receptors close to Bury Lane Bridge (BE06), Station Road Bridge (BE07) and Wellington Road Bridge (BE08) in Hatfield Peverel (retaining wall piling and structures piling <u>vibratory compaction for structures backfilling</u>) • Receptors closest to Olivers Bridge (BE10) on Hodges Holt, Benton Close and Pantile Close (retaining wall piling and structures piling <u>vibratory compaction for structures backfilling</u>) • Receptors at the north-east end of Market Lane (retaining wall piling <u>vibratory compaction for structures backfilling</u>)” <p>Concluding statement</p>	APP-079

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			There is no change to the assessment of construction vibration.	
21	Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration, paragraph 12.10.14, page 56	Typographical error	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The reference to the noise barrier in 5th bullet point should be PNB5 and not PBN5.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>The 6th bullet in paragraph 12.10.4 should read as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At Witham, a 2m high absorptive noise barrier of approximately 115m in length would be installed for the sensitive receptors on Pantile Close (PBN5PNB5). 	APP-079
22	Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration, Table 12.29 and paragraph 12.11.16	Error describing the significant adverse effect from construction at receptor R10 (The Vineyards)	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Table 12.29 states there is a likely significant adverse effect at receptor R10 (The Vineyards) during the construction of the compound. This is not a likely significant adverse effect as the noise level is below SOAEL. The predicted noise level is 63dB and not 65dB as stated.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>Table 12.29 and paragraph 12.11.16 should be deleted.</p> <p>Concluding statement</p> <p>The assessment has been changed as there are now no predicted significant effects for The Vineyards during construction of the compound.</p>	APP-079

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
23	Chapter 13, Population and Health, paragraph 13.10.23	Data reported in the Environmental Statement has been superseded	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Paragraph 13.10.23 cites the proportion of cereal farm businesses (3%), proportion of arable land use (0.5%) and average farm size (140.2ha) affected by the project in Essex. In reviewing the data in the early part of the examination, it was discovered that the data relied upon in the Environmental Statement was no longer available on the Defra website, so the impact on cereal agriculture was reviewed using updated data.</p> <p>The latest Defra data for 1 June 2021 (Detailed annual statistics on the structure of the agricultural industry at 1 June in England and the UK, Defra 2022) shows that there were 930 cereal farms in Essex with an aggregate farmed area of 180,823ha (average farm size 194.43ha) and so the proportion of farm businesses affected (17 with Moderate or above significance) is 2% and proportion of arable land use affected is 0.2%.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>“In terms of agricultural businesses, major adverse magnitude impacts have been assessed for three landholdings in terms of land take, while 14 would have moderate adverse magnitude impacts. In some cases, land required for the proposed scheme would result in permanent loss of entire fields. Approximately 504ha of arable farmland would be lost to the proposed scheme during the construction phase, of which 395ha would be permanently lost. There would be remaining viable agricultural land at most landholdings affected, but the scale of loss and high value</p>	APP-080 as updated in REP1-002

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			<p>of agricultural assets means the overall effect is significant for the study area. On a county-wide basis, there were 552930 cereal farms in Essex in June 2021 2019/20 (Defra, 2020 2022) so this impact affects approximately 3% 2% of the cereal farm businesses in Essex, and approximately 0.5% 0.2% of agricultural land use (assuming an average farm size 140.2ha 194.43ha (Defra, 2020 2022)).”</p> <p>Concluding statement</p> <p>The updated data from Defra, 2022 confirm the magnitude of impact on the percentage of farm businesses affected and the percentage of acreage under cereals. The assessment of a Large adverse significant effect on agriculture remains.</p> <p><u>References:</u></p> <p><u>Updated data source used for addendum:</u></p> <p>Defra (2022). Structure of the agricultural industry in England and the UK at June. Data download: Structure-england-june21-county-23june22. Available at https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/structure-of-the-agricultural-industry-in-england-and-the-uk-at-june</p> <p><u>Original data source used for Environmental Statement:</u></p> <p>Defra (2020). Farm Business Survey: Data Builder. Tables 20061 and 20062. Available at Farmbusinesssurvey.co.uk</p>	
24	Chapter 13, Population and	Inconsistency in data presented	Explanation	APP-080

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number																	
	Health, paragraph 13.18.73		<p>Paragraph 13.15.32 in the baseline section is inconsistent with the predictions of severance in section 13.18. The baseline consideration of severance drew on the traffic flow bands used to inform sensitivity for walkers, cyclists and horse riders (WCH) as set out in Table 3.11 of DMRB LA 112 (Highways England, 2020). However the assessment drew on assessment guidelines for severance as set out in Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) Unit A4.1 which refers to the slightly different scale of traffic flow bands and terminology for severance used in the (now withdrawn) DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 8 – Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects (June 1993). This has resulted in an inconsistency between the application of traffic flow bands and terminology applied to the baseline severance and those applied in the assessment of likely significant effects. The difference between LA112 and TAG Unit A4.1/DMRB 11.3.9 is set out below for information.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="860 935 1789 1326"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="1171 935 1789 991">Indicative severance classification</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="860 991 1171 1086">Traffic flow band (AADT*)</th> <th data-bbox="1171 991 1480 1086">Table 3.11 in DMRB LA112</th> <th data-bbox="1480 991 1789 1086">Section 6.1, DMRB 11.3.9**</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="860 1086 1171 1145">>16,000</td> <td data-bbox="1171 1086 1480 1145">Very high</td> <td data-bbox="1480 1086 1789 1145">Severe</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="860 1145 1171 1204">>8,000 – 16,000</td> <td data-bbox="1171 1145 1480 1204">High</td> <td data-bbox="1480 1145 1789 1204">Moderate</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="860 1204 1171 1264">>4,000 - 8000</td> <td data-bbox="1171 1204 1480 1264">Medium</td> <td data-bbox="1480 1204 1789 1326" rowspan="2">Slight (<8,000 AADT)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="860 1264 1171 1326"><4000</td> <td data-bbox="1171 1264 1480 1326">Low</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="860 1326 1789 1375">*AADT = Annual average daily traffic</p>	Indicative severance classification			Traffic flow band (AADT*)	Table 3.11 in DMRB LA112	Section 6.1, DMRB 11.3.9**	>16,000	Very high	Severe	>8,000 – 16,000	High	Moderate	>4,000 - 8000	Medium	Slight (<8,000 AADT)	<4000	Low	
Indicative severance classification																					
Traffic flow band (AADT*)	Table 3.11 in DMRB LA112	Section 6.1, DMRB 11.3.9**																			
>16,000	Very high	Severe																			
>8,000 – 16,000	High	Moderate																			
>4,000 - 8000	Medium	Slight (<8,000 AADT)																			
<4000	Low																				

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			<p data-bbox="869 419 1771 483">**As referred to in Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) Unit A4.1 (May 2019) and V1 (November 2022)</p> <p data-bbox="857 504 1720 600">The inconsistent application affects assessments for Boreham, Rivenhall End, and Inworth. The revised text below aligns the assessment to the bands indicated by Table 3.11 in DMRB LA112.</p> <p data-bbox="857 624 1032 647">Revised text</p> <p data-bbox="857 671 1697 699">Paragraph 13.18.73 on Boreham should be amended as follows:</p> <p data-bbox="857 722 1787 1359">“The village of Boreham itself would not be particularly impacted by the physical footprint of the proposed scheme. However, traffic levels are predicted to slightly increase on Main Road which runs through Boreham, increasing from 4,000–8,000 vehicles per day in the Do Minimum scenario, to 8,000–16,000 vehicles per day in the Do Something scenario, which would increase severance to a moderate level from a medium level to a high level. Speed restrictions are proposed on Main Road (B1137) where the current 50mph speed limit would be reduced to 40mph, and the current 40mph speed restriction through the village itself would be reduced to 30mph. The lower speed limits may help reduce perceived severance, however 30mph is a relatively standard speed in built-up areas and is not likely to greatly improve actual or perceived safety (compared with safety benefits brought by 20mph speed limits) particularly for vulnerable road users such as children, the elderly and people with disabilities. There is a controlled pedestrian crossing to enable crossing to the recreation ground and Boreham Village Hall (likely to be the main community hubs of social interaction) and so the physical ability to cross the road would not be greatly altered by changes in traffic flow. Overall, the impact of</p>	

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			<p>the proposed scheme on community severance in the Boreham village is assessed as negative, but not significant.”</p> <p>Paragraph 13.18.76 on Rivenhall End should be amended as follows:</p> <p>“The main community that would experience a physical impact from the proposed scheme would be Rivenhall End where the A12 currently cuts through the village at grade. Currently, the main route that residents must take to cross between the north and south of the village is via Henry Dixon Road as there is no at-grade crossing provision of the existing A12 where traffic levels are substantially over 16,000 vehicles per day (severe very high severance). The proposed realignment of the A12 trunk road approximately 180m south-east of its current alignment, coupled with de-trunking of the existing A12 through the village and installation of toucan crossings, means there would potentially be a degree of relief from community severance, and traffic levels along the existing A12 alignment through the village are expected to reduce to 4,000–8,000 vehicles per day in the Do Something scenario (slight medium severance). However, most of the residential area of Rivenhall End is located on the north side of the A12 and it is mostly business use to the south, so it is unlikely that social interaction is significantly inhibited in the baseline situation. Furthermore, the proposed scheme would result in a less direct route for pedestrians between the Fair Rest community and Rivenhall End (see Table A.12 in Appendix 13.3 of the Environmental Statement [TR010060/APP/6.3]). It is therefore likely that any net health benefit associated with the relief of community severance for Rivenhall End would be relatively small. On this basis, the overall effect on population health outcomes related to community</p>	

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			<p>severance and social networks is assessed to be positive but is unlikely to be significant.”</p> <p>Paragraph 13.18.78 on Inworth should be amended as follows:</p> <p>“One area of increase has been noted on the B1023 Inworth Road between Tiptree and Kelvedon where modelling indicates traffic flows would substantially increase. The baseline traffic flows on this route are already relatively high at around 10,000 AADT, and the predicted increase in the Do Something scenario would mean traffic would stay within the 8,000–16,000 vehicles per day band (moderate high severance). The increase in flows could potentially increase severance (actual and perceived) within the village of Inworth, particularly at peak traffic times, which may reduce social interaction within the neighbourhood. The proposed scheme includes some localised widening and a lengthened pedestrian footway along Inworth Road. However, these measures would not mitigate the increase in traffic.”</p> <p>Concluding statement</p> <p>The interpretation of health evidence which underpinned the judgement of significance is set out in Section 8 of Appendix 13.1 of the Environmental Statement [APP-153] which states “Given the lack of research on size of effect, or thresholds at which severance may occur, significant effects on health outcomes are judged likely only if changes would be widespread across the human health study area.” The assessment of significance of population health effects relating to impacts on severance for each of these communities does not change.</p>	
Appendices				

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number						
25	Appendix 7.9 Cultural Heritage Summary Impact Assessment Tables	Omission of data and update of assessment	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The summary impact assessment tables were updated to show the designation status of the heritage features and the revised assessment for Rivenhall long mortuary enclosure scheduled monument at the request of Historic England [REP2-060]. The appendix was submitted to the Examining Authority at Deadline 4 in a clean and tracked changed versions of the document.</p>	APP-117 updated in REP4-016 (clean) and REP4-017 (version with tracked changes)						
26	Appendix 8.3, Visual effects schedule, page 27	Error in the distance recorded between Viewpoint 21 and the centreline of the proposed scheme	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The distance between Viewpoint 21 and the centreline of the proposed scheme is approximately 910m and not 380m.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>On page 27, Viewpoint 21, second column, change “380m” to “910m”.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="862 965 1792 1332"> <thead> <tr> <th>Representative Viewpoint</th> <th>Approx. distance from viewpoint to centreline of proposed scheme</th> <th>Receptor type and visual sensitivity</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>21. Representative view north from PRow 128_28, Easthorpe.</td> <td>380m910m</td> <td>Receptor type: users of the PRow (public bridleway). Visual sensitivity: High</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Representative Viewpoint	Approx. distance from viewpoint to centreline of proposed scheme	Receptor type and visual sensitivity	21. Representative view north from PRow 128_28, Easthorpe.	380m 910m	Receptor type: users of the PRow (public bridleway). Visual sensitivity: High	APP-121
Representative Viewpoint	Approx. distance from viewpoint to centreline of proposed scheme	Receptor type and visual sensitivity								
21. Representative view north from PRow 128_28, Easthorpe.	380m 910m	Receptor type: users of the PRow (public bridleway). Visual sensitivity: High								

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number						
			<p>Concluding statement</p> <p>The correction to the distance does not change the description of the impact in the visual effects schedule.</p>							
27	Appendix 9.4 Bat Survey Report Entry for Essex County Council.	Error in the recorded value of barbastelle bats	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The importance level for barbastelle bats is presented as 'Regional' in Appendix 9.4 Table 6.3 but should be 'County', in line with the subsequent text in paragraph 6.2.2.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>The entry for Essex County Council should read as follows.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Species</th> <th>Foraging</th> <th>Commuting</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Barbastelle</td> <td>RegionalCounty</td> <td>RegionalCounty</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Concluding statement</p> <p>There is no change to the assessment, as Barbastelle bats were assessed as being of County level importance.</p>	Species	Foraging	Commuting	Barbastelle	Regional County	Regional County	APP-128
Species	Foraging	Commuting								
Barbastelle	Regional County	Regional County								
28	Appendix 9.7, Hedgerow Survey, paragraph 7.2.12	Consistency	<p>Explanation</p> <p>There are variations in the valuation of priority habitat hedgerows between Appendix 9.7 (132 hedgerows valued as local) and Chapter 9 (these hedgerows were valued as national).</p>	APP-131						

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			<p>Revised text</p> <p>Appendix 9.7 requires correction to be consistent with DMRB LA 108. Paragraph 7.2.12 should be amended as follows.</p> <p>“In accordance with DMRB LA108, As priority habitat hedgerows supporting more limited structural and species diversity than ancient/irreplaceable hedgerows, these hedgerows are considered of Local National importance for biodiversity.”</p> <p>Concluding statement</p> <p>There would be no effect on the assessment of impacts because priority habitat hedgerows were assessed as being of National value in the Environmental Statement (see paragraph 9.11.89).</p>	
29	Appendix 9.7, Hedgerow Survey, paragraph 2.3.1 (f)	Typographical error	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Paragraph 2.3.1(f) is missing the word 'mitigation' at the end of the point.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>Paragraph 2.3.1(f) should be revised to read</p> <p>“collect information about hedgerows to inform the development of mitigation”</p>	APP-131
30	Appendix 9.7, Hedgerow Survey, Subheading 4.2	Typographical error	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The sub-heading cites the wrong policy document.</p> <p>Revised text</p>	APP-131

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			Replace Subheading 4.2 “National Policy Planning Framework” with Subheading 4.2 “National Networks National Policy Statement”.	
31	Appendix 9.7, Hedgerow Survey, paragraph 6.1.1.	Typographical error	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The letter “s” is included in the sentence.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>The text should read as follows</p> <p>“A total of 365 features were surveyed of which 343 were hedgerows. The features are shown in Figure 1 and full results are provided in Annex A to this report. Sample photographs are sprovided in Annex D.”</p>	APP-131
32	Appendix 9.7, Hedgerow Survey, paragraph 6.4.1.	Typographical error	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The word “hedgerow” should be in the plural.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>Paragraph 6.4.1 should read as follows:</p> <p>“Two-hundred and ninety-one hedgerow<u>s</u> qualified as priority habitat and are shown in Figure 1. Priority habitat hedgerows are summarised by hedgerow type and species-richness in Table 6.4, and full results of the assessment are provided in Table E.1 in Annex E.”</p>	APP-131
33	Appendix 9.7, Hedgerow Survey, Table E.4	Error in classification of hedgerow	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Hedgerow No. HID275 should not be classed as an important hedgerow in Table E.4, but as not applicable ‘N/A’, as it does not meet</p>	APP-131

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			<p>one of the i, ii or iii criteria. Figure 1 Sheet 9 in the report also needs to be changed.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>The final column in row 275 in Table E.4 should be amended from 'important' to 'not important'.</p> <p>Sheet 9 of Figure 1 should be amended so hedgerow 275 is coded as 'not important – species rich'.</p>	
34	Appendix 9.7, Hedgerow Survey, paragraphs 1.1.3, 6.6.1, 7.1.1, 7.2.6.	Error in classification of hedgerow	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Following the reclassification of Hedgerow 275 to 'not important' the total number of important hedgerows needs to be revised from 88 to 87 in the four paragraphs identified.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>Paragraph 1.1.3 should read as follows</p> <p>“The survey recorded 343 hedgerows, of which 107 were species rich. Out of the 343 hedgerows, 291 hedgerows qualified as 'priority habitat' and 8887 of the hedgerows were regarded as 'important' under the wildlife and landscape criteria of the Hedgerows Regulations (1997).”</p> <p>Paragraph 6.6.1 should read as follows</p> <p>“A total of 8887 hedgerows were assessed as 'important' under the wildlife and landscape criteria in Schedule 1 of the Hedgerows Regulations (1997), shown in Figure 1. A summary of hedgerow importance and species-richness by hedgerow type is provided in Table 6.7. Full results of the assessment are provided in Annex C.”</p>	APP-131

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			<p>Paragraph 7.1.1 should read as follows</p> <p>“The survey recorded 343 hedgerows, of which 107 were species-rich, 291 qualified as priority habitat and 888⁷ were ‘important’ under the wildlife and landscape criteria of the Hedgerows Regulations (1997).”</p> <p>Paragraph 7.2.6 should read as follows</p> <p>“There are no published national or local criteria for consistently recognising ancient or irreplaceable hedgerows, but the following types of hedgerows within the study area are likely to be ancient or irreplaceable:</p> <p>a. important hedgerows – 888⁷ hedgerows</p> <p>b. hedgerows with average species-richness at least five (species-rich hedgerows) – 107 hedgerows</p> <p>c. hedgerows supporting ancient or veteran trees – 15 hedgerows.”</p>	
35	Appendix 10.2 Agricultural Land Classification Survey Report	Error in data presented	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Errors were identified in Appendix 10.2 in relation to ALC grades/mapping and missing/incorrect observation locations and location maps.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>These errors were corrected in the following Deadline 4 submissions:</p> <p>Deadline 4 Submission - 6.3 - Environmental Statement - Appendix 10.2 - Agricultural Land Classification Survey Report Part 1 - (Tracked Changes) - Rev 2 [REP4-019]; and</p>	APP-143 as updated in REP4-019 and REP4-021

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			Deadline 4 Submission - 6.3 Environmental Statement – Appendix 10.2 - Agricultural Land Classification Survey Report Part 2 - (Tracked Changes) - Rev 2 [REP4-021].	
36	Appendix 12.3, Baseline Noise Surveys, paragraph 2.1.2.	Typographical error	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Paragraph 2.1.2 should not refer Table 2.4.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>Paragraph 2.2.1 should read as follows.</p> <p>“The rationale for the selection of each survey location is given in Table 2.2. The rationale behind choosing some locations was based upon potential uses of the data during the assessment. Since the survey locations were selected before any assessment for the proposed scheme had been undertaken and without knowledge of the final scheme design, some of measured data may not have been utilised within the assessment as is indicated within Table 2.4.”</p>	APP-149
37	Appendix 12.3, Baseline Noise Surveys, paragraph 2.1.4.	Error in describing a single specific property when it should be general	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The text refers to a single property, but should refer to property in general.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>Paragraph 2.1.4 text should read as follows.</p> <p>“The subjective nature of the traffic noise from the A12 on internal noise levels within this dwellings cannot be described without a visit inside the dwellings. This was considered an unnecessary requirement for the overall noise assessment, and any such visit would unlikely be</p>	APP-149

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			representative of all the those dwellings represented by this a given location.”	
38	Appendix 13.3, Land Use and Accessibility Assessment Tables, Table A.5, page 16	Error in description of impact	<p>Explanation</p> <p>2 Sorrells Cottages is identified as being temporarily acquired, but the property would be permanently acquired.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>The text in row 2, column 4 would read as:</p> <p>“Construction: No 1 Sorrells Cottages (nearest to the bridge) would be permanently acquired to allow for construction of a retaining wall, construction access and other works associated with the Bury Lane Overbridge replacement. No. 2 Sorrells Cottages would be temporarilypermanently acquired during construction. This would result in loss to residential use for the duration of construction activities in that location.”</p> <p>Concluding statement</p> <p>The assessment of significance on residential land use in Hatfield Peveral does not change.</p>	APP-155
39	Appendix 13.3, Land Use and Accessibility Assessment Tables, Table A.13	Omission of affected receptors	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Approximately three residential properties (1 and 2 Prested Hall Cottages and Heathfield) along southbound side of A12 London Road east of New Lane, Kelvedon, were omitted from the land use and accessibility assessment.</p> <p>Revised text</p>	APP-155

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks						Application document number																		
			<table border="1" data-bbox="862 443 1792 965"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="862 443 1016 592">Assets</th> <th data-bbox="1016 443 1149 592">Baseline</th> <th data-bbox="1149 443 1296 592">Sensitivity</th> <th data-bbox="1296 443 1485 592">Description of Impact</th> <th data-bbox="1485 443 1637 592">Essential mitigation proposed</th> <th data-bbox="1637 443 1792 592">Magnitude of impact (with essential mitigation)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="862 592 1016 890"> 1 and 2 Prested Hall Cottages and Heathfield along southbound side of A12, London Road </td> <td data-bbox="1016 592 1149 890"> Existing housing </td> <td data-bbox="1149 592 1296 890"> Medium </td> <td data-bbox="1296 592 1485 890"> Construction: Short to medium term disruption to their access onto the B1024 while works to the proposed Feering East Roundabout take place. </td> <td data-bbox="1485 592 1637 890"> Appropriate temporary or permanent access arrangements would be provided where practicable. </td> <td data-bbox="1637 592 1792 890"> Minor </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="862 890 1016 965"></td> <td data-bbox="1016 890 1149 965"></td> <td data-bbox="1149 890 1296 965"></td> <td data-bbox="1296 890 1485 965"> Operation: None </td> <td data-bbox="1485 890 1637 965"> N/A </td> <td data-bbox="1637 890 1792 965"> No change </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="862 975 1211 1007">Add new line to Table A.13</p> <p data-bbox="862 1034 1171 1066">Concluding statement</p> <p data-bbox="862 1086 1778 1316">During construction these properties (medium value) would experience short to medium term disruption to their access onto the B1024 while works to the proposed Feering East Roundabout take place. With standard mitigation in place, the impact would be intermittent inconvenience rather than prevention of access. The magnitude of impact would be Minor. No operational impact on the function of these residential properties is predicted. No change in significance of effect</p>						Assets	Baseline	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Essential mitigation proposed	Magnitude of impact (with essential mitigation)	1 and 2 Prested Hall Cottages and Heathfield along southbound side of A12, London Road	Existing housing	Medium	Construction: Short to medium term disruption to their access onto the B1024 while works to the proposed Feering East Roundabout take place.	Appropriate temporary or permanent access arrangements would be provided where practicable.	Minor				Operation: None	N/A	No change	
Assets	Baseline	Sensitivity	Description of Impact	Essential mitigation proposed	Magnitude of impact (with essential mitigation)																						
1 and 2 Prested Hall Cottages and Heathfield along southbound side of A12, London Road	Existing housing	Medium	Construction: Short to medium term disruption to their access onto the B1024 while works to the proposed Feering East Roundabout take place.	Appropriate temporary or permanent access arrangements would be provided where practicable.	Minor																						
			Operation: None	N/A	No change																						

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			on private property and housing in Kelvedon, Feering and Inworth is predicted.	
40	Appendix 13.3, Land Use and Accessibility Assessment Tables, Table A.21	Update to assessment of effects	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Table A.21 cites the proportion of cereal farm businesses (3%), proportion of arable land use (0.5%) and average farm size (140.2ha) affected by the project in Essex. In reviewing the data in the early part of the examination, it was discovered that the data relied upon in the Environmental Statement was no longer available on the Defra website, so the impact on cereal agriculture was reviewed using updated data.</p> <p>The latest Defra data for 1 June 2021 (Detailed annual statistics on the structure of the agricultural industry at 1 June in England and the UK, Defra 2022) shows that there were 930 cereal farms in Essex with an aggregate farmed area of 180,823ha (average farm size 194.43ha) and so the proportion of farm businesses affected (17 with Moderate or above significance) is 2% and proportion of arable land use affected is 0.2%.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>The sentence in the overall Significance Statement should read as follows.</p> <p>“On a county wide basis, there were 552<u>930</u> cereal farms in Essex in June 2021<u>2019/20</u> (Defra, 202<u>2</u>) so this impact affects approximately 3%<u>2%</u> of the cereal farm businesses in Essex, and approximately 0.5%<u>0.2%</u> of arable land use (assuming an average farm size 140.2<u>194.43</u>ha (Defra, 202<u>2</u>)).”</p>	APP-155

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			<p>Concluding statement</p> <p>The updated data from Defra (2022) confirm the magnitude of impact on the percentage of farm businesses affected and the percentage of acreage under cereals. The assessment of a Large adverse significant effect on agriculture remains.</p> <p><u>References:</u></p> <p><u>Updated data source used for addendum:</u></p> <p>Defra (2022). Structure of the agricultural industry in England and the UK at June. Data download: Structure-england-june21-county-23june22. Available at https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/structure-of-the-agricultural-industry-in-england-and-the-uk-at-june</p> <p><u>Original data source used for Environmental Statement:</u></p> <p>Defra (2020). Farm Business Survey: Data Builder. Tables 20061 and 20062. Available at Farmbusinesssurvey.co.uk</p>	
41	Appendix 13.3: Land Use and Accessibility Assessment Tables Table A.21	Omission of affected receptors	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Two potentially affected agricultural landholdings in the Inworth area were missed out in the population and human health assessment. Landholding 31 would comprise two adjacent arable fields under land titles AA13026 and EX501256 in the Inworth area. Landholding 32 comprises land title EX943084, also in the Inworth area. Land-take from these landholdings is proposed to accommodate drainage proposals. Table A.21 of Appendix 13.3: Land Use and Accessibility Assessment Tables [APP-155] should include two additional Agricultural Landholdings. 11ha of agricultural land under arable production. The</p>	APP-155

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks						Application document number												
			<p>magnitude of impact is assessed as Minor adverse since approximately 9.7ha of land would be unaffected and remain viable for agricultural use.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>Table A.21 to include two new rows.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="862 619 1792 1367"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="862 619 1014 767">Agricultural asset</th> <th data-bbox="1014 619 1184 767">Baseline</th> <th data-bbox="1184 619 1328 767">Sensitivity</th> <th data-bbox="1328 619 1485 767">Description of impact (land take and severance)</th> <th data-bbox="1485 619 1637 767">Essential mitigation</th> <th data-bbox="1637 619 1792 767">Magnitude of impact (with essential mitigation)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="862 767 1014 1367">Agricultural landholding 31</td> <td data-bbox="1014 767 1184 1367">Two combined fields approximately 6.2ha in area. From aerial imagery the land appears to be under arable (cereal) production</td> <td data-bbox="1184 767 1328 1367">High</td> <td data-bbox="1328 767 1485 1367"> Construction: Approximately 2.68ha would be acquired for flood compensation areas and drainage ponds. Remaining land could be farmed. Operation: It is unlikely that cereal production would be viable in the flood mitigation </td> <td data-bbox="1485 767 1637 1367"> Appropriate temporary or permanent access arrangements would be provided where practicable to access land outside of Order Limits. Liaison with landowners, tenants, and their agents which are affected by the proposals has been ongoing. The </td> <td data-bbox="1637 767 1792 1367">Minor adverse (construction and operation)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						Agricultural asset	Baseline	Sensitivity	Description of impact (land take and severance)	Essential mitigation	Magnitude of impact (with essential mitigation)	Agricultural landholding 31	Two combined fields approximately 6.2ha in area. From aerial imagery the land appears to be under arable (cereal) production	High	Construction: Approximately 2.68ha would be acquired for flood compensation areas and drainage ponds. Remaining land could be farmed. Operation: It is unlikely that cereal production would be viable in the flood mitigation	Appropriate temporary or permanent access arrangements would be provided where practicable to access land outside of Order Limits. Liaison with landowners, tenants, and their agents which are affected by the proposals has been ongoing. The	Minor adverse (construction and operation)	
Agricultural asset	Baseline	Sensitivity	Description of impact (land take and severance)	Essential mitigation	Magnitude of impact (with essential mitigation)																
Agricultural landholding 31	Two combined fields approximately 6.2ha in area. From aerial imagery the land appears to be under arable (cereal) production	High	Construction: Approximately 2.68ha would be acquired for flood compensation areas and drainage ponds. Remaining land could be farmed. Operation: It is unlikely that cereal production would be viable in the flood mitigation	Appropriate temporary or permanent access arrangements would be provided where practicable to access land outside of Order Limits. Liaison with landowners, tenants, and their agents which are affected by the proposals has been ongoing. The	Minor adverse (construction and operation)																

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks					Application document number	
						<p><u>area, which would limit the agricultural options for this area of land. Therefore it is assumed 2.68ha would be permanently lost to agriculture. Remaining land could be farmed.</u></p>	<p><u>principles of the compensation code will apply.</u></p> <p><u>Contractor to appoint an Agricultural Liaison Officer for ongoing engagement with landholders, tenants and their agents.</u></p> <p><u>Undertake record condition of farm assets at pre-construction against which to measure quality of reinstatement of temporarily acquired land.</u></p> <p><u>Requirements for protection of biosecurity, water supplies.</u></p>		

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks					Application document number	
							<p>soils, and other farm assets placed on Principal Contractor.</p>		
			<p>Agricultural landholding 32</p>	<p>One field approximately 4.8ha in area. From aerial imagery the land appears to be under arable (cereal) production</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Construction: Approximately 0.63 ha would be required for a flood mitigation area. Remaining land could be farmed.</p> <p>Operation: It is unlikely that cereal production would be viable in the flood mitigation area, which would limit the agricultural options for this area of land. Therefore it is assumed 0.63ha would be permanently</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>Minor adverse (construction and operation)</p>	

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number						
			<table border="1" data-bbox="862 408 1792 542"> <tr> <td data-bbox="862 408 1014 542"></td> <td data-bbox="1014 408 1182 542"></td> <td data-bbox="1182 408 1328 542"></td> <td data-bbox="1328 408 1480 542"> lost to agriculture. Remaining land could be farmed. </td> <td data-bbox="1480 408 1635 542"></td> <td data-bbox="1635 408 1792 542"></td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="862 614 1176 646">Concluding statement</p> <p data-bbox="862 662 1758 758">This omission will not affect the overall significance conclusion of the assessment of a Large adverse significant effect on agriculture, but it means two additional landholders are affected than reported.</p>				lost to agriculture. Remaining land could be farmed.			
			lost to agriculture. Remaining land could be farmed.							
42	Appendix 14.5, Flood Risk Assessment, paragraph 2.7.7	Typographical error	<p data-bbox="862 790 1041 821">Explanation</p> <p data-bbox="862 837 1769 933">This text states that Domsey Bridge would be widened by 36.4m, but this should be 34.6m, as per the ES Chapter 2 The Proposed Scheme and the structures plans.</p> <p data-bbox="862 957 1041 989">Revised text</p> <p data-bbox="862 1005 1310 1037">Paragraph 2.7.7 to read as follows:</p> <p data-bbox="862 1053 1780 1324">“At the existing A12 western crossing of the Domsey Brook, the proposed scheme would involve widening and realigning the existing crossing. This would require lengthening the existing arch structure which the Domsey Brook flows through under the existing A12 (approximate dimensions 7m x 5.5m x 38.1m) by approximately 36.434.6m. A short section of the watercourse immediately upstream of the crossing would be displaced by the proposed scheme and would therefore be realigned.</p>	APP-162						

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
43	Appendix 14.5, Flood Risk Assessment	Error in presentation of map	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Plate 7.8 of the Flood Risk Assessment contains an old version of the modelled change in flood depths. This means it shows an adverse impact north of the A12 that has been designed out.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>This issue was corrected in the Applicant's response to the second round of questions, ExQ2 2.18.1, including a revised Plate 7.8 and submitted to the Examining Authority for Deadline 4.</p>	APP-162 As updated in REP4-055
44	Appendix 14.6, Surface Water Drainage Strategy, header	Typographical error	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Appendix reference in the report header was incorrect.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>The report header should read as follows "ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT APPENDIX 14.6<u>14.6</u> SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE STRATEGY"</p>	APP-174
45	Appendix 16.1, Long List and Short List of Other Developments, ID 92	Typographical error	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The planning application FEER233 (Crown Land) refers to the wrong number of dwellings. The appendix refers to 750 or more new dwellings, but it should be 795 or more new dwellings.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>The text in row 92, 5th column should read as follows. "Allocation for 750<u>795</u> or more new dwellings."</p>	APP-182

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
46	Figure 2.1, Environmental Masterplan, Sheets 8, 9, 14 and 20	Errors on figure	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Existing hedgerows are not mapped on the Environmental Masterplan at Inworth Road and along the gas main diversion, because these were not included within Appendix 9.7 Hedgerow Survey Report [APP-131].</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan has been updated with hedgerow survey data along Inworth Road and submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-015]. Whilst the latest Environmental Masterplan shows the more recently surveyed hedgerows as potentially important, they are confirmed as important where applicable in the Supplementary Hedgerow Survey report [REP4-064].</p> <p>Hedgerows along the gas main diversion are included within the Supplementary Botanical Survey Report [REP2-027].</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan will be updated and submitted to the Examination Library following resolution of the change application.</p>	<p>APP-086 to APP-088</p> <p>Updated in REP4-015.</p> <p>REP2-027</p> <p>REP4-064</p>
47	Figure 2.1, Environmental Masterplan, Parts 1 - 3	Error on figure	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Hedgerows identified as conforming to the archaeology and heritage criteria of the Hedgerow Regulations have not been illustrated as important on the Environmental Masterplan.</p> <p>However, important hedgerows for cultural heritage reasons are recorded in Appendix 9.7 Hedgerow Survey Report [APP-131] and Supplementary Hedgerow Survey [REP4-064].</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan will be updated and submitted to the Examination Library following resolution of the change application.</p>	<p>APP-086 to APP-088</p> <p>APP-131</p> <p>REP4-064</p>

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
48	Figure 2.1, Environmental Masterplan, Parts 1 - 3	Error on figure	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Minor sections of hedgerow were not shown on the Environmental Masterplan. However, all hedgerows are recorded in Appendix 9.7 Hedgerow Survey Report [APP-131], Supplementary Hedgerow Survey [REP4-064] and Supplementary Botanical Survey Report [REP2-027].</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan will be updated and submitted to the Examination Library following resolution of the change application.</p>	APP-086 to APP-088 APP-131 REP4-064 REP2-027
49	Figure 2.1, Environmental Masterplan, Sheet 8	New data	<p>Explanation</p> <p>New Tree Preservation Order at Ishams Chase and the proposed Blue Mills LWS and proposed Barn Grove LWS are not illustrated on the Environmental Masterplan</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan will be updated and submitted to the Examination Library following resolution of the change application.</p>	APP-086
50	Figure 2.1, Environmental Masterplan, Parts 1 - 3	New data	<p>Explanation</p> <p>A further potential veteran tree and five A grade trees, identified in the Supplementary Arboricultural Survey Report [REP3-008] are not shown on the Environmental Masterplan.</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan will be updated and submitted to the Examination Library following resolution of the change application.</p> <p>Concluding Statement</p> <p>There is no change to the impact assessment, as this was based on the survey report and not the Environmental Masterplan.</p>	APP-086 to APP-088

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			The Environmental Masterplan will be updated and submitted to the Examination Library following resolution of the change application.	
51	Figure 2.1, Environmental Masterplan, Sheet 12	Error on figure	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Hedgerow 144 is not important (as defined in Appendix 9.7) but is illustrated as important in error on the Environmental Masterplan. As hedgerow 144 is recorded correctly in Appendix 9.7 Hedgerow Survey Report [APP-131] no updates to this document are required.</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan will be updated and submitted to the Examination Library following resolution of the change application.</p>	APP-087
52	Figure 2.1, Environmental Masterplan, Parts 1-3	Typographical error on figure	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Notes on the Environmental Masterplan refers to Schedule 8 of the dDCO instead of Schedule 9.</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan will be updated and submitted to the Examination Library following resolution of the change application.</p>	APP-086 to APP-088
53	Figure 2.1, Environmental Masterplan, Sheet 6	Omission of data on figure	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Hedgerow 9275 at the advanced works compound was not shown on Sheet 6 of the Environmental Masterplan. However, hedgerow 9275 is included within Appendix 9.7 Hedgerow Survey Report [APP-131].</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan will be updated and submitted to the Examination Library following resolution of the change application.</p>	APP-086
54	Figure 2.1, Environmental	Error	<p>Explanation</p>	APP-088

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
	Masterplan, Sheet 17		<p>At Wishingwell Overbridge roundabout a section of hedgerow is not shown across the roundabout. This should be added and shown as removed and the sections either side should be shown as 'at risk' to accommodate potential construction losses.</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan will be updated and submitted to the Examination Library following resolution of the change application.</p>	
55	Figure 2.1, Environmental Masterplan, Sheet 18	Layer order error	<p>Explanation</p> <p>There is a layer order error on Sheet 18 of the Environmental Masterplan at Marks Tey Bridge regarding the proposed planting.</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan will be updated and submitted to the Examination Library following resolution of the change application.</p>	APP-088
56	Figure 2.1, Environmental Masterplan, Sheet 18	Error	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Retained vegetation is shown on the mainline south of J25, when it should be shown as to be removed.</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan will be updated and submitted to the Examination Library following resolution of the change application.</p>	APP-088
57	Figure 7.1 Cultural heritage archaeological remains	Addition of data outside the Order Limits	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Figure 7.1 showed archaeological features within the Order limits. These figures were updated to show all the features within the study area at the request of Historic England and resubmitted at Deadline 4.</p>	APP-215 Updated in REP4-013

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
58	Figure 7.2 Cultural Heritage Built Heritage and Historic Landscape	Addition of data outside the Order Limits	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Figure 7.2 showed heritage features within the Order limits. This figure was updated to show all the features within the study area at the request of Historic England and resubmitted at Deadline 4.</p>	APP-216 Updated in REP4-014
59	Figure 10.2 Agricultural Land Classification	Error	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Due to the errors/updates set out above for Chapter 10: Geology and Soils [APP-077], there were errors in the ALC mapping as presented on this figure. These have been corrected and submitted at Deadline 6.</p>	APP-226
60	Figure 13.3, Human Health Baseline and Impacts	Error	<p>Explanation</p> <p>Figure 13.3 shows Hatfield Peverel and Terling Ward and Witham Central Ward as 'significantly worse' than average for deaths due to respiratory disease. This is not correct as the data for 2015-19 show that the standard mortality ratio for deaths from respiratory disease in these wards is not significantly different from the average for England.</p> <p>Revised Figure</p> <p>Figure 13.3 has been resubmitted at Deadline 6. The figure has been amended so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It now only indicates wards where the baseline health indicators are significantly worse or significantly better than average for England • The hatch colours indicating death rates from respiratory diseases have been changed to red (significantly worse) and 	APP-238

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number
			<p>green (significantly better) rather than the previous shades of blue and purple</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The legend for the hospital admissions for COPD indicator has been amended to better show the hatch used on the figure Labels all ward names have been added so it is easier to identify the wards 	
61	Habitats Regulations Assessment NSER, various locations	Error in description of impact	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The text states in various locations that "a shelter belt of trees of approximately 15-20m in depth, around the entire perimeter of the reservoir" would persist after construction. However, a section about 80m long of the shelter belt would be removed during construction and replanted.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>This error in the assessment has been addressed in response to the Examiner's Question 3.0.9 in REP2-025, pages 36-38.</p>	APP-201 Updated in REP2-025
62	Supplementary Arboricultural Survey	Incorrect estimate of the Root Protection Area (RPA) radius for Black poplar	<p>Explanation</p> <p>The RPA radius was calculated incorrectly.</p> <p>Revised text</p> <p>In Appendix F Tree Survey Schedule the entry for Tree Reference No. T2077 should state that the RPA radius for the Black poplar is 20.4m and not 16.3m.</p>	REP3-008

Ref. No.	Document Title / Paragraph number or Table and page number	Nature of erratum or addendum	Explanation / Revised text / Concluding remarks	Application document number																																
			<table border="1" data-bbox="869 424 1711 791"> <thead> <tr> <th>Tree Ref. No.</th> <th>Species</th> <th>Height</th> <th>DBH (mm)</th> <th>N</th> <th>E</th> <th>S</th> <th>W</th> <th>Age class</th> <th>Struc cond.</th> <th>Physiol cond.</th> <th>High Value Tree Status</th> <th>General Observations and Comments</th> <th>ERC</th> <th>Category grading</th> <th>RPA radius (m)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>T2077</td> <td>Black poplar (Populus nigra)</td> <td>17</td> <td>1360</td> <td>14</td> <td>14</td> <td>9</td> <td>9</td> <td>V</td> <td>Fair</td> <td>Fair</td> <td>PV</td> <td>Potential veteran. Adventitious roots – Aerial. Adventitious roots – Basal. End-loaded limb / limbs. Shedding limb / limbs – Recent. Subsiding limb / limbs'. Tree has self braced some heavy loaded limbs. Aerial and standing deadwood. Large cavity at base being used by others. Desiccated fungal brackets at basal cavity. Hazard beam crack</td> <td>40+</td> <td>A3</td> <td>16.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="857 858 1171 890">Concluding statement</p> <p data-bbox="857 911 1630 943">The correction does not change the ecological assessment.</p>	Tree Ref. No.	Species	Height	DBH (mm)	N	E	S	W	Age class	Struc cond.	Physiol cond.	High Value Tree Status	General Observations and Comments	ERC	Category grading	RPA radius (m)	T2077	Black poplar (Populus nigra)	17	1360	14	14	9	9	V	Fair	Fair	PV	Potential veteran. Adventitious roots – Aerial. Adventitious roots – Basal. End-loaded limb / limbs. Shedding limb / limbs – Recent. Subsiding limb / limbs'. Tree has self braced some heavy loaded limbs. Aerial and standing deadwood. Large cavity at base being used by others. Desiccated fungal brackets at basal cavity. Hazard beam crack	40+	A3	16.3	
Tree Ref. No.	Species	Height	DBH (mm)	N	E	S	W	Age class	Struc cond.	Physiol cond.	High Value Tree Status	General Observations and Comments	ERC	Category grading	RPA radius (m)																					
T2077	Black poplar (Populus nigra)	17	1360	14	14	9	9	V	Fair	Fair	PV	Potential veteran. Adventitious roots – Aerial. Adventitious roots – Basal. End-loaded limb / limbs. Shedding limb / limbs – Recent. Subsiding limb / limbs'. Tree has self braced some heavy loaded limbs. Aerial and standing deadwood. Large cavity at base being used by others. Desiccated fungal brackets at basal cavity. Hazard beam crack	40+	A3	16.3																					

