

Applicant's Post Hearing Submissions (CAH, ISH 2 and ISH3)

The West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange Order 201X

Four Ashes Limited

THE WEST MIDLANDS RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE ORDER 201X

APPLICANT'S POST HEARING SUBMISSIONS (CAH, ISH 2 AND ISH3) – DOCUMENT 14.1

1. This document sets out the Applicant's Post Hearing (CAH, ISH2 and ISH3) Submissions, focussing on the Deadline 4 actions provided by the Examining Authority in their Action Lists published on the Planning Inspectorate website.
2. The document seeks to provide additional detailed information where requested, and further information where it is considered it might help address points raised by others at the Hearings.
3. No attempt is made to repeat everything said at the Hearings, as this is captured in the recording and in the notes made by those who attended the Hearings.

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response										
Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 5 June 2019													
1.2.1	2. Croft House & MMS Gas Power	Applicant to provide clarification on legal interests in Croft House and MMS Gas parcels	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Plot Number</th> <th>Party Interests and Tenure</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>52</td> <td>Anthony Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Jean Ann Lea-Jones (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Donna Gilmartin (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Antonia Murphy (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) James Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>53</td> <td>Anthony Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Jean Ann Lea-Jones (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Donna Gilmartin (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Antonia Murphy (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) James Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) MMS Gas Power (tenancy)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>54</td> <td>Anthony Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Jean Ann Lea-Jones (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Donna Gilmartin (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Antonia Murphy (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) James Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) MMS Gas Power access rights.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>55</td> <td>Anthony Powell (sole freeholder, registered land (SF340072)) MMS Gas Power (occupier)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In respect of plots 52 – 54, the property is unregistered. Efforts were made to confirm the interests held by sending Questionnaires to all the individuals</p>	Plot Number	Party Interests and Tenure	52	Anthony Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Jean Ann Lea-Jones (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Donna Gilmartin (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Antonia Murphy (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) James Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property)	53	Anthony Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Jean Ann Lea-Jones (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Donna Gilmartin (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Antonia Murphy (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) James Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) MMS Gas Power (tenancy)	54	Anthony Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Jean Ann Lea-Jones (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Donna Gilmartin (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Antonia Murphy (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) James Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) MMS Gas Power access rights.	55	Anthony Powell (sole freeholder, registered land (SF340072)) MMS Gas Power (occupier)
Plot Number	Party Interests and Tenure												
52	Anthony Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Jean Ann Lea-Jones (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Donna Gilmartin (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Antonia Murphy (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) James Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property)												
53	Anthony Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Jean Ann Lea-Jones (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Donna Gilmartin (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Antonia Murphy (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) James Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) MMS Gas Power (tenancy)												
54	Anthony Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Jean Ann Lea-Jones (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Donna Gilmartin (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) Antonia Murphy (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) James Powell (joint freeholder, unregistered land/property) MMS Gas Power access rights.												
55	Anthony Powell (sole freeholder, registered land (SF340072)) MMS Gas Power (occupier)												

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
			concerned however no responses were received. A telephone conversation between the land referencers and Anthony Powell confirmed that the situation as indicated above is correct.
1.4.1	4. Inglewood Investment Company Limited's Interests	Applicant to provide detail on cut and fill balance (including implications on drainage and green infrastructure) as a case study on the Inglewood land.	Please see the Inglewood Engineering Note found at Appendix 1 of this submission.
1.4.2	4. Inglewood Investment Company Limited's Interests	Applicant to confirm what percentage of the Development site is comprised of the Inglewood owned land.	Please refer to paragraph 4.5 of the Compelling Need and VSC Note found at Appendix 2 of this submission.
1.4.3	4. Inglewood Investment Company Limited's Interests	Applicant to provide justification for the revised Green Belt boundary envisaged in the Calf Heath area of the Site and a comparison to the suitability of Vicarage Road as a revised GB boundary.	Please see the Compelling Need and VSC Note found at Appendix 2 of this submission.

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
1.4.4	4. Inglewood Investment Company Limited's Interests	Applicant to provide justification as to why the demand for logistics development demonstrated by the Applicant should all be accommodated on one site.	Please see the Compelling Need and VSC Note found at Appendix 2 of this submission.
Accessibility and Transport Hearing 5 June 2019			
2.3.1	3. Rail Connectivity	Applicant to provide evidence of other SRFI GRIP Stages at time of submission for DCO	Please see Section 1 of the Rail Connectivity Note found at Appendix 3 of this submission.
2.3.2	3. Rail Connectivity	Applicant to confirm proportion of iPort occupiers using rail	Please see Section 2 of the Rail Connectivity Note found at Appendix 3 of this submission.
2.3.3	3. Rail Connectivity	Applicant to provide evidence of quantum of floorspace occupied when first freight train became operational at other SRFIs and provide a view on where the "tipping point" lies in terms of demand to	Please see Section 3 of the Rail Connectivity Note found at Appendix 3 of this submission.

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
		support the first rail freight service.	
2.4.1	4. Proposed Travel Plan measures	Applicant to provide details on increased frequency of 54 bus route, data on current use and proportion of workforce anticipated to use this service. Also provide first and last bus times from Stafford and Wolverhampton.	<p>Details of the proposed enhancements to the existing 54 service are provided within paragraphs 5.18 – 5.28 of the Sustainable Transport Strategy (APP-136).</p> <p>The Applicant has requested data on current patronage of the 54 service from the operator, which is awaited.</p> <p>As provided in Section 4 of the Sustainable Transport Strategy (APP-136), it is forecast that 5.5% of the future workforce of WMI will use the 54 bus service. This equates to 470 employees. This is considered to be a robust figure, which through targeted and personalised travel planning to be delivered through the Site Wide Travel Plan (AS-039) as described in paragraphs 5.3.6 and 5.3.7 could increase. Any increases in patronage would add to the viability of the service.</p> <p>Currently, the time of the first bus leaving Stafford is 0625 (Monday – Friday) and 0840 on Saturday. The last bus leaving Stafford is 1845 (Monday – Friday) and 1805 on Saturday.</p> <p>The time of the first bus leaving Wolverhampton is 0530 (Monday – Friday) and 0740 on Saturday. The last bus leaving Wolverhampton is 1740 (Monday – Friday) and 1705 on Saturday.</p>

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
2.4.2	4. Proposed Travel Plan measures	Applicant to provide evidence that the extended service will become self-sustainable in the future.	<p>Provided in the Bus Subsidy Calculations Note (available at Appendix 4 of this submission) are details of calculations undertaken setting out the cost assumptions underpinning the contribution for the extended bus service, which have been agreed with SCC.</p> <p>The calculations undertaken assume a gradual build out of development and thus workers over a 15-year period. This shows that the bus service would be forecast to have become self-sustaining by 2029. The calculations do not take account of any revenue generated by bus patronage associated with non WMI workers, which would also assist with the viability of the service.</p> <p>As set out at paragraph 9.2.7 of the Site Wide Travel Plan (AS-039), the Plan will be monitored annually, and this will report upon the success of the plan. This will include usage of the enhanced bus service which will be monitored and kept under review. If the Travel Plan does not perform as expected, as set out in Section 7.2 of the Site Wide Travel Plan (AS-039), the Travel Plan Contingency Fund is available, upon which monies can be drawn from, subject to agreement from the Transport Steering Group. This will ensure the future viability of the service can be maintained.</p>
2.4.3	4. Proposed Travel Plan measures	Applicant to provide details on i54 bus service which has recently reduced its service following end of subsidisation.	The Applicant understands that the bus service running between i54 and Cannock was withdrawn due to lack of patronage. From discussions held with SCC, the Applicant understands that despite the secured subsidy not having been fully spent, upon review and given the low patronage levels, the decision was taken to re direct funds towards other public transport measures.

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
			<p>It is the view of the Applicant that the proposed enhancements to the 54 service differ from the withdrawn service. The 54 service will cater for the main urban area local to WMI, Wolverhampton, which was not served by the withdrawn service. It will also serve the i54 employment area providing an increased frequency of service in order to reach this development, which would make the use of the bus more attractive to workers by way of greater certainty. Therefore, the enhanced service would serve two significant employment areas, which the Applicant considers would add to the viability of the proposal.</p>
2.4.4	4. Proposed Travel Plan measures	Applicant to provide further details on how shuttle buses provision will be work in practice.	<p>As discussed in paragraphs 5.2.4 – 5.2.6 of the Site Wide Travel Plan (AS-039), provision has been made for three shuttle bus vehicles, serving collection points anticipated in the Wolverhampton urban area, Cannock and Walsall.</p> <p>As set out in Table 24 of the Transport Assessment (APP-114), these areas have been identified as key urban areas forecast to provide workers for WMI.</p> <p>However, as set out in paragraph 5.2.4, of the Site Wide Travel Plan (AS-039), the exact level of shuttle bus service provision and the areas and routes which it will serve will only be decided closer to occupation and are to be agreed by the Transport Steering Group, considering conditions at that time. The TSG will liaise with officers of Staffordshire County Council with responsibility for Employment, Skills and Training in order to advise them of the routes of the shuttle bus. This is in order to ensure that any future relevant employees of WMI will be made aware of the availability of the shuttle bus routes and how it can be used to travel to WMI.</p>

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
			<p>Providing the Shuttle Buses in this way will allow targeted services to be provided, which are able to respond to the locational characteristics of groups of future employees.</p>
2.4.5	4. Proposed Travel Plan measures	Applicant to provide details of the implications for cyclists wishing to turn right from A449 into Station Drive.	<p>As set out at paragraph 3.4.2 of the Transport Assessment (APP-114), shared use cycle/footways are present to the east of the A449. These will accommodate cyclists wishing to travel from the A449 to Station Drive, together with existing signal controlled pedestrian/cycle crossing facilities of Station Drive. Using this existing off carriageway facility, there will be no difficulty for cyclists who wish to turn right from the A449, there is existing provision to ensure that they can be safely accommodated away from the A449.</p> <p>Cyclists will also be able to dismount and cross the A449 using the existing pedestrian crossing facilities that are available.</p> <p>Therefore, cyclists have acceptable access to Station Drive.</p>
2.4.6	4. Proposed Travel Plan measures	Applicant to provide details on assessment undertaken of impact on Four Ashes Industrial Estate from the right turn ban.	<p>As set out at paragraph 8.3.6 of the Transport Assessment (APP-114), the South Staffordshire Vissim Model was modified in order to take account of the traffic effects of the right turn ban from the A449 to Station Drive. This has included for any traffic diversion associated with Four Ashes Industrial Estate. The traffic impact analysis presented within Sections 9.2 – 9.7 and Section 9.9 of The Transport Assessment (APP-114) reports the resultant satisfactory operation of the highway network with the development and this highway modification in place, including for traffic reassignment associated with Four Ashes Industrial Estate.</p>

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
			<p>The Applicant accepts that traffic travelling to the Four Ashes Industrial Estate from the south will need to undertake a diversion with the proposed banned right turn in place. However, the diversion is modest in terms of length, being of the order of 2 km and can be undertaken on the primary road network, where journey times will be at their quickest. All other traffic movements to the Four Ashes Industrial Estate will be as existing. It is therefore the view of the Applicant that there is no substantial adverse effect on the Four Ashes Industrial Estate from a traffic and access perspective. No objections were received from Four Ashes Industrial Estate at Stage 1 DCO Consultation or at Stage 2 DCO Consultation. The banned right turn formed part of the Stage 2 DCO material, with no objections received from Four Ashes Industrial Estate at that time.</p> <p>The traffic analysis of the Pre A449 / A5 link road scenario as set in Section 9.13 of the Transport Assessment (APP-114) does not allow for this highway modification as it is not proposed to have implemented this measure until such time as the proposed A449 roundabout is open to traffic.</p>
2.5.1	5. Likely traffic effects on the A4 west of Gailey Roundabout	Applicant to confirm the application of the mitigation funding in respect of noise and vibration for homes along the A5 west of the Gailey roundabout.	<p>The A5 to the west of Gailey Roundabout forms part of SCC's primary road network and its function is to carry traffic flow, including HGV's, having previously formed part of the Strategic Road Network prior to being de-trunked. Given its status, it is considered that the A5 is an appropriate route upon which to direct traffic with an origin/destination to the north west.</p> <p>The changes in road traffic noise along the A5 to the west of Gailey Roundabout are predicted to be +0.6dB during the daytime and +1.4dB</p>

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
			<p>during the night-time, as shown in Tables 13.5.5, 13.5.6, 13.5.7, and 13.5.8 in the Operational Noise Assessment Information (APP-112). These would be classed as minor adverse effects at worst, and not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>As stated in paragraph 13.360 of the ES (APP-046), potential impacts from road traffic vibration mirror noise impacts, but at a lower level of annoyance. Negligible vibration effects are therefore expected from road traffic on the A5 west of Gailey Roundabout.</p> <p>Since there are no significant effects anticipated from road traffic noise or vibration on the A5 west of Gailey Roundabout, no mitigation is proposed.</p>
2.7.1	7. Likely effects on local roads passing through nearby villages	Applicant to signpost where the likelihood of "rat running" has been assessed in the application documents and explain in further detail how the Contingent Traffic Management Fund will work.	<p>Please refer to Section 9.11 of the Transport Assessment (APP-114).</p> <p>Details of how the Contingent Traffic Management Fund will work are set out with Section 7.3 of the Site Wide Travel Plan (AS-039).</p> <p>Residents will be able to advise the Transport Steering Group (TSG) or SCC direct of instances where they believe inappropriate travel behaviour associated with WMI may occur. There is no prescribed basis for the information that residents will need to submit to the TSG or SCC in the event that concerns are expressed in respect of any apparent issues. This will ensure there is flexibility to allow any resident issues to be considered by SCC, who will consider all representations made and any appropriate action to take. It is also understood that Staffordshire County Council employ a Community Transport Officer, who will be able to advise of any issues reported to the Highway Authority directly.</p>

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
			<p>The Applicant's view is that the approach agreed with SCC as local highway authority will provide a suitable means for any concerns of local residents relating to adverse traffic implications perceived to be attributed to WMI to be expressed and therefore considered. If agreed, the fund can be drawn upon to introduce appropriate mitigation measures. This will allow the scheme to respond to unforeseen circumstances in highway terms.</p>
2.8.1	8. Proposed operation and enforcement of proposed HGV ban on A449 north of Gailey roundabout	Applicant to provide details of the scheme agreed with HE.	<p>The arrangements for the Penkridge HGV Ban are contained within section 7 of the Site Wide HGV Management Plan (AS-040) and Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the Development Consent Obligation. They are all agreed with the relevant local authorities.</p> <p>In terms of enforcement and monitoring of HGV movements the arrangements are similar to those proposed for the recent Howbury proposals in relation to the use of Junction 1A and 1B of M25/A282 by HGV's. The situation at Howbury was however far more complex involving a cap on HGV movements in peak hours, in view of the sensitivities of J1A and J1B of the M25, and the monitoring also of LGV movements. The mechanism was the subject of consideration by the Inspector at the planning inquiry into the proposals and he found that such measures in the equivalent to the SWTMP and the s.106 gave "the required level of confidence that the proposed traffic restriction measures it contains are likely to be managed to an acceptable degree" (Para 15.5.43 Inspectors Report) . The relevant paragraphs of the Inspectors Report, where he deals with the efficacy of such an arrangement, are paragraphs 15.5.38 to 15.5.43 (the relevant extract of the Howbury Park Inspector's Report is provided at Appendix 5).</p>

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
			<p>As with the WMI proposals, at Howbury the precise details of the scheme to be used are left for later approval so that they can reflect up to date technology and practice at the time. The s.106 agreement for Howbury Park is also provided at Appendix 5 and the relevant paragraphs are Schedule 4, paragraph 1.4 i) to m).</p>
2.9.1	9. Highway Mitigation Measures	Applicant to identify the location of the Crateford Lane traffic data in the TA and confirm the current level of usage and rationale for the mitigation proposed.	<p>Details of existing traffic flows at Crateford Lane are provided in the Transport Assessment (APP-133) at Figures T1 – T4. Details of forecast traffic flows with the Crateford Lane one system in place are provided in the Transport Assessment (APP-146) at Figures T5 – T8.</p> <p>The Crateford Lane one-way section was proposed in response to specific issues identified at Stage 1 DCO Consultation. Local residents expressed concern of the potential for “rat running” traffic passing through Crateford Lane and the Village of Brewood in particular to avoid the Gailey Roundabout. This is discussed in further detail in paragraph 5.2.11 of the Transport Assessment (APP-114).</p> <p>Concerns continue to be expressed by residents in respect of inappropriate use of Crateford Lane. By providing Crateford Lane as one way eastbound, this will prevent both existing traffic and that associated with WMI from using this inappropriate route. It is considered that given the proximity of Crateford Lane to WMI, there may be some future employees who without the measures proposed, would see this as a potential route, particularly to avoid Gailey roundabout. Through the mitigation identified, the Applicant has proposed</p>

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
			measures to minimise the use of this inappropriate route and promote use of the primary road network.
2.9.2	9. Highway Mitigation Measures	Applicant to identify the location of the Station Road Right Turn Ban traffic data in the TA and explain the rationale for the HGV Turning Head in more detail.	<p>Details of existing right turn movements from A449 to Station Drive are provided at Figures T1 - T4 in the Baseline Link Flow Diagram (APP-133). Details of the forecast traffic flows with the right turn ban in place are provided at Figures T5-T8 in the Traffic Flow Turning Diagrams of Local Area Using SSVM Data – 2021 document (APP-146).</p> <p>The rationale for the HGV turning head is set out at paragraph 5.2.16 the Transport Assessment (APP-114). This specific mitigation was provided in response to comments received from local residents during Stage 1 DCO Consultation, who were concerned about potential bridge strikes by HGV vehicles at the reduced height bridge and advised of difficulties of HGV's turning around within Station Drive. The provision of the turning head will allow HGV's to turn around within a designated area, which is not currently available. It will also avoid HGV's attempting to pass beneath the reduced height bridge, which the Applicant understands currently takes place from time to time, with adverse implications for the travelling public and residents of Station Drive. As set out in paragraph 9.12 of the Statement of Common Ground with SCC, (REP2-007), the provision of the HGV turning head will provide a net benefit.</p>
2.9.3	9. Highway Mitigation Measures	Applicant to provide detailed response on possible closure of road between Station Road and Station Drive as an	Please see Technical Note (TN) 42 Station Drive Closure , provided at Appendix 6 of this submission.

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
		<p>alternative to the Right Turn Ban in response to representations made on behalf of the managers of the Four Ashes PH.</p>	
2.9.4	9. Highway Mitigation Measures	<p>Applicant to provide details on assessment undertaken for alternative junctions at Vicarage Road and confirm whether the roundabout should be regarded as mitigation or whether it is needed to make the scheme work.</p>	<p>Two other access options to serve the land to the south east of Vicarage Road were considered and were discussed within the Technical Note 22 (Vicarage Road Junctions), which forms part of the Transport Assessment (APP-135). These were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of a bridge spanning Vicarage Road, linking land to the north and south, supplemented by two east facing slip road; and • The provision of a restricted movements traffic signal junction. <p>In the case of the bridge, it is considered that this would be a disproportionate means of achieving access in order to serve the site, particularly when conventional access arrangements (the roundabout) are available. A bridge would need to be sited at least 6 metres above ground level, which may give rise to inadvertent increases in vehicle noise/emissions whilst negotiating the uphill gradients. Consequently, this option was not considered further.</p> <p>In the case of a restricted movements traffic signal junction, this was not favoured, given that it would be expected to lead to inappropriate traffic movements, which would have safety implications. Once again, given that a conventional access arrangement could be provided (the roundabout) this option was not considered further.</p>

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
			<p>In addition, further consideration has been given to the possibility of utilising a priority junction in order to serve development either side of Vicarage Road. However, it is important to recognise that the form of access must be capable of serving land either side of Vicarage Road, therefore consideration has been given to a cross roads junction.</p> <p>It would not be possible to provide a cross roads priority junction to serve land either side of Vicarage Road. Given the scale of development proposed and resultant traffic generation levels, it would be necessary to provide right turn lanes on Vicarage Road in order to provide a clear waiting area for vehicles wishing to turn right into WMI. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges does not permit cross road junctions to be provided with separate right turn lanes. Such an access arrangement would not offer any ability to control vehicle speeds, as would be the case with a roundabout.</p> <p>It is the view of the Applicant that the provision of a roundabout junction remains the safest option and most appropriate method to provide direct access from Vicarage Road. This is because a roundabout is a form of access junction that is simple, conventional, understood by road users and would be proportionate to the area it would serve. It would not preclude traffic movements, therefore it would not lead to use of inappropriate routes which may be the case with the restricted movement access options considered. It is appropriate to provide a roundabout along Vicarage Road given its existing highway context, the arrangement proposed achieves the relevant design requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and its use has been accepted by SCC as the local highway authority.</p>

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
			<p>Whilst the provision of the roundabout junction with Vicarage Road is required to provide access to land south east of Vicarage Road, it would provide embedded mitigation in terms of reducing traffic speeds along Vicarage Road. In respect of existing and future road users (including the Four Ashes Industrial Estate), it would generally maintain free flow of traffic along Vicarage Road, which would not be the case if a traffic signal junction were provided.</p>
2.9.5	9. Highway Mitigation Measures	<p>HE to provide details of layby usage close to the Site.</p> <p>Applicant to provide layby survey information and view of whether there is any disbenefit in moving the laybys.</p>	<p>Technical Note (TN) 25, Parking Laybys, provided at Appendix 7 details layby usage previously provided to HE. This formed the justification for the need to relocate the existing laybys given their existing usage.</p> <p>Details of the usage of the laybys are provided in Appendix A of TN 25. As set out in paragraph 5.1.8 of the Statement of Common Ground with Highways England (REP2-008), it is agreed that the proposed A449 laybys can be relocated in the form proposed by the Applicant. As agreed with HE, there would be no disbenefit to the travelling public in relocating the layby's as proposed. This is because the laybys are located within 300 metres of the A5 and the proposed A449 roundabout would afford the opportunity for vehicles travelling westbound, but wishing to utilise the laybys, to U turn and then continue their journey. The provision of a Traffic Regulation Order would prevent overnight parking, which would ensure the availability of the laybys to the travelling public is not compromised.</p>
2.10.1	10. Measures proposed to avoid increase in off-site HGV parking	Applicant to provide a note on sufficiency of proposed HGV Parking on site.	This is provided in Technical Note (TN) 43, HGV Parking , provided at Appendix 8 of this submission.

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
2.13.1	13. Other matters	Applicant to confirm number of properties affected by Harrisons Lane Left In – Left Out proposals.	<p>The Applicant understands this to be seven properties.</p> <p>A number of outbuildings are also served from Harrisons Lane, which are assumed to be linked to properties served via Harrisons Lane.</p>
Environmental Matters Hearing 6 June 2019			
3.3.1	3. Air Quality	SSDC to submit Air Quality Consultants reports into the Examination	<p>It is noted that SSDC will provide the referenced Air Quality reports to the Examining Authority. The Applicant believes it is worthwhile also submitting Ramboll's response to comments raised in these reports (an Air Quality (AQ) Note is provided at Appendix 9 of this submission). In general, the comments raised by Air Quality Consultants were noted, although Ramboll didn't necessarily agree with the significance of some of the comments. However, the requested further details were provided to SSDC.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the further information provided doesn't affect the overall conclusions of the Air Quality Environmental Statement (APP-027). The further information provided to SSDC (the Applicant AQ Response to SSDC is provided at Appendix 10 of this submission) was in response to the final Air Quality Consultants report. This further information was reviewed and accepted by SSDC which resulted in agreement on the Air Quality findings (as per paragraphs 15.16 to 15.18 of the SSDC Statement of Common Ground (REP2-050)).</p>
3.3.2	3. Air Quality	Applicant to confirm the number of properties at Receptor 7A.	Further details regarding Receptor 7A are provided in the Air Quality (AQ) Note at Appendix 9 of this submission.

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
3.3.3	3. Air Quality	Applicant to provide a note on what mitigation options might be available for Receptor 7A (if applicable)	Further details regarding Receptor 7A are provided in the Air Quality (AQ) Note at Appendix 9 of this submission.
3.3.4	3. Air Quality	Applicant to confirm the full extent of the AQ assessment including in relation to Crateford Lane.	<p>The assessment of traffic related impacts of the development has been undertaken in accordance with the criteria outlined in Paragraph 7.91 of the Air Quality ES chapter (APP-027); in particular, where the change in traffic as a result of the development changes by 1,000 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) or more.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is not predicted to result in a change of more 1,000 AADT on Crateford Lane and therefore in accordance with the agreed methodology, the air quality effects on Crateford Lane in relation to traffic generation do not require further consideration. However, properties within 350m of the Site boundary along Crateford Land are considered as receptors as part of the construction phase dust assessment (paragraph 7.87, APP-027).</p>
3.3.5	3. Air Quality	Applicant to reconsider ExQ1.8.10 in respect of operational monitoring.	Further details regarding operational monitoring are provided in the Air Quality (AQ) Note at Appendix 9 of this submission.
3.4.1	4. Noise	SSDC to submit Hepworth Consultants reports into the Examination	It is noted that SSDC will provide the referenced Hepworth Consultants report to the Examining Authority.

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
			<p>The Applicant believes it is worthwhile also submitting Ramboll's response to comments raised (the Applicant Noise Response to SSDC is provided at Appendix 11 of this submission).</p> <p>In general, the comments raised by Hepworth Consultants were noted, although the Applicant didn't necessarily agree with all comments. However, this prompted further discussion with SSDC which resulted in changes to the noise insulation scheme. This further discussion resulted in agreement on Noise findings (as per paragraphs 14.21, 14.22 and 14.24 of the SSDC Statement of Common Ground (REP2-050)).</p>
3.4.2	4. Noise	Applicant to consider if any other mitigation for canal users is workable for moorings.	Please see Section 7 of the Noise Submission provided at Appendix 12 of this submission.
2.5.1	5. Ecology	Applicant to revisit paragraph 3.3.2 of the updated FEMMP in respect of the protection for future veteran trees.	The Framework Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (FEMMP) will be updated and submitted to take account of future veteran trees.
2.8.1	8. Heritage	Applicant and SCC to confirm the common ground on the prospect of a significant archaeological find and the implications for	Since the Environmental Matters hearing (6 June 2019) the Applicant has been in liaison with the SCC archaeologist. It is proposed that matters raised will be captured via an addendum to the existing SCC Statement of Common Ground (REP2-064).

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
		variation to the written scheme of investigation.	
2.9.1	9. In combination effects on nearest residential receptors	Applicant to revisit paragraph 17.13 of ES Chapter 17 and clarify the worst case scenario in terms of approximate duration.	<p>The assessment of intra-project effects is qualitative, the methodology for which is described in full in ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects) (APP-056). It utilises the significance of effects assessed within the relevant technical chapters and provides a narrative as to whether these are likely to be additive, by acting in combination on a particular receptor or receptor group. Chapter 17 does not provide its own matrix for the assessment of the significance of intra-project effects.</p> <p>Chapter 17 does not specifically state the duration of effects, as these are already taken into account in the technical chapters as a factor of the significance of effects.</p> <p>As identified in paragraph 17.14 of ES Chapter 17 (APP-056), with regard to construction effects the <i>“Temporary medium to large scale impacts would be more prevalent during the enabling, earthworks and substructure works”</i>. Paragraph 13.188 of the Chapter 13 of the ES (Noise) (APP-046) states that <i>‘site preparation works or landscaping works at the closest distances might last approximately one to two days, before they move further from the receptors’</i>. This isn't to say that enabling, earthworks and substructure works will only last this duration, however this is the anticipated duration where the works are the closest possible distance to each receptor. Hence this is the period with the greatest potential for additive effects.</p>

Ref	Agenda Item	Action	Applicant's Response
			<p>The overall conclusion of the intra-project effects section is that implementation of the Outline Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (APP-060) will avoid any significant impact interactions during demolition/construction.</p> <p>The highest intra-project effect identified, for Heath Farm, is <u>Moderate</u>, which matches the highest single technical ES chapter effect identified (Noise and Vibration).</p>
DCO/DCOb Hearing 6 June 2019			
4.5.1	5. Schedule 2 (Annex 4)	Applicant and SCC to give consideration to SCC's desired amendments to the requirements and amend if necessary.	This action will be addressed at Deadline 5.
4.8.1	8. Actions arising and submission of updated draft documents	Application to submit a Minerals Safeguarding Report	A Minerals Resource Statement, agreed with SCC, has been included as part of the Deadline 4 submission, see Document 14.3 .