

## Response to ExA's Third Written Questions (ExQ3)

This document sets out the response to the Examining Authority (ExA)'s Second Written Questions and requests for information (ExQ3) by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCoC). The table below sets out the topic, question number and CCoC response.

Question Number	Question for	Question	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCoC)
<b>General &amp; Cross Topic Questions</b>			
1.4	Cambridgeshire County Council (CCoC)	<b>Planning History</b> Is CCoC aware of any planning history of relevance to the determination of the DCO application (the ExA asked this question of the Applicant, South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) and Cambridge City Council (CCC) at ExQ1.2.16)?	In terms of planning history in the sense of planning application history, the County Council can confirm there is none of relevance to the determination of the DCO application. In terms of development plan history that is of relevance the County Council would refer the ExA to the County Council's LIR [REP1-133] and that of the City Council [REP1-128 superseded by REP5-114] and the SCDC [REP1-139 superseded by REP5--120] as well as the County Council's response to ExQ1 in particular ExQ1 2.9 [REP1-134]. With regard to any earlier development plan history prior to the changes brought about by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and in particular the direct change to and limitation of the County Council's prior wider strategic planning role the County would refer the ExA to the previous structure plan documents listed and referred to in the City Council and SCDC's LIR [REP5-114] and REP5-120] at Appendix 1.
1.5	Applicant, CCoC, SCDC, CCC	<b>Ministerial Statements</b> The Applicant provided two Ministerial Statements at Appendix C of, and in response to ExQ2.1.4 [REP5-111]. Please provide your view on the status of these statements.	The County Council agrees with the SCDC and City Council with regard to the status of the two ministerial statements referred to in the ExA's question at Appendix C of the Applicant's response to ExQ2.1.4 [REP5-111]. These Government statements are policy statements and fall within the category of "matters which...are both important and relevant to the Secretary of State's decision" to which the ExA and thereafter the SoS must have regard when deciding whether to grant an application for a DCO (see sections 103; 104 and 105 of the Planning Act 2008). The

			weight to accord to policy as part of that decision making is a matter for the S of S as is any support from or conflict with it.
<b>Biodiversity</b>			
5.1	Natural England, Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire (WTBCN), National Trust, CCoC, SCDC	<p><b>Recreational pressure on Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI</b></p> <p>The Applicant proposed during ISH4 that changes to ES Chapter 22: Cumulative Effects [REP2-009] to recognise potential recreational pressure on the SSSI as a result of the Proposed Development and a s106 agreement to secure a financial contribution towards measures to mitigate recreational effects on the SSSI will be provided by D6. Would these amendments adequately address your concerns regarding potential recreational impacts on the SSSI? If not, why not?</p>	<p>The Council has seen a draft version of the S106, which includes a financial commitment from the applicant for the administration of a Recreational Group, to contribute towards set up costs and commissioning of a baseline survey. In addition, a financial contribution towards mitigation, such as signage and education.</p> <p>The Council is satisfied that this contribution will address our concerns regarding potential recreation impact on the SSSI (providing the Applicant includes this item within the final S106).</p>
5.4	CCoC	<p><b>BNG</b></p> <p>Please set out clearly why you consider that R25 of the dDCO [REP5-003] would not adequately secure BNG, and what additionally a s106 agreement would achieve in comparison to R25 alone? Please</p>	<p>The Council considered that Requirement 25 will adequately secure BNG.</p> <p>The Council's requirement for S106 contribution is to cover officer time to review the BNG monitoring reports and conduct site visits to ensure compliance with BNG scheme secured under Requirement 25. Over the 30 year period, this would include 10 monitoring years (e.g. years 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30) and each would take approximately 2 days of officer time.</p>

		clearly set out what the s106 would seek to capture and why this would be required.	
5.6	CCoC	<p><b>Bats</b> Review and provide a comprehensive response to comments from Chris Smith [REP4-098], with consideration of the comments from the Applicant in Appendix A of [REP5-112] and SCDC [REP5-122] on this matter.</p>	<p>The Council agrees with South Cambridgeshire District Council's response to comments of Chris Smith [REP5-122].</p> <p>We are satisfied that Applicant's response at Appendix A of [REP5-112] adequately addresses comments from Chris Smith [REP4-098]. The Applicant has explained how deficiencies within the bat survey work have been taken into account within the ecological assessment set out in the ES Chapter 8 [REP5-028]. The Council is satisfied that this issue will be addressed through pre-commencement bats surveys, undertaken to the latest best practice standards, set out in the Code of Construction Practice Part A [REP5-050] / as part of the Construction Environment Management Plan (secured through Requirement 9).</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed that the wording of the Code of Construction Practice Part A [REP5-050] will be updated to provide further confirmation of how bat mitigation (as part of the licenced works) will be delivered, including management / monitoring of bat boxes. As well as update to wording of the Lighting Design Strategy [REP5-054] to confirm that the railway corridor will be retained as a dark corridor.</p> <p>In light of the above, the Council is satisfied that the impact to bats has been adequately assessed and appropriate mitigation will be secured as part of the scheme.</p>
<b>Water resources</b>			
21.3	Applicant, CCoC	<p><b>Outline drainage strategy</b> CCoC's response to ExQ2.21.9 [REP5-118] states that the updated drainage strategy [REP4-074]</p>	<p>The Applicant has confirmed to CCoC they will update the Drainage Strategy [REP4-074] to reflect this agreement and remove Model 2.</p>

		<p>submitted at D4 is acceptable. However, the Applicant's response to ExQ2.21.9 [REP5-111] suggests that CCoC questioned the use of two models within the outline drainage strategy, and that 'Model 1' has been agreed upon. The ExA notes that the SoCG [REP5-095] was updated to reflect this agreement. However, does the outline drainage strategy [REP4-074] also need to be updated to reflect this</p>	
--	--	---	--