

Appendix 4

**A14 CAMBRIDGE TO HUNTINGDON IMPROVEMENT SCHEME
DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER**

**STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND BETWEEN
HIGHWAYS ENGLAND
AND
CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

DRAFT

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. This is a record of consultation and agreement between Cambridgeshire County Council and Highways England in the pre-application and pre-examination phases of the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Development Consent Order. It records substantive issues of agreement as well as substantive matters of disagreement, together with agreed actions to be adopted in later phases.
- 1.1.2. The matters of agreement are those relevant to the statutory function of Cambridgeshire County Council as a planning and highway authority.
- 1.1.3. Matters of minor detail are omitted for clarity, and the full extent of agreement and disagreement is recorded in the minutes of meetings and communications between the parties.
- 1.1.4. The former Highways Agency became Highways England from 1 April 2015. To avoid confusion all references to Highways England in this document mean also the Highways Agency.
- 1.1.5. A summary of general meetings and discussion is set out below:
- 1.1.6. A summary of the key meetings (including meeting notes) and correspondence that has taken place between the HA and Cambridgeshire County Council is outlined in the table below:

Date	Form of Contact or Type of Correspondence	Summary of that Contact and Key Outcomes and Points of Discussion
21/11/2013	Meeting	Discussion on funding and engagement strategy
02/12/2013	Meeting	A14 kick-off meeting
03/12/2013	Meeting	Discussion on ecology baseline surveys
09/12/2013	Meeting	A14 scheme design meeting
11/12/2013	Meeting	A14 early community engagement
09/01/2014	LA forum	LA forum - outline and update on process and

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

		programme
16/01/2014	Workshop	Scheme design Workshop
17/01/2014	Presentation	Presentation to CCC and Atkins
21/01/2014	Meeting	Traffic modelling meeting to discuss Northstowe
28/01/2014	Meeting	Follow-up highway design meeting
29/01/2014	Workshop	Environmental stakeholders workshop - update on A14 scheme and discussion of environmental issues
11/02/2014	Meeting	CCC coordination meeting - feedback meeting
13/02/2014	LA forum	LA forum - outline and update on process and programme
20/02/2014	Members presentation	Updating council members on the proposed scheme
06/03/2014	Meeting	Meeting to discuss access into and out of the bus / train facilities in Huntingdon Town Centre
12/03/2014	Meeting	A14 Landscape Mitigation. Discussion with Local Authority Landscape Officers
18/03/2014	LA forum	LA forum - outline and update on process and programme
04/04/2014	Meeting	Discussion regarding the proposed archaeological trial trenching and previous comments raised regarding the scheme
13/05/2014	Meeting	Meeting to discuss proposed NMU provision on the A14 scheme in more detail
19/05/2014	LA forum	Progress meeting with Tier 1 Local Authority's

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

11/06/2014	Meeting	Meeting to discuss EIA Scoping Response Letter, potential content of the Borrow Pit Planning Statements as well as updating CCC on the scheme
30/06/2014	Workshop	Workshop to discuss SoCG initiation
30/06/2014	Workshop	Workshop to discuss SoCG initiation
01/08/2014	Meeting	First meeting of internal board
14/08/2014	Meeting	Meeting to discuss traffic Regulation Orders (TROs)
18/08/2014	Presentation	Presentation on Design Freeze 4
26/08/2014	Workshop	To discuss potential ecological impact on the scheme
08/09/2014	Meeting	A14 Project Board
09/09/2014	Workshop	To discuss the new traffic model that was used to predict future traffic movements
11/09/2014	Workshop	To discuss the new traffic model that was used to predict future traffic movements
11/09/2014	Workshop	To discuss the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)
18/09/2014	Meeting	SoCG highway geometry inception meeting
19/09/2014	Seminar	Traffic seminar
23/09/2014	Meeting	SoCG highway geometry - Meeting 1
30/09/2014	Meeting	SoCG highway geometry - Meeting 2
08/10/2014	Meeting	A14 Project Board

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

07/10/2014	Meeting	SoCG highway geometry - Meeting 3
13/10/2014	Meeting	Combined operation meeting – emergency services
14/10/2014	Meeting	To discuss ITS and ADS
14/10/2014	Meeting	SoCG highway geometry - Meeting 4
20/10/2014	Meeting	Meeting to discuss consent for the proposed scheme
21/10/2014	Meeting	SoCG highway geometry - Meeting 5
23/10/2014	Meeting	To discuss DCO
27/10/2014	Meeting	Going through the latest iteration of the Transport Assessment which responds to CCC's comments
28/10/2014	Meeting	SoCG highway geometry - Meeting 6
06/11/2014	Meeting	A14 Project Board
14/11/2014	Meeting	SoCG consent meeting to discuss draft DCO
01/12/2014	Meeting	SoCG highway geometry - Meeting 7
01/12/2014	Meeting	Scheme wide NMU provision
01/12/2014	Meeting	To discuss Huntingdon Town centre proposal, highway design and NMU
08/12/2014	Meeting	A14 Project Board
09/12/2014	Meeting	SoCG highway geometry - Meeting 8
19/12/2014	Meeting	SoCG highway geometry - Meeting 9
20/01/2015	Meeting	SoCG highway geometry - Meeting 10

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

22/01/2015	Meeting	A14 Project Board
03/02/2015	Meeting	Meeting to discuss ecology
24/02/2015	Meeting	SoCG highway geometry - Meeting 11
24/02/2015	Meeting	Draft legal agreement discussion
27/03/2015	Meeting	Meeting to discuss archaeology and cultural heritage

1.1.7. Other meetings are listed in the topic specific sections below:

1.2. General Matters Agreed

Description	Matters Agreed
Need for the scheme.	Confirmation of support for the need for the improvement scheme to achieve the five listed objectives of combating congestion, unlocking growth, connecting people, improving safety and creating a positive legacy.
The agreement of the proposed route.	Support for the route option as offering the right solution to address current problems and to meet reasonably foreseeable future needs.
Issues related to the removal of the viaduct and related changes to the local roads in Huntingdon	The County Council supports the demolition of the Huntingdon A14 Viaduct and the related changes to the local roads.
The section of the proposed scheme between Alconbury and the New Brampton Hut junction.	Support is given for the widening of A1 between Alconbury and New Brampton Hut junction, except for matters contained in the technical appendices.

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

Description	Matters Agreed
The section of the proposed scheme between New Brampton Hut junction and Swavesey junction.	Support is given for the proposed scheme, referred to as the Huntingdon Southern Bypass which is between New Brampton Hut and Swavesey junction, except for matters contained in the technical appendices.
The online-widened section of the proposed scheme between Swavesey junction and Girton interchange.	Support is given for the online widening of the A14 and associated junction modifications between Swavesey and Girton interchange, except for matters contained in the technical appendices, except for matters contained in the technical appendices.
The section of the proposed scheme between Histon and Milton junctions and the Cambridge Northern Bypass.	Support is given for the online widening of A14 and associated junction modifications between Histon and Milton junctions, except for matters contained in the technical appendices.
Brampton interchange	The alternative layout now proposed for the A1 and A14 junction adjacent to Brampton is supported and the noise mitigation proposed is appropriate
NMU provision	NMU provision, including widths, is supported along the scheme. This includes the provision of new facilities, enhanced local connectivity and the re-connection of severed PROWs.
Noise mitigation	The proposed noise mitigation measures detailed in the Environmental Statement are supported, subject to Local Impact Report

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

Description	Matters Agreed
Highway signing and telematics	Supported in principle, further to be developed in discussions during detailed design
Local Access Road	The proposed Local Access Road and associated junctions are supported in principle.
Details of Ouse valley crossing structure designs and mitigating impacts.	No objection in principle to the revised crossing of the River Great Ouse near the Offords.
Borrow pits	The locations of proposed borrow pits are broadly consistent with CCC's Minerals and Waste Plan and are broadly compliant with County requirements.
Traffic regulation orders	The extent of TROs, including the national speed limit on the LAR are supported.
Drainage, flood mitigation and water courses	The proposed drainages, outfalls, flood mitigation, flood compensation areas and design input statement are supported pending agreement about the protective provisions contained within the DCO.

2. Transport Assessment

2.1. Relevant Documents and Data

- Draft Transport Assessment – October 2014
- Local Model Validation Report
- Traffic Forecasting Report
- Data Collection Report

2.2. Substantive Matters Agreed

- 2.2.1. The Applicant has developed a traffic model (CHARM – Cambridge to Huntingdon A14 Road Model) which is based in part on the County Council's CSRM (Cambridge Sub-Regional Model). The Applicant has augmented and developed CSRM to create a traffic model for forecasting traffic on the A14. Part of the traffic modelling process is validation, comparing modelled flows to actual count data. The Applicant, as this is a strategic road project, has focussed validation on the traffic on the A14 and in the immediate environs.
- 2.2.2. The assessment of the Applicant's traffic modelling was based on the CHARM2 version of their traffic model, which has been superseded by an updated version called CHARM3A. CHARM3A was provided to the County Council on 5 May 2015 and the County Council reserves further comment on traffic modelling until examination of CHARM3A has been completed.
- 2.2.3. The Applicant and the County Council has agreed a programme of local impact testing to improve the level of confidence in the forecast traffic changes on the local road network. When this local impact testing is completed, a further statement of common ground will be agreed with the Applicant and deposited into Examination, together with any additional written representations that the County Council wishes to make.

3. Local Roads Design

3.1. Relevant Drawings and Documents

Reference	Title	Content	Date
	Design for DCO -10 Oct 2014	1:2500 General Arrangement	10 Oct 2014
Version P01	NMU Context report		27 th Oct 2014
A14-ARP-H0-E2-SK-C-0001	Departure From Standards Section 2	Key Plan	
A14-ARP-H0-E2-SK-C-0002	Departure From Standards Section 2	Mainline 20+000 - 20+400	
A14-ARP-H0-E2-SK-C-0005	Departure From Standards Section 2	Mainline 23+200 - 24+600	
A14-ARP-H0-E2-SK-C-0009	Departure From Standards Section 2	Robin's Lane compact grade separated junction	
A14-ARP-H0-E2-SK-C-0007	Departure From Standards Section 2	Mainline 26+000 - 27+400	
A14-ARP-H0-E2-SK-C-00010	Departure From Standards Section 2	Bar Hill junction Service Access Rd & Segregated Left Turn Vert.	
A14-ARP-H0-E2-SK-C-0008	Departure From Standards Section 2	Mainline 27+400 - 28+745	
A14-ARP-H0-E2-SK-C-0011	Departure From Standards Section 2	Dry Drayton Road	

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

Departure from Standards	B1043 Offord Road		
Departure standards from	A1198 Southern Roundabout		
Departure from standards	B1040 Potton Road		
A14-ARP-H0-E2-SK-C-0009	Departure From Standards Section 2	Swavesey Junction Dumb-Bell Link Road	
	Design Input Statement Drainage		27 March 2015
A14-JAC-S0-TN-C-00003	Huntingdon Improvements at Mill Common / pathfinder junction	Illustrative urban design option layout	16 February 2015
Technical note A14-JAC-S0-HT-TN-C-00004_Views Common RBT_Comb			

3.2. Relevant Meetings

Subject	Date	Location
Highways Design - SoCG	23/09/2014	Shire Hall Cambridge
Highways Design - SoCG	30/09/2014	as above
Highways Design - SoCG	07/10/2014	as above

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

Highways Design - SoCG	14/10/2014	as above
Highways Design - SoCG	21/10/2014	as above
Highways Design - SoCG	28/10/2014	as above
Highways Design - SoCG	01/12/2014	as above
NMU issues	01/12/2014	as above
Highways Design - SoCG	09/12/2014	as above
Highways Design - SoCG	16/12/2014	as above
Highways Design - SoCG	20/01/2015	as above

Substantive Matters Agreed

- 3.2.1. The general arrangement of local roads in terms of alignment and general principles is agreed subject detailed design. Agreement of Design Input Statements at detailed design stage will be needed to finalise agreement of design speed and proposed standards.
- 3.2.2. The general arrangement for junction layouts on local roads is agreed subject to demonstration of acceptable operational performance in detailed design. It is agreed that Brampton Hut junction will remain trunk road. In respect of the junction between Edison Bell Way and Brampton Road, this when optimised for NMU creates excessive delay and optimisation that balances road and NMU capacity is required.
- 3.2.3. The general principles of the NMU context report are accepted in relation to NUM provision on local roads. Public Rights of Way are the subject of a separate Record of Agreement. In respect of Brampton Road, the County Council will need to be convinced at detailed design stage that the width of the footways between Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Edison Bell Way is adequate and that a satisfactory balance exists between providing for safe NMU use and optimising signal capacity.
- 3.2.4. The Design Input Statement for Drainage submitted on 27 March 2015 is agreed. A separate drainage system for local roads is required.

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

- 3.2.5. The principle of a departure (below standard SSD) on B1043 Offord Road is accepted subject to detailed design.
- 3.2.6. The principle of a departure (below standard SSD) on A1198 Southern Roundabout is accepted subject to detailed design
- 3.2.7. The principle of a departure (below standard Vertical Crest Curve) on B1040 Potton Road is accepted subject to detailed design
- 3.2.8. The principle of a Departure from Standard (vertical crest curve 1 step below & SSD 1 step below) on Swavesey Junction Dum-bell Connector Road is accepted subject to detailed design
- 3.2.9. The principle of non-provision of single lane dualling to prevent right turns is accepted in order to provide for local access from Cambridge to Lolworth. This is subject to the provision of a ghost island right turn lane to protect vehicles in detailed design. Measures to prevent abuse of the right turn lane for overtaking may be required, such as traffic islands, overtaking bans or similar.
- 3.2.10. The principle that the Local Access Road will be subject to a 60 mph speed limit is accepted although this may result in sub-standard overtaking sections. The imposition of a 50mph limit in order to provide full standard overtaking sections is considered to be inconsistent with the road status and likely to create an enforcement problem.
- 3.2.11. The layout of Milton Junction is accepted subject to detailed design, but the left turn lane from the east bound slip to A10 north will required further consideration in detailed design to provide for safe merging of traffic streams. The taper length over which streams will merge may be too short for safe merging and distract attention from potential stopped vehicles ahead.
- 3.2.12. The general principles of the speed reduction measures on approach to Views Common roundabout and Mill Common signals (Option 2) set out in the relevant technical notes are accepted subject to detailed design.

3.3. Substantive Matters Not Agreed

- 3.3.1. The A14 east bound off slip to Cambridge Services has a very tight entry curve onto the Boxworth road roundabout. Whilst this is Trunk Road, it is possible that loss of control accidents at this point could cause incidents on the roundabout or the

Swavesey Junction connector road which are local roads. Highways England is requested to review the design of this slip road to reduce the risk of loss of control accidents. The County Council would be supportive of reasonable design alterations to the junction to reduce this risk.

- 3.3.2. The link from the A14 overbridge to the junction of Dry Drayton Road with the Local Access Road is sub-standard. Although it is accepted that the original road alignment is adopted, a roundabout is inserted into that alignment. Currently traffic from Dry Drayton towards Oakington does not have to yield, reducing the importance of adequate visibility. The insertion of the roundabout in combination with reduced stopping sight distance makes a departure from standards not acceptable. The County Council would be supportive of relocation of the roundabout which seems to be feasible within the red line.
- 3.3.3. The outfall of drainage from the single carriageway link between Mill Common and Brampton Road is not accepted as it places attenuation storage under the station car park. Without a legal agreement with Network rail/Train Operating Company granting rights to access for inspection and maintenance and an easement this is not acceptable to the County Council. This objection will be withdrawn when legal rights and easement are secured.

Detailed Design Requirements

- 3.3.4. Design Input Statements, and all detailed design in accordance with the legal agreement between the County Council and Highways England.
- 3.3.5. Approach works to Huntingdon to be designed to enhance awareness of changing road conditions. Visibility to Mill Common junction to be ensured.

4. De-Trunking and Asset Transfer

4.1. Relevant Meetings

Date	With	Subject
03/10/2014	Highways England	A14 Asset Condition and Handover
22/01/2015	Highways England, J2A	Meeting to discuss status of non-highway land parcels not required for road to be de-trunked, and identification of categories of assets within highway boundaries
24/02/2015	Highways England/Pinsent Mason	Draft Legal Agreement

4.2. Substantive Matters Agreed

- 4.2.1. The general principle of a legal agreement to secure defined condition and processes for handover and adoption of new, improved and de-trunked local roads and rights of way.
- 4.2.2. Highways England will carry out all planned and necessary maintenance until the point of handover. The County Council will review the forward maintenance programme and agree with the Highways England a schedule of remedial repairs needed before handover.
- 4.2.3. Highways England have carried out condition surveys and will provide the data to the County Council. All data currently held in HAPMS and IAMS will be transferred to the County Council within 3 months of completion..
- 4.2.4. The County Council require a minimum period of 10 years after handover without other than routine and planned maintenance. Baseline condition to be established before start of construction to be able to identify deterioration from construction operations.

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

- 4.2.5. Highways England will transfer all as built construction records (in an agreed electronic format) for local and de-trunked roads to the County Council, including the health and safety file.
- 4.2.6. Existing ITS infrastructure (VMS and SPECS) is either at end of life or is not required by the County Council, and will be removed by the Highways England including cables and all abandoned services, plant and infrastructure.
- 4.2.7. Lighting installed by Highways England to comply with the County Council PFI Specification, and to be on separate circuits. Existing lighting at A14 junctions to be to be adapted to the County Council PFI specification.
- 4.2.8. Procedures for the County Council inspection, testing, and adoption of new and improved local roads, and procedures for the County Council inspection, testing, and adoption of de-trunked roads are defined in the draft legal agreement.
- 4.2.9. Fees for inspection and testing of local and de-trunked roads, and fees for checking of the design of local and de-trunked roads are provided for in the draft legal agreement.
- 4.2.10. Commuted sums for maintenance of de-trunked roads if required to deal with deferred maintenance.

4.3. Substantive Matters Not Agreed

- 4.3.1. A legal agreement with the Secretary of State dealing with de-trunking, asset condition, handover, maintenance and residual life yet to be agreed in terms of detail.
- 4.3.2. The County Council is unable to agree to adoption of de-trunked elements until such time as asset condition has been established, a legal agreement signed and a preliminary scheme for de-trunking agreed.
- 4.3.3. Date of de-trunking to be when due diligence and all remedial repairs, alteration, conversion, and improvement works have been completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the County Council, and all redundant assets, cables, services, plant and equipment removed. The date of de-trunking may be later than the date of completion. The County Council to become responsible for routine maintenance from the date of completion, but not remedial repairs, defects, and matters covered by the responsibilities of the Contractor in contract with the Highways England.

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

- 4.3.4. No information yet available on condition of substantial structures and future risk profile for the County Council. Presence of asbestos and hazards in structures and assets to be handed over to be established.
- 4.3.5. Signing on the local road network remote from A14 referring to A14 that requires changing. The existing signals at Spittals to be considered by the County Council as to future need, and may need to be removed.
- 4.3.6. Increased funding for the County Council from central government will need to be agreed in respect of the substantial increase in local road network arising from the A14 project. The current funding “formula” was fixed in 2013 and will be re-set in 2020 at which time the changes due to the A14 will be included. However, Revenue Support Grant is decreasing and hence there will be less revenue available in 2020 for the County Council to maintain an increased network. The condition of the de-trunked roads and structures is a significant risk for the County Council and further clarity regarding the condition, maintenance costs and revenue support is needed in order to make further progress with terms for agreement .
- 4.3.7. Category definition and all maintenance records as to the extent of different asset categories within the highway boundary in addition to the carriageway to be provided (landscaping, environmental mitigation areas, drainage, utilities, lighting, physical boundary features) prior to the agreed de-trunking date in order to allow the County Council to assimilate these into its asset record, plan for the future maintenance responsibility, be able to deal with any queries concerning liability for any of these asset categories avoiding lengthy and costly disputes.

5. Drainage and Flooding

5.1. Relevant Drawings and Documents

Reference	Title	Content	Date
OWC- PRE-80	140715 SCDC Award Drains affected by A14	SCDC Award Drains affected by A14	11 Sept 2014
OWC- PRE-80	140718 Hunts Award map1	Hunts Award map1	11 Sept 2014
OWC- PRE-80	140718 Hunts Award map2	Hunts Award map2	11 Sept 2014
OWC- PRE-80	Ordinary Watercourse Land Drainage Consent Application Form	OWC Application Form	5 November 2014
OWC- PRE-80	Ordinary Watercourse Land Drainage Consent Application Guidance	OWC Application Guidance	5 November 2014
OWC- PRE-80	Cambridgeshire's Culvert Policy	The County Council Culvert Policy	5 November 2014

5.2. Relevant Meetings

With	Subject	Date
Mike Symons - Jacobs	A14 Drainage and Flood Risk	10/09/2014
Richard Wozmirski -		

Aecom

Steve Henry - Arup

Clair Rouse - Jacobs

The County Council, A14 DCO Consents
Pinsent Masons, J2A

20/10/2014

5.3. Substantive Matters Agreed

- 5.3.1. The County Council in respect of drainage to local roads, and works affecting watercourses for which the County Council is the relevant authority accepts the outline proposals for drainage and control of flooding included in the DCO, except as set out in this document.
- 5.3.2. The County Council, subject to agreement of an acceptable Protective Provision to be included in Schedule 8 of the Development Consent Order, agrees to the disapplication of the Land Drainage Act 1991 and Water Resources Act 1991 as provided for in Article 3 of Part 1 of the Development Consent Order.
- 5.3.3. The County Council has classified watercourses as low or high risk (important). The County Council is agreeable to with low risk watercourses being dealt with by a shortened consent process where watercourses are grouped into a single consent. Important or high risk watercourses will require individual consents.
- 5.3.4. A strip of 5m from top of bank is required for maintenance on significant watercourses which shall be agreed with the County Council.
- 5.3.5. Any culvert on all tributaries off Oakington and Longstanton Brook's which run under the A14 must not be altered in diameter as it is likely to cause downstream flooding in Oakington as the downstream watercourse is unable to take increased flow.

5.4. Substantive Matters Not Agreed

- 5.4.1. Existing flooding occurs at Brampton, Bar Hill, and Girton. The proposals for the A14 address flood storage compensation for the scheme, but could at relatively low cost address as part of a positive legacy for communities existing flooding problems. Girton, Brampton, Fenstaton and Histon and Impington are in the top 50th centile of

settlements in the County that have been identified as being of significant risk of flooding.

5.5. Detailed Design Requirements:

- 5.5.1. A Design Input Statement has been agreed with Jacobs (J2A) that provides details of all detailed design requirements for drainage and related works.

DRAFT

6. Minerals and Waste

6.1. Relevant Drawings And Documents

Date	Reference	Title	Content
November 2014	A14-JAC-ZZ-XX-RP-V-00071	Draft ES, including road drawings and appendix 3.3	Borrow Pit Proposals

6.2. Relevant Meetings

Date	With	Subject
5.3.14	Highways England	Borrow Pit Meeting
27.3.14	Highways England	Environmental Forum
16.5.14	Highways England	Environmental Forum
24.6.14	Highways England	Borrow Pit Workshop
29.7.14	Highways England	Environmental Forum
18.8.14	Highways England	Highways England Presentation (DF4)
11.9.14	Highways England	CoCP Meeting
20.10.14	Highways England	Highways England Presentation (ES)
27.11.14	Highways England	LIR Meeting
9.12.14	Highways England	BP Restoration Meeting
15.1.15	Highways England	Borrow Pit Discussion

3.2.15	Highways England	Ecology Discussion
27.2.15	Highways England	Cultural Heritage Discussion

6.3. Substantive Matters Agreed

- 6.3.1. The working of construction materials on sites adjacent to the proposed road scheme is highly desirable in order to minimise transport distances and associated environmental impact.
- 6.3.2. The location of the borrow pits broadly accords with the areas of search identified in the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy: three sites being totally consistent, two being partly within and partly outside the allocated site and one being outside but immediately adjacent to the allocated site.
- 6.3.3. The outline proposals for restoration are generally acceptable to the County Council, being based upon restoration to agriculture where possible and an informal recreational and/or wildlife after use in other cases.
- 6.3.4. Detailed landscaping and aftercare schemes can be agreed at a later stage in the process (subject to comments below re aftercare of sites restored to nature conservation).
- 6.3.5. The use of borrow pits to assist in mitigating flood risk issues resulting from the proposed road scheme is a positive approach, but does not address existing flooding which is an opportunity.
- 6.3.6. The Soil Management Scheme forms an acceptable basis for the working and restoration of the borrow pits.
- 6.3.7. The Code of Construction Practice is an acceptable tool for controlling the amenity impacts of the operation (subject to the comments below regarding noise criteria).
- 6.3.8. The borrow pits will have no direct impacts on public rights of way.

6.4. Substantive Matters Not Agreed

- 6.4.1. Notwithstanding that the NPSNN is the main policy guidance in relation to linear infrastructure projects, in relation to the proposed borrow pits the ES fails to have proper regard to the NPPF and associated Mineral Planning Practice Guidance.

Moreover, it fails to take on board the policy requirements the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core strategy and the Site Specific Proposals Plan Document, which provide both general and site specific advice in relation to the development of the borrow pit sites.

- 6.4.2. The proposed Scheme fails to take the opportunity to provide legacy benefits to the community by using the borrow pits to assist in the resolution of local flooding issues, particularly at Brampton, Fenstanton and Girton.
- 6.4.3. The current proposals do not provide a phased programme for the working and restoration of sites, which would be beneficial in mitigating amenity impacts and ensuring progressive restoration. It is recognised that a Contractor has yet to be appointed, and that detail of working of the borrow pits will be worked up in detailed design. The County Council would expect phased working where feasible to form part of the detailed proposals.
- 6.4.4. There is no Requirement in the draft DCO Schedule 2 Part 1 for the Secretary of State to consult with the County Council as the expert Mineral Planning Authority at the detailed design stage. This is a deficiency and the County Council expects Schedule 2, part 1 Requirement 10 to be reworded in similar terms to Requirement 8 providing for consultation with the County Council as relevant planning authority.
- 6.4.5. The proposed after uses for biodiversity (on borrow Pits 1, 2 & 3) or for informal recreation (on borrow pits 1 & 2) are only aspirational, delivery of these objectives is not secured or binding. In particular:
- 6.4.6. An aftercare agreement for a minimum period of 10 years is considered essential for the development of the biodiversity interest on borrow pits, and the creation of additional public rights of way is necessary to secure long-term public access.
- 6.4.7. The scheme fails to take the opportunity to provide compensation for unmitigated ecological impacts of the road scheme, through the restoration and aftercare of borrow pits. An opportunity to provide a positive legacy for communities which is stated as an objective of the project is missed as a result.
- 6.4.8. The County Council notes as presented to the Stakeholder Strategy Board on 18/03/2015 that delivery of these objectives is being considered, and proposals are being costed.

- 6.4.9. The noise assessment displays a lack of understanding of the nature of borrow pit operations and fails to apply the appropriate guidance, as a result of which there may be unacceptable noise impacts.
- 6.4.10. The soil storage areas on borrow pits 1 and 2 are considered to be too close to residential properties, and should be relocated or additional mitigation provided.
- 6.4.11. There is some concern that the potential impact on Brampton Wood SSSI as a result of dewatering borrow pit 1 has not been considered in sufficient detail. The County Council will expect detailed proposals for working borrow pit 1 to consider impacts of dewatering.
- 6.4.12. The potential impacts of borrow pit 3 on Fenstanton Gravel Pits County Wildlife Site have not been specifically acknowledged in the ES. These need to be assessed in detail and appropriate mitigation provided. The ES fails to assess the potential impact on bats known to inhabit the hedgerow running through borrow pit 1 and to apply appropriate mitigation.
- 6.4.13. A fully detailed assessment of potential archaeological interest has not been carried out, and the need for sterilising or recording areas of archaeological interest has not therefore been established.

6.5. Detailed Design Requirements:

- Phased working and restoration schemes required to provide for the orderly working and progressive restoration of sites in a timely and effective manner.
- A final drainage scheme for restored sites.
- A scheme for the protection and enhancement of biodiversity interests on each site.
- Detailed restoration schemes for each borrow pit based upon the proposals contained in the Environmental Statement, to include the shape and gradients of restored lakes and banks, the inclusion of any islands or shallow areas, the arrangements for ground treatment and seeding, the drainage of the restored land and any proposals for public access.
- Contingency arrangements to demonstrate that the restoration scheme is capable of implementation in the event that not the entire mineral is worked.

- Landscaping schemes, including details of species, size, spacing and protection of plants.
- Schemes for the aftercare and management of restored sites.

6.6. Construction Requirements:

- 6.6.1. Borrow pits should be monitored independently by the County Council (as Mineral Planning Authority) in the same way that any other mineral working in Cambridgeshire would be, to ensure compliance with conditions and high standards of restoration, to provide public confidence and to provide a mechanism for agreeing any changes that become necessary during the course of operations.
- 6.6.2. The Code of Construction practice needs to reflect the difference between construction noise from road construction on a linear site, and point sources from fixed machinery in mineral extraction. The County Council considers that noise from mineral extraction should be assessed using methods and limits normally applied to mineral workings, and not methods used for general construction.

7. Cultural Heritage

7.1. Relevant Drawings and Documents

Date	Reference	Title	Content
Nov 2014	A14-JAC-ZZ-XX-RP-V-00049	Draft ES Vol 1 CH 9 (Assessment of potential impacts)	Cultural Heritage
Nov 2014	A14-JAC-ZZ-XX-RP-V-00047	Draft ES Vol 3: Technical Appendices Appendix 9.1	Cultural Heritage A14 Cultural Heritage Gazetteer
Nov 2014	A14-JAC-ZZ-XX-RP-V-00048	Draft ES Vol 3: Technical Appendices Appendix 9.2	Cultural Heritage Archaeology and built heritage baseline list
Nov 2014	A14-JAC-ZZ-XX-RP-V-00048	Draft ES: Technical Appendices	Appendix 9.3 Cultural Heritage desk based study
Nov 2014	All other pertinent chapters	Draft ES	
Jan 2015	6.1 Environmental Statement (ES)	ES DCO application	Cultural Heritage Chap 9
Jan 2015	6.2 ES Figures	ES DCO application	Location of archaeological remains and historical buildings Historic Landscape

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

			Characterisation
			Heritage Desk-Based
			Study Photos
Jan 2015	6.3 Appendices	ES DCO application	Heritage Annex I - J (10 folders of non-intrusive and intrusive surveys, including the 2009 reports for the former A14 scheme)
			Cultural Heritage Gazetteer
			Archaeology & built heritage baseline list
			Cultural Heritage desk-based study
			Archaeological fieldwork reports (2014)

7.2. Relevant Meetings

Date	With	Subject
16.12.13	Highways England	A14 Legacy meeting
29.01.14	Highways England/J2A & Stakeholders	Technical & Environmental Workshop
5.3.14	Highways England & LA's	Borrow Pit Meeting
27.3.14	Highways England & Environmental Stakeholders	Environmental Forum

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

04.04.14	Highways England/J2A & English Heritage	Draft scoping report and proposed trial trenching programme for EIA
27.5.14	Highways England & J2A + Heritage stakeholders	Huntingdon Town Centre Heritage Workshop
24.6.14	Highways England & LA's	Borrow Pit Workshop
18.8.14	Highways England & LA's	Highways England Presentation (DF4)
11.9.14	Highways England & LA's	CoCP Meeting
20.10.14	Highways England & LA's	Highways England Presentation (ES)
10.09.14 to 29.10.14	Jacobs	Series of twice-weekly site monitoring meetings during off-line evaluation programme.
27.02.15	Highways England, J2A & EH	Cultural Heritage Meeting to discuss mitigation

7.3. Substantive Matters Agreed

- 7.3.1. The County Council Historic Environment Team (HET) officers will comment on the impact of the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme where it stands to affect non-designated heritage assets. English Heritage and the District Councils (specifically the Conservation Officers) will consider its impact upon designated assets, including Scheduled Monuments and their settings, Listed Buildings and their curtilages.
- 7.3.2. The specifications of programmes of archaeological works will be jointly appraised by the County Council HET and English Heritage, while scoping, fieldwork monitoring for further evaluation and mitigation (investigation) phases will be conducted by the

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

County Council HET, supported by EH where remains considered to be of national importance are revealed during fieldwork, or where fieldwork takes place in close proximity to Scheduled Monuments (such as at Mill Common).

- 7.3.3. English Heritage advised by email on 15th July 2014 and at a meeting on 27 February 2015 that for non-designated sites the relevant authority is Cambridgeshire County Council.
- 7.3.4. There is an understanding that mitigation by controlled archaeological excavation will take place well in advance of construction of the off-line route. Save for certain access-barred areas, the off-line route has been subject to a very dense array of evaluation trenches and non-intrusive surveys, and the character and significance of diverse archaeological remains has been obtained. No archaeological remains of national importance were found in the examined areas of the off-line road corridor that would require in situ preservation through avoidance strategies or engineered design solutions. Focused archaeological excavations can, therefore, be but have not yet been, quantified, specified and resourced for inclusion in the scheme's forthcoming mitigation strategy.
- 7.3.5. J2A are preparing Written Schemes of Investigation over which they will collaborate with the County Council & EH:
- A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme - Method Statement for Historic Building Recording
 - A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme - Method Statement for the Protection, Removal, Storage and Reinstatement of Historical Milestone and Mileposts
 - A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement - Written Scheme of Investigation: Archaeological Mitigation
- 7.3.6. Sites of newly discovered nationally important remains, or other significant sites such as cemeteries or shrines that may be found either within the unevaluated areas of the off-line route, or in those areas of the scheme's footprint that have not been subject to physical evaluation, are likely to receive full excavation in advance of construction, as more typical mitigation measures to preserve in situ remains of such calibre within this element of the scheme may not be possible after the design of roads and other structures has occurred.

Mill Common

- 7.3.7. The demolition of the viaduct at Huntingdon and the embedding of the old A14 at lower level in what will become a local road will remove an inharmonious physical barrier between the towns of Huntingdon and Godmanchester and the river (*cf* ES Vol 6.1 Ch 9, 9.8.3). This will enhance the significance, landscape setting and visual appeal of general and designated heritage assets in the area: including the remnant earthwork of the Civil War rampart on Mill Common, the motte of Huntingdon Castle, and the Listed Buildings in the Conservation Area within the vicinity of the scheme. The proposed link road at Mill Common between what will become a new local road (old A14) and the Huntingdon ring road (B1514 - Castle Moat Road/Walden Road), has been carefully designed as a consequence of local authority and English Heritage consultation, and due consideration given to reducing the number and scale of roundabouts and the size of junctions and carriageways. This is a welcome change in the scheme design for this area, as it will enable beneficial change to the historic landscape area enabling its rural composition and character to be retained. Further work on new street furniture, proportionate signage and lighting will be necessary to ensure that they are sympathetic to this historic environment.
- 7.3.8. This more appropriately scaled design of the new road link will also considerably reduce impacts upon non-designated archaeological assets known at Mill Common, although the scheme by which their mitigation will occur remains to be agreed (see section below). This is a highly sensitive part of the town's historic environment that has been in the ownership of the Freemen of Huntingdon since the Domesday Survey of 1086, and which contains remains of the town's defences from all major periods of English history since the Roman conquest of Britain.

7.4. Substantive Matters Not Agreed

- 7.4.1. Our aim is to continue to collaborate with Highways England to ensure that these matters can reach a state of agreement.

Mitigation Strategy

- 7.4.2. The detailed mitigation strategy has not yet been received and the outline mitigation strategy presented in the ES is too generic for agreement at this stage

Non-Intrusive Survey Providing Adequate Area Evaluation

- 7.4.3. It is not agreed that non-intrusive survey (aerial photograph transcription work for crop and soil marks; UAV [unmanned aerial vehicle] survey data, geophysical survey) and trenching undertaken within the off-line road corridor is sufficient evaluation for the borrow pits, some of which contain known and extensive archaeological remains. These sites cannot be considered to have been adequately characterised and their archaeological significance remains unknown.

Value and interpretation

- 7.4.4. The value and interpretation ascribed to heritage assets is based on professional judgement in line with the guidance set out in DMRB Highways England 208/07 (Highways Agency et al, 2007) but in some areas is in conflict with the County Council's professional judgement, or is subject to factual inaccuracies. Issues surround the view of the heritage assets as individual entities, instead of forming parts of broader archaeological landscapes. A list of interpretational differences and errors will be produced separately for re-consideration by the Highways England team.
- 7.4.5. The County Council's view is that cropmarked sites and geophysical anomalies cannot be ascribed a 'value', or their character and nature be fully understood without recourse to physical testing unless survey results depict distinctive site morphologies that conform to recognised site types covered in national research frameworks or on Heritage at Risk registers (see EH 2008 Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation - geophysics guidelines that stipulate the need to ground truth results, particularly in areas of negative evidence). The problem is further compounded by certain site classes being given different 'value' attributions in the mitigation tables (eg Table 9.9) that differs from how they are described in the DBA: see value attributions given to cropmarks containing the distinctive site forms of Late Iron Age 'banjo enclosures' and ascribed 'Medium' value (instead of the County Council's preferred 'High' value for such sites) and the discordant descriptions given in the Heritage Desk Based Assessment.
- 7.4.6. The ascription of value to physically untested sites is, therefore, subjective and opens the scheme to risks of under scoping of and under resourcing at both field excavation stage or, equally importantly, in post-excavation stages.

7.4.7. This is an important consideration as resourcing pressures can be anticipated post consent should higher 'value' remains be found during further evaluations and stripping exercises. Unscheduled or inadequately scoped archaeological excavations risk the unrecorded loss of archaeological evidence and/or reduction in agreed scope or excavation/post-excavation outputs, which will be considered unacceptable by this authority.

Mill Common

7.4.8. The archaeological study of Mill Common has been overly reliant on non-intrusive survey and the character of the archaeological remains in this historic landscape area have been underplayed as a consequence.

7.4.9. Heritage assets in the Mill Common area include:

- Large Roman and Saxon cemeteries (extents unknown) that were in part truncated by the construction of the railway in the 19th century (the present A14 follows the route of the dismantled railway) and which were associated with early settlement at the river crossing;
- Large Roman ditches possibly enclosing the Roman settlement on the west side of the 1st century AD road of Ermine Street (the latter built by the IX Legion after the conquest of Britain between London and York; currently the route of High Street from Huntingdon bridge (scheduled monument ref NHLE1011712).
- Defensive works relating to a 9th century AD Viking riverside enclosure connected to the Battle of Huntingdon in 921AD , and the 10th century refortifications under Edward the Elder as a *burh* following the re-conquest of the Danelaw ;
- Suspected outer works of the outer bailey of William the Conqueror's Norman castle (scheduled monument NHLE1011712), built in 1068 and demolished by order of Henry II in 1174;
- The western arm of 'Bar Dyke' the Civil War defences in Oliver Cromwell's home town (scheduled monument NHLE1004669) connected with the 1645 Battle of Huntingdon;
- The potential for the presence of further remains of regional or national significance.

7.4.10. These historic assets are recorded in Cambridgeshire's Historic Environment Record where they are accompanied by further evidence that is able, period by period, to

amplify the archaeological character of this part of the town on the north bank of the River Great Ouse. Taken together, they enrich an understanding of the origins of the town and of the scale and intensity of settlement types and activities that took place here, and suggest that it is highly likely that significant archaeological remains could be affected by the proposals.

Detailed Design Requirements:

7.4.11. Mitigation of construction impacts of all groundwork types will be required where archaeological evidence is present within the scheme. Aside from the off-line route (see agreed matters above) these will include:

1. Balancing ponds & drainage sites
2. Ecology Ponds
3. Ecological Mitigation areas
4. Soil Storage Areas) Temporary
5. Construction Compound Sites) Works
6. Borrow Pits
7. Flood Compensation areas
8. Link and new access roads and new junctions
9. Acoustic/screening bunds
10. Areas of new landscaping, particularly tree planting in areas of shallow soil cover.
11. Any areas in which as yet unspecified groundworks will occur.

7.4.12. An appropriate mitigation strategy needs to be designed that will allow for an appropriately resourced programme of archaeological works that will include:

- a) Preceded by an appropriate scale of trench based evaluation so that a suitable mitigation scheme can be designed, the full excavation of remains in advance of:
 - (i) extraction in borrow pits
 - (ii) the construction of areas of unevaluated new road, and

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

- (iii) all other associated groundworks (pertaining to roadwork excavations or compression sites, eg bunds and embankments where archaeological remains are present);
- b) where appropriate and possible, the preservation in situ of remains considered to be of national importance (possibly requiring a design change)
- c) a strategy for examining the excavated gravel units in Borrow Pit 3 – an area of known Palaeolithic remains (eg sites M2A & M2B: The County Council & PCC, 2012. Cambridge and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan, Site Specific Proposals DPD);
- d) the analysis and publication of the results of all of the archaeological surveys and fieldwork schemes relating to the project (two formats: technical and popular);
- e) provision for the long-term display of discoveries in suitable public places as this scheme will generate very large archaeological assemblages of public interest. This should include museum funding assistance; interpretation boards in publically accessible legacy areas (eg restored borrow pits, appropriate places along public rights of way), fuel stations/service stations (new and/or existing, as appropriate) and other public places such as libraries and dedicated websites;
- f) the preparation and storage of the archive in Cambridgeshire's archaeological archive facility following the transfer of title to the County Council of retained assemblages and records (preferred, but as agreed).
- g) an appropriate policy for Treasure finds.
- h) a public engagement outreach scheme.
- i) the deposition of reports to, and provision of GIS layers in suitable formats to the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record.

- 7.4.13. The programme will follow published professional industry standards (eg ClfA, 2014, *Standard and guidance: Archaeological Excavation* and Waddington, C. 2008. Minerals and Historic Environment Forum).
- 7.4.14. The archaeological objectives will be guided by the Regional Research Framework (Medlycott, M. (ed.) 2011 *Research and Archaeology Revisited: a revised framework for the East of England*. East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper No. 24: ALGAO East of England).
- 7.4.15. Cambridgeshire County Council's archaeological adviser will monitor the programme throughout, ensuring conformity with other development-led archaeological schemes in the county.

Contingency works

- 7.4.16. Programmes of archaeological work of various intensities may become necessary if unexpected archaeological remains appear during mainline stripping works, for which resource allocation has not been previously considered. The archaeological response will need to be discussed and agreed with the County Council HET in advance of investigation work, as contingency works generally require considerable departures from the agreed written scheme of investigation for a site/archaeological area.

Public Engagement & Communications strategy

- 7.4.17. Although this subject is expected to be addressed within the mitigation strategy, the provision open days or community excavations/participation days should be included in the mitigation strategy. We would encourage the Highways England to develop a communications strategy, developing this with the County Council's Communications Team.

8. Public Rights of Way and Access

8.1. Relevant Drawings and Documents

Date	Reference	Title	Content
19/08/14	DF4	Design Freeze 4 Plans	Details of PROW proposals
30/09/14		RoW & Access Plans	See title
30/09/14		De-trunking Plans	See title
13/10/14		Environmental Statement	See title
27/10/14		NMU Context Report	See title
10/10/14	DF4.1	Design for DCO	See title
05/12/14		RoW & Access Plans	See title
06/01/15		RoW & Access Plans forming part of DCO submission	See title
06/01/15		General Arrangement Plans forming part of DCO submission	Includes additional detail of PROW proposals

8.2. Relevant Meetings

Date	With	Subject
09/05/14	Highways England/User groups	NMU Meeting
24/06/14	Highways England	Borrow Pits Workshop
18/08/14	Highways England/HDC	Design Freeze 4 Presentation

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

20/10/14	Highways England/HDC	Env Statement Headlines Presentation
14/11/14	Highways England	Draft DCO Consultation
01/12/14	Highways England	RoW/NMU provision

8.3. Substantive Matters Agreed

- 8.3.1. Diversions to public rights of way in the vicinity of the scheme including reconnecting routes that were previously severed when the previous A14 scheme was undertaken.
- 8.3.2. The construction of an NMU route along the Local Access Road linking with PROW that are affected by the scheme.
- 8.3.3. The County Council provided input into the proposed restoration of borrow pit sites after they have been worked with three out of six sites having PROW running through them. Recommendations were also made as to how the PROW need to be incorporated into the restored sites and these also appear to have been taken on board in the detailed drawings of how the restored pits will look that were circulated recently. PROW and access to restored borrow pit sites remains an unsecured objective of borrow pit restoration and is dealt with in the Minerals and Waste Record of Agreement.
- 8.3.4. Public Footpaths Girtton 4 and 5 were agreed at the meeting on 13 May 2014 to be upgraded to bridleway by the County Council as they are outside the boundary of the scheme. This can only be achieved if the Highways England meets the County Council costs in so doing.

8.4. Substantive Matters Not Agreed

- 8.4.1. The legal instruments by which the NMU routes will be legally established are not clear (eg Cycle Tracks Order, bridleway creation or will they form part of the road).
- 8.4.2. No details of widths or NMU routes and PROW have been included in the Draft DCO Schedule, these need to be defined for definitive map purposes as the County

Council cannot update its definitive map records without widths. Ideally these would be added to the schedule in the DCO.

- 8.4.3. A single annotation covering both PROW and NMU routes is used which means it is unclear where a PROW and NMU join and what the intended status of each route is. The plans need to distinguish the different status of each route and the legal means of rights creation, so that it is clear between general highway rights and public rights of way. The distinction between the General Arrangement Plans and RoW and Access Drawings is not clear, as the RoW & Access drawings omit important PROW/NMU details that are included in the General Arrangement Plans.
- 8.4.4. Provision in the DCO for NMU routes and PROW must include specific information on width, length, status and future maintenance responsibility for each route.
- 8.4.5. A number of issues have been identified with the way proposed diversions of public rights of way are shown on plans that were supplied by the Highways England on 10 October 2014. These were discussed with Highways England representatives at the meeting held on 1 December. The Rights of Way and Access Plans that were subsequently issued on 5 Dec show that many issues remain and also introduced further issues where some changes/improvements to the PROW network that had previously been shown were omitted and other issues are still unresolved on the new plans. The Rights of Way and Access Plans accompanying the DCO have replicated all these issues which are therefore still outstanding.
- 8.4.6. A public footpath link within the Borrow Pit No. 2 site between Brampton Public Footpath 3 (adjacent to RAF Brampton) and Grafham Road is required as RAF Brampton will be redeveloped as housing. The provision of a PROW is justified by current the County Council and HDC policies, and is essential to effectively link Brampton to the network of PROW being created by the Highways England around the A1 and A14. This will create a positive legacy and mitigate the adverse impact of the A14 proposals in this area.

8.5. Detailed Design Requirements:

- 8.5.1. Final alignment, gradient and widths of new and diverted PROW and the surface type to be used where a new or improved surface will be constructed. Details of any limitations (pedestrian or bridle gates) to be installed on diverted/newly created routes.

- 8.5.2. Specifications of surface type where improvements are to be made to existing PROW for access purposes, whether for landowners or haul road access for construction and arrangements for ongoing maintenance after completion of the scheme.
- 8.5.3. A developed Code of Construction practice dealing with protection of users of PROW and temporary diversions.

8.6. Construction Requirements:

- 8.6.1. Temporary diversions and temporary closures of PROW.
- 8.6.2. As-built records of PROW with accompanying GIS records for loading onto the County Council asset records database.

9. Highways Asset Records

9.1. Relevant Drawings and Documents

Date	Reference	Title	Content
30/09/14	DF4	De-trunking Plans	Plans showing proposed transfer of existing trunk road to the County Council
30/09/14		RoW & Access Plans	Detailing proposed permanent changes to the local roads and public rights of way network
13/10/14		Environmental Statement	Detailed how the scheme will affect the local road and public rights of way network and associated communities.
30/10/14		Draft Development Consent Order	Order detailing legal mechanisms as to how the scheme will be achieved, and what changes it will make to the local road and PROW network
05/12/14	DF4.1	RoW & Access Plans	Detailing proposed permanent changes to the local roads and public rights of way network
06/01/15		RoW & Access Plans, Land Plans, De-Trunking Plans, Crown Land Plans, Special	

APPENDIX 4: STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

		Category Plans, Classification of Roads Plans forming part of DCO submission	
03/02/15		GIS dwg received for all RoW & Access Plans, Land Plans, De- Trunking Plans, Crown Land Plans, Special Category Plans, Classification of Roads Plans forming part of DCO submission	85 dwg files covering all the plans submitted with the DCO

9.2. Relevant Meetings

Date	With	Subject
14/11/12	Highways England, Pinsent Mason, J2A	Draft DCO, Schedule, ROW & Access plans and De-trunking plans – definition of legal highway asset boundaries and extent of roads to become the County Council responsibility; legal mechanisms for handover of altered/de-trunked routes
22.01.15	Highways England, J2A	Meeting to discuss status of non- highway land parcels not required for road to be de-trunked, and identification of categories of assets within highway boundaries

9.3. Substantive Matters Agreed

- 9.3.1. It was agreed on 03/10/2014 that Highways England will agree asset boundaries and extent of local roads with the County Council to avoid future uncertainty of boundaries, and to rigorously define same in records. This is desired to avoid perpetuating the historic lack of consistency in plans and records.
- 9.3.2. Highways England have agreed to the adoption of best practice for asset delineation: Definition of the asset boundaries between the County Council and Highways England, and the extent of works/infrastructure to become the responsibility of the County Council for new roads, modified roads, and roads to be de-trunked (width, length and height (e.g. subways).
- 9.3.3. Draft DCO has been reviewed by the County Council and annotated recommendations made. At the meeting on 14/11 it was agreed that the comments made to date were valid and would be addressed. the County Council completed review 09/12; Pinsent Mason agreed to review and feedback.

De-trunking

- 9.3.4. A meeting was held on the 22nd January 2015 to discuss status of non-highway land parcels not required for road to be de-trunked, and identification of categories of assets within highway boundaries. A representative of the Highways England stated that the County Council would not be asked to take on any land parcels not required for highway purposes. For the avoidance of doubt the County Council is not prepared to take on non-highway land parcels adjacent to trunk road to be de-trunked.
- 9.3.5. The County Council has undertaken an analysis using the GIS versions of the Highways England's records and proposals over the County Council's records, and is content that the proposed boundaries and extent of highway, currently managed by the Highways England, to be de-trunked matches with the County Council's asset records (for example slip roads conjoining the local road network). The County Council is therefore content in principle with the representation of the extent of the highway assets shown on the De-Trunking Plans, subject to agreement of detail

Road Classifications

- 9.3.6. The classifications of the minor roads were reviewed and comments were provided on the 23/12/2014. It is understood that these have been accepted by the Highways England.

9.4. Substantive Matters Not Agreed

Side and local roads network

- 9.4.1. It is evident that a number of errors and inconsistencies are in the ROW & Access Plans with regard to the extent of the whole highway asset. Details of these have been provided to Highways England.

Ownership of land

- 9.4.2. Incorrect assumptions have been made that the County Council owns all land over which highway runs, but this will not necessarily be the case.

9.5. Detailed Design Requirements:

- 9.5.1. Detailed designs are required for all local and de-trunked roads and public rights of way in GIS format for asset registration with The County Council records. This is required to ensure that assets to be constructed comply with relevant statutory instruments such that future risk to the County Council of errors and omissions in highways records is minimised.

10. Highway Lighting

10.1. Relevant Drawings And Documents

Date	Reference	Title	Content
17/12/2014	N/A	Road Lighting Strategy Statement – Version 0.2 November 2014	Describes the road lighting strategy of the submitted package and is provided to inform the Detailed Designer of the work conducted by J2A to-date, approvals obtained, consultations held and the approach that should be taken during detailed design.
21/10/2014	Drawing Number: A14-ACM-ZZ-00-DR-E-13000 Rev P00.1	Proposed Scheme Road Lighting Location Key	Drawing shows proposed extents of highway road lighting at Junctions and interchanges.

10.2. Relevant Meetings

Date	With	Subject
16/12/2014	J2A (Highways England Consultants)	Highway Lighting Provision.

10.3. Substantive Matters Agreed

- 10.3.1. The proposed extent of lighting shown on drawing A14-ACM-ZZ-00-DR-E-13000 Rev P00.1 has been agreed as the general preferred and necessary limits of new or amended road lighting, subject to detailed design.
- 10.3.2. Street Lighting designs and installation works on local roads, de-trunked roads and public rights of way to be carried out in accordance with Cambridgeshire County Council Standard Development Specification Dated 14/4/11 or its successors if superseded, or such specification as shall be agreed.
- 10.3.3. All existing lighting on de-trunked sections to be adapted to comply with the County Council Standard Development Specification. Existing columns, cables, pillars, cabinets and other equipment that are not compliant with the PFI specification and are older than 2 years, or are damaged, unsafe, or unserviceable, shall be replaced