

Dear Ms Fernandes

As outlined in the rule 8 letter I am submitting our summary of the oral presentations made at the specific issue hearing on Tuesday 15 September 2015.

As I mentioned at the meeting there is a disagreement between the findings presented by our sound expert and the expert used by HE and the Parish Council. We have a classic standoff here between one expert opinion and another. It is unlikely that a full examination of the two positions can take place in the timescale available however we do ask that the findings from Giles Parker from SBS be given serious consideration, he is a very qualified in his field. I attach the letter I read out from Giles Parker in which he highlights the issue regarding the data he requested which was not made available to him.

From early in the process we have been told by HE that they would like to do more for Hilton but they need to be told to do it. On that basis I would request on behalf of the residents of Hilton that should the result of the examination period be that you are recommending the proposed scheme that this is done with the explicit instruction to HE to include the maximum mitigation on the road along the 4km stretch north of Hilton.

These instructions should be contained within the Section 16 instructions in order to prevent them being altered when the detailed design is completed post examination period.

As a bare minimum we would ask that you instruct that the scheme should use the very low noise road surface given, as you will recall from the meeting, we have not asked for it and HE produced a document that shows that the use of this surface would have a neutral cost vs benefit effect on the scheme.

At best we would ask that you instruct HE to deliver a 4 metre bund with sufficient tree planting which may or may not produce a material reduction in road noise depending on which expert you believe however it would shield the village from some of the light pollution effects of having a new road some 3m above ground level.

We would ask that whatever the final bund design might be it is contained within the Section 16 instructions to ensure this height is adhered to and not adjusted downward.

You requested that we met again with representatives from HE to seek out any further middle ground and on the afternoon of the noise issue specific hearing a member of the Parish Council and our action group and I met with Colin, the sound expert from Arup and Bonny Palling. Bonny has supplied an updated Statement of Common Ground reflecting that further meeting and this is attached.

From this document you will see that there is still some way to go in the discussions between us and many of the areas are either un-agreed or under further discussion. I understand that HE are happy for this to be submitted as it does provide a snapshot of the present position.

At the meeting at the racecourse we were advised that ARUP will rerun some of their noise modelling to include what effect a continuous bund across the north of Hilton and to go past Pear

Tree Close to see if there was any positive effect in noise reduction as this could reduce noise pollution from where the existing proposed bund finishes. We hope that this will also be run with the very low road noise surface to see if there is a more than neutral effect within their calculations. At the time of preparing this letter for submission (Sunday 27 September 2015) that report was not available and I am not able to make comment on it before the deadline of noon on 28 September 2015.

We also discussed the HGV traffic through the village which ARUP said they would discuss further with HE and make recommendations that this is pursued further with the local authority. Throughout the examination period we have had meetings with Cambridge County Council and there remains little drive from them to implement a 24 hour HGV ban in the village. We are aware that this is outside the remit of the examination of the A14 route but if we look at the matter of legacy we still see that Hilton will have nothing but negative outcomes from the scheme as proposed. If any weight can be brought on the local authority to place a 24 hour ban on HGV traffic on all routes through the village this will be an outcome that will have a positive effect on the village and I would ask you to consider including this outcome as a directive in the scheme.

HE and their representatives at the issue specific meetings continue to keep to what they state are the conditions laid down by the policy on road building. It is disappointing that they are unable to act outside this. They do not look at some of the more effective road designs used within Europe and are ignoring the possibility of coming up with a more imaginative scheme especially when considering the overall use of public money. We continue to be disappointed that the views of our community are ignored. This is a national scheme which is riding rough shod over local needs. It is even more disappointing when we see that local services including public transport to rural locations are facing large cuts at a time when local funds are diverted to this national scheme. Our local authorities (at both district and county level) are contributing to the cost of the scheme which we see as local money being diverted to a national scheme with little benefit to our local community.

The outcome for Hilton is unsatisfactory. The depth of feeling demonstrated by our residents at meetings held by HE, its representatives and of course your own open meeting appear to be unheard. HE have said they would like to do more but need to be told. Please could I ask, on behalf of the residents of Hilton that you take this opportunity to instruct them to do so.

Please do let me know if you require any further information.

Yours sincerely

Peter Balicki

Chairman, Hilton Parish Council

