

A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme

Environmental Statement

Appendices

Appendix 5.1: Scoping consultees and review of scoping opinion

Date: December 2014

6.3

Page left intentionally blank.

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Scoping	1
2	Bibliography	30

1 Introduction

1.1 Scoping

- 1.1.1 This is an appendix of the *A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme Environmental Statement (ES)*. It contains a list of bodies formally consulted by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS), on behalf of the Secretary of State, (Highways Agency, March 2014) during the scoping exercise for the *A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement, Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report* (Highways Agency 2014), as set out in *Appendix 1 of the Scoping Opinion, Proposed A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme* (the scoping opinion) (The Planning Inspectorate, 2014). The list of scoping consultees is provided in *Table 1.1*.
- 1.1.2 In addition, the key issues noted in the Secretary of State's final recommendations in the scoping opinion are summarised in *Table 1.2*, including comments on how these have been responded to, as explained in *Chapter 6 of the ES*. Some of the bodies formally consulted by PINS included detailed scoping recommendations in their responses, but not all of these recommendations were assimilated into the Secretary of State's final recommendations.

Table 1.1: Scoping consultees

Consultee	Organisation	Comments received ¹
Schedule 1 consultees (<i>Schedule 1 of the APFP Regulations 2014, as amended</i>)		
The Health and Safety Executive	Health and Safety Executive	Letter dated 15/4/2014
The National Health Service Commissioning Board	NHS England	-
The relevant clinical commissioning group	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group	-
Natural England	Natural England	Letter dated 13/6/2014 Letter dated 17/4/2014
The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England	English Heritage – East of England	Letter dated 10/6/2014
The Relevant Fire and Rescue Authority	Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service	-
The Relevant Police and Crime Commissioner	Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Commissioner	Letter dated 9/4/2014

¹ All comments received have been considered in the environmental impact assessment.

Consultee	Organisation	Comments received¹
The Relevant Parish Council(s) or Relevant Community Council	Ellington Parish Council	-
	Alconbury Parish Council	-
	The Stukeleys Parish Council	-
	Huntingdon Town Council	-
	Brampton Parish Council	-
	Buckden Parish Council	-
	Offord Cluny and Offord D'Arcy Parish Council	Letter dated 25/4/2014
	Godmanchester Town Council	-
	Hemingford Grey Parish Council	-
	Hilton Parish Council	-
	Fenstanton Parish Council	-
	Fen Drayton Parish Council	-
	Swavesey Parish Council	-
	Boxworth Parish Meeting	-
	Lolworth Parish Meeting	Email dated 17/4/2014
	Longstanton Parish Council	-
	Oakington and Westwick Parish Council Bar Hill Parish Council	-
	Dry Drayton Parish Council	-
	Madingley Parish Council	-
	Girton Parish Council	Email dated 4/4/2014
Orchard Park Community Council	-	
Histon and Impington Parish Council	Letter dated April 2014	
Milton Parish Council	-	
The Environment Agency	The Environment Agency – Anglian Central	Letter dated 17/4/2014
The Civil Aviation Authority	Civil Aviation Authority	-
The Highways Agency	The Highways Agency	-
The Relevant Highways Authority	Highways Department	-
The Coal Authority	The Coal Authority	Letter dated 11/4/2014
The Relevant Internal Drainage Board	Bedford Group of Internal Drainage Boards	-
	Middle Level Commissioners	-
The Canal and River Trust	The Canal and River Trust	-

Consultee	Organisation	Comments received ¹
Public Health England, an executive agency to the Department of Health	Public Health England	Letter dated 8/4/2014
The Crown Estate Commissioners	The Crown Estate	-
The Forestry Commission	Forestry Commission	Email dated 1/4/2014
The Secretary of State for Defence	Ministry of Defence	-
Relevant statutory undertakers		
Health bodies (section 16 of the Acquisition of Land Act (ALA) 1981)		
The relevant clinical commissioning group	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group	-
Local Area Team	National Health Service (NHS), East Anglia Area Team	-
Ambulance Trusts	East of England Ambulance Trust	-
Care Trusts	Hinchingbrooke Health Care NHS Trust	-
Relevant statutory undertakers (section 8 ALA 1981)		
Railways	Highways Agency Historical Railways Estate	-
Water Transport	The Canal and River Trust	-
Civil Aviation Authority	Civil Aviation Authority	-
Licence Holder (Chapter 1 of Part 1 of Transport Act 2000)	NATS En-Route (NERL) Safeguarding (air traffic control)	Email dated 21/3/2014
Universal Service Provider	Royal Mail Group	-
Relevant Environment Agency	Environment Agency	Letter dated 17/4/2014
The relevant water and sewage undertakers	Anglian Water Cambridge Water	-
The relevant public gas transporters	British Gas Pipelines Limited	-
	Energetics Gas Limited	-
	ES Pipelines Limited	-
	ESP Connections Limited	-
	ESP Networks Limited	-
	Fulcrum Pipelines Limited	Email dated 27/3/2014
	GTC Pipelines Limited	Email dated 24/3/2014
	Independent Pipelines Limited	-
LNG Portable Pipeline Services Limited	-	

Consultee	Organisation	Comments received ¹
	National Grid Gas Plc	Letter dated 7/4/2014
	National Grid Plc	Letter dated 7/4/2014
	Quadrant Pipelines Limited	-
	SSE Pipelines Limited	-
	The Gas Transportation Company Limited	-
The relevant electricity licence holder with CPO Powers (electricity distributors)	Energetics Electricity Limited	-
	ESP Electricity Limited	-
	Independent Power Networks Limited	-
	The Electricity Network Company Limited	-
	UK Power Networks Limited	-
The relevant electricity licence holder with CPO Powers (electricity transmitters)	National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc	Letter dated 7/4/2014
	National Grid Plc	Letter dated 7/4/2014
The relevant electricity licence holder with CPO Powers (electricity interconnectors)	-	-
Local Authorities (Section 43 of the Planning Act 2008)		
Local Authority	Huntingdonshire District Council	Email dated 17/4/2014
	South Cambridgeshire District Council	Letter dated 6/6/2014 Letter dated 17/4/2014
	Cambridge City Council	Letter dated 07/3/2014
	Peterborough City Council	Letter dated 8/4/2014
	East Northamptonshire Council	-
	Bedford Borough Council	-
	Central Bedfordshire Council	-
	North Hertfordshire District Council	-
	Uttlesford District Council	Letter dated 2/4/2014
	Braintree District Council	-
	St Edmundsbury Borough Council	-
	East Cambridgeshire District Council	-
	Fenland District Council	-
	Northamptonshire County Council	-

Table 1.2: Review of the Secretary of State's final recommendations in the scoping opinion

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
General		
<p>The SoS welcomes the use of figures in the Scoping Report to support the description of the application site and surrounding area to clarify the location of potentially affected receptors. A number of suggestions are provided below to ensure the figures presented in the ES are of a high quality and relate closely to the main text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All features referenced in the main text of the ES should be illustrated on an accompanying figure, including for example, affected community figures. • All figures should be clear and legible, and where there is a lot of environmental information to present, this should be arranged over a number of figures to limit the amount of overlaid information and avoid confusion. • Given the linear nature of the proposed development which covers a wide area, the applicant should consider providing figures in smaller sections, accompanied by a key plan. • All features on figures should be clearly labelled, identifying not only the presence of certain designations, but also the name of that specific one. 	Y	The figures in the <i>ES</i> comply with the points suggested.
When describing the location of receptors in relation to the site in the main text of the ES, the SoS would find it helpful to know the direction and distance between these.	Y	The location of receptors is generally shown on figures to facilitate understanding of location.
The applicant should ensure that the description of the proposed development that is being applied for is as accurate and firm as possible as this will form the basis of the environmental impact assessment. It is understood that at this stage in the evolution of the scheme the design proposals and the location of the site may not yet be confirmed. The applicant should be aware however, that the description of the development in the ES must be sufficiently certain to meet the requirements of paragraph 17 of Schedule 4 Part 1 of the EIA Regulations and there should therefore be more certainty by the time the ES is submitted with the DCO.	Y	A description of the scheme is provided in text and figures. Although at preliminary design stage, adequate detail is provided to fully satisfy the requirements of the <i>EIA Regulations</i> .

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
If a draft Development Consent Order (DCO) is to be submitted, the applicant should clearly define what elements of the proposed development are integral to the NSIP and which is 'associated development' under the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) or is an ancillary matter. The applicant is advised to clarify this in the ES as the Scoping Report does not make this clear.	Y	The DCO submission has addressed this point.
Any proposed works and/or infrastructure required as associated development, or as an ancillary matter, (whether on or off-site) should be considered as part of an integrated approach to environmental assessment.	Y	All elements of the proposal are considered in an integrated approach to the environmental assessment.
The Figures illustrating the development in the Scoping Report (Figures 2.1 to 2.3) are small in scale and it is not possible to see the exact detail of the scheme design. The applicant should consider providing figures in smaller sections, accompanied by a key plan.	Y	The figures for the ES are at an appropriate scale, with insets and key plans where required.
Paragraph 2.3.1 of the Scoping Report makes it clear that there are a number of distinct elements to the proposed development. The Scoping Report names the scheme elements differently between the introduction (Scoping Report paragraph 1.1.1) and the description of the proposed development (Scoping Report section 2.3). The applicant is advised to ensure that consistency in the description of the development is maintained throughout the ES. In addition, the order in which the scheme elements are listed and described should remain the same throughout the ES. In addition, consistency should be maintained between the description of the development in the ES and the DCO.	Y	The description of the scheme is provided in a consistent order throughout the ES. The description of the scheme is provided in <i>Chapter 3 of the ES</i> .
Whilst the overall development is illustrated on Figures 2.1-2.3 of the Scoping Report, the extent of each distinct element is not defined on these Figures. The ES should include a figure to illustrate this.	Y	The DCO submission includes detailed drawings showing each section of the route at 1:2500 scale.
It is unclear from paragraph 2.6.1 of the Scoping Report and Figures 2.1-2.3 how many 'structures' would be required along the route, such as the over-bridges. The ES should clarify the number and location of these structures both in text and figures.	Y	<i>Chapter 3 of the ES</i> includes the locations of structures and a schedule of structures is included in <i>Appendix 3.1 of the ES</i> .

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
<p>Limited description on the proposed roundabout and junction works has been provided in the Scoping Report. The SoS would expect to see detailed information on these aspects of the development in the ES.</p>	Y	<p>Detailed information on the scheme is provided in <i>Figures 3.1 and 3.2 of the ES</i>, including road layouts around junctions. This is the arrangement that has been assessed within the <i>ES</i> to inform the DCO submission.</p>
<p>The dimensions of all structures, lighting columns and signage, and cross sections of the scheme, including the vertical alignment of the road that was assumed and used to inform the assessment should be provided in the ES. In this respect, the applicant is advised to thoroughly cross check the DCO and associated plans against the ES to ensure consistency across all aspects of the application. Should the applicant intend to seek limits of deviation in the DCO, the ES should describe how these limits have been factored into the EIA.</p>	Y	<p>Cross sections at a selection of locations are included in the <i>ES</i> figures to illustrate the vertical alignment.</p> <p>The details of how the preliminary design of the scheme has been assessed is detailed in <i>Chapter 6 of the ES</i>, including limits of deviation and the approach to the likely worst case scenario in line with <i>Advice note 9: Rochdale Envelope</i> (PINS, 2012). <i>Appendix 3.1 of the ES</i> contains schedules of structures, culverts, gantries referred to within the <i>ES</i> for the purposes of the environmental assessment.</p>
<p>The environmental effects of all wastes to be processed and removed from the site should be addressed. The ES will need to identify and describe the control processes and mitigation procedures for storing and transporting waste off site. All waste types should be quantified and classified.</p>	Y	<p><i>Chapter 13 of the ES</i> addresses waste. <i>Appendix 20.2 of the ES</i> describes control processes for managing construction waste.</p>
<p>The SoS notes that a description of the likely emissions from the development (water, air, soil pollution, noise, vibration and light) will be included in the ES (Scoping Report Table 18.1). This should cover both the construction and operational phases of the development.</p>	Y	<p><i>Appendix 13.2 of the ES</i> provides a description of likely emissions for both construction and operational phases.</p>
<p>The SoS notes from Table 18.1 in the Scoping Report that the applicant intends to include information on alternatives in Chapter 4 of the ES.</p>	Y	<p>Information on alternatives is provided in <i>Chapter 4 of the ES</i>.</p>

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
The SoS appreciated the inclusion of a detailed description of the scheme evolution in Section 3 of the Scoping Report to assist in understanding the evolution and aims of the scheme. The SoS would expect this information to be included in the ES, and extended to describe the continued evolution of the development up until the DCO submission.	Y	<i>Chapter 4 of the ES</i> includes information on the continued evolution of the development up until DCO submission.
The SoS would expect to see detailed information in the ES regarding alternative design details, construction methods, and other alternatives considered during the evolution of the scheme design.	Y	<i>Chapter 4 of the ES</i> explains the design alternatives considered through the evolution of the scheme to current time. Construction methods would be refined by the main contractors during detail design. A likely worst case scenario has been used as a basis for the EIA underpinning the ES. This is defined within <i>Appendix 3.2 of the ES</i> .
The SoS notes from paragraph 1.2.3 of the Scoping Report that the design of the proposed development is still being developed and that the draft description of development contains a number of variables in terms of the temporary land-take and the requirement for borrow pits. The SoS welcomes that the proposals are to be firmed up during the pre-application stages but encourages the description to be as accurate and firm as possible so that its environmental impact can be more accurately assessed.	Y	<i>Chapter 3 of the ES</i> provides a description of the scheme in text and provides reference to figures. Although at preliminary design stage, adequate detail is provided to fully satisfy the requirements of the <i>EIA Regulations</i> . This includes information on temporary land-take and borrow pits.
Where the details of the scheme cannot be defined precisely for the EIA, the applicant must assess the likely worst case scenario, and clearly define what this is. The SoS notes the reference to Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 9 'Using the 'Rochdale Envelope' but also directs attention to the 'Flexibility' section in Appendix 3 of this Opinion which provides additional details on the recommended approach.	Y	A description of the scheme is provided in adequate detail to allow accurate assessment of likely environmental impacts, taking account of the 'flexibility' section in the scoping opinion and Planning Inspectorate advice on the Rochdale Envelope. A worst case scenario is assessed and clearly described where precise details remain unknown at this stage.

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
It should be noted that if the proposed development changes substantially during the EIA process, prior to application submission, the applicant may wish to consider the need to request a new scoping opinion.	Y	The scheme has not changed substantially since the scoping opinion was requested.
The Scoping Report does not provide any detail on site access arrangements, for example access to the construction compounds or access along the route during the construction phase. The SoS expects to see a detailed description of access arrangements in the ES, accompanied by Figures where appropriate. The ES should also identify proposed routes to and from the various areas of the site, for both construction vehicles and workers.	Y	<i>Appendix 3.2 of the ES</i> includes a description of haul routes and access routes, in text and provides reference to figures.
<p>The Scoping Report does not provide a section setting out the construction requirements of the development which has limited the SoS's ability to provide detailed comments on the scope of the assessment relating to construction impacts. The SoS notes from Table 18.1 in the Scoping Opinion that the applicant intends to provide this as part of the 'Description of the Proposed Development' in Chapter 3 of the ES. This should include, but is not limited to, information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site clearance/preparation works; • construction activities and methods; • plant and equipment requirements; • lighting equipment/requirements; • number of workers required during construction, whether they are full/part time and if shift work is required; • construction hours, including any requirement for overnight working; and • number, movements and parking of construction vehicles (both HGVs and staff vehicles). 	Y	<p>Construction information is given in <i>Chapter 3 of the ES</i>. The <i>ES</i> includes an appendix on construction information (<i>Appendix 3.2</i>) and a <i>Code of Construction Practice (Appendix 20.2)</i>. These set out the envisaged construction scenario as well as objectives and measures to be applied throughout construction in terms of management and operation of the works, environmental protection and limits to disturbance from construction activities.</p> <p>The number of estimated workers during construction is provided in <i>Chapter 16 of the ES</i>.</p>
The ES should include information on the materials required to construct the development, where they are likely to be sourced and the methods of transporting these to the site.	Y	Details on the materials required for construction are provided in the <i>Chapter 13 of the ES</i> . <i>Appendix 3.2</i> addresses transportation of materials to site.

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
<p>The phasing and timescale of the development is not provided in the Scoping Report, however it is noted from Table 18.1 in the ES that the applicant intends to provide this as part of the 'Description of the Proposed Development' in Chapter 3 of the ES. The construction programme should confirm the anticipated start date of the construction, its phases of delivery, and the anticipated completion date. The construction programme should clearly show how the elements of the development would be constructed over time, either sequentially, concurrently or both.</p>	Y	<p>The phasing and timescale of the scheme is described in <i>Chapter 3</i> and <i>Appendix 3.2 of the ES</i>.</p>
<p>No information on the maintenance requirements during the operation of the development has been provided in the Scoping Report and therefore the SoS is unable to comment on the on the scope of the assessment relating to maintenance activities. The SoS notes from Table 18.1 in the ES that the applicant intends to provide this as part of the 'Description of the Proposed Development' in Chapter 3 of the ES.</p>	Y	<p>The <i>ES</i> provides information on maintenance requirements in <i>Chapter 3</i> and also in <i>Chapter 20</i> which addresses environmental management plans.</p>
<p>The SoS would suggest that the applicant ensures that appropriate consultation is undertaken with the relevant consultees in order to agree wherever possible the timing and relevance of survey work as well as the methodologies to be used. The SoS notes and welcomes the intention to finalise the scope of investigations in conjunction with ongoing stakeholder liaison and consultation with the relevant regulatory authorities and their advisors.</p>	Y	<p>There has been ongoing engagement with stakeholders on scope and methods.</p>
<p>The SoS recommends that the physical scope of the study areas should be identified under all the environmental topics and should be sufficiently robust in order to undertake the assessment. The extent of the study areas should be on the basis of recognised professional guidance, whenever such guidance is available. The study areas should also be agreed with the relevant consultees and, where this is not possible, this should be stated clearly in the ES and a reasoned justification given. The scope should also cover the breadth of the topic area and the temporal scope, and these aspects should be described and justified.</p>	Y	<p>The study area for each assessment topic is clearly described and explained in <i>Chapters 8 to 18 of the ES</i>.</p>

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
Paragraph 6.4.2 of the Scoping Report states that it is not intended to include the impacts of emissions from site equipment, vehicles and machinery highways within the ES. This is on the basis that the applicant has indicated that any impacts can be mitigated by use of equipment meeting recent emission control standards, operating well-maintained vehicles and planning to reduce trip generation.	Y	Noted.
Decisions to scope out impacts should be explained in the ES. At this stage, the SoS agrees that emissions from site equipment, vehicles and machinery can be scoped out. The SoS acknowledges that site vehicle and equipment emissions are likely to be minimal, particularly in comparison to levels of similar emissions from vehicle movements on the existing local road network.	Y	Decisions to scope out impacts are explained in the <i>ES</i> , where relevant.
In order to demonstrate that topics have not simply been overlooked, where topics are scoped out prior to submission of the DCO application, the ES should still explain the reasoning and justify the approach taken.	Y	Decisions to scope out impacts are explained in the <i>ES</i> , where relevant.
Structure of the ES: The SoS considers that the topics to be covered are adequate.	Y	Noted.
Any proposed road improvement schemes within the vicinity should also be considered as part of the cumulative impact assessment.	Y	<i>Chapter 18 of the ES</i> (cumulative effects and impact interactions) considers other road improvement schemes in the vicinity.
Health Impact Assessment: The SoS considers that it is a matter for the applicant to decide whether or not to submit a stand-alone Health Impact Assessment (HIA). However, the applicant should have regard to the responses received from the relevant consultees regarding health, and in particular to the comments from the Health and Safety Executive and Public Health England. The methodology for the HIA, if prepared, should be agreed with the relevant statutory consultees and take into account mitigation measures for acute risks.	Y	<i>Appendix 18.1 of the ES</i> explores impacts on human health, taking account of feedback from stakeholders, results in the EIA and information from health stakeholders is provided.

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
The SoS recommends that the ES should identify whether the proposed development has the potential for significant transboundary impacts and if so, what these are and which EEA States would be affected.	Y	The <i>ES</i> identifies that the development does not have the potential for significant transboundary effects.
Air quality		
All of the AQMAs have been declared in relation to measured or predicted exceedance of the nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂) annual mean objective. The SoS considers that impacts to air quality should be assessed in relation to compliance with European air quality limit values, the National Air Quality Objectives and its impact upon designated AQMAs in its vicinity.	Y	<i>Chapter 8 of the ES</i> follows the methodology set out in the <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1</i> and supporting <i>Interim Advice Notes</i> which consider the impacts on the <i>National Air Quality Objectives</i> and compliance with the Directive.
The SoS recommends that dispersion modelling considers a range of possibilities and seeks to ensure that the 'worst case' scenario is assessed, for example the 'worst case' may occur as a short term impact.	Y	<i>Chapter 8 of the ES</i> follows the methodology set out in <i>DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1</i> and supporting <i>Interim Advice Notes</i> and is based on an assessment of the likely worst case.
The SoS considers that the site lies in the vicinity of ecologically designated sites. The impacts on these sites should be carefully assessed. There is the need to consider effects due to an increase in airborne pollution and an increase in nitrogen deposition rates.	Y	There are a number of ecological designations in the vicinity of the development and air quality impacts on these sites has been assessed including nitrogen oxide concentrations and nitrogen deposition rates in line with Annex F of <i>DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1</i> .
The SoS notes the comments of Cambridgeshire County Council that borrow pits may generate issues in relation to dust. Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of borrow pits should be identified a baseline survey should be carried out mitigation measures proposed and residual impacts should be identified. The SoS recommends that dust emissions associated with all construction work are taken into account in the assessment.	Y	The air quality impacts as a result of borrow pits is assessed as part of the construction phase impacts. This includes identification of sensitive receptors, specification of mitigation measures and identification of residual impacts.

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
<p>Consideration should be given to appropriate mitigation measures and to monitoring. The SoS notes that Girton Parish Council have requested that monitoring of NO_x and PM_{2.5} be undertaken as a minimum. Requests for PM_{2.5} monitoring are also echoed by Histon and Impington Parish Council.</p>	Y	<p>Consideration has been given to this matter. Additional monitoring of NO₂ has been carried out to support the scheme assessment. The assessment of PM_{2.5} is not required as part of the DMRB methodology. A review of PM_{2.5} monitoring data from AURN stations across the UK indicates no exceedances of the PM_{2.5} pollutant threshold. As such it is unlikely that there are any exceedances of PM_{2.5} threshold in this area and consequently monitoring for PM_{2.5} has not been undertaken.</p>
Cultural heritage		
<p>The SoS notes that the guidance described in DMRB Volume 11 Section 3, Part 2 'Cultural Heritage' (HA 208/07) has been followed in the assessment and that a detailed assessment of the Archaeological Remains sub-topic and simple assessment of Historic Buildings and Historic Landscape will be undertaken. The SoS accepts this approach to the assessment of cultural heritage impacts for this scheme.</p>	Y	Noted.
<p>The Scoping Report acknowledges that the setting of cultural heritage features could be affected; this includes historic buildings, historic landscapes and archaeological sites and the SoS agrees that impacts to these features should be assessed in the ES. Cross reference should be made to the Landscape section of the ES as appropriate.</p>	Y	<p>Impacts on cultural heritage features are assessed in <i>Chapter 9 of the ES</i>. Cross references are provided as appropriate.</p>
<p>The applicants scoping report identifies a total of 327 archaeological remains, 166 historic buildings and four historic landscape character types in the study area. The SoS notes that the study area within this section is referred to as being both 200m and 300m around the scheme footprint, clarification should be provided within the ES</p>	Y	<p>A 300m buffer around the scheme footprint was employed for the scoping study, and a 200m buffer is applied in the <i>ES</i>. This is in accordance with DMRB guidance on the assessment for archaeological remains and is clarified in the <i>ES</i>.</p>

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
<p>The SoS advises that English Heritage have indicated concerns regarding some of the current values that have been assigned to specific heritage assets in the Scoping Report for example the medium values applied to Huntingdon and Godmanchester Conservation areas have been queried given that they contain a high number of very important buildings. The SoS recommends that the values assigned to the heritage assets are reviewed.</p>	Y	<p>Assessment of value for all assets has been re-examined for the ES. Comments from English Heritage are noted and supported by the findings of the site inspection.</p>
<p>The SoS notes that English Heritage have welcomed the applicant's acknowledgement that there will be a number of heritage assets beyond 300m that could be impacted by the proposed development. These assets should be properly identified and assessed within the ES.</p>	Y	<p>Assets beyond 300m that could be impacted are identified and assessed as appropriate in the ES.</p>
Landscape		
<p>The SoS draws the attention of the applicant of the need to take account of the updates to legislation; together with the need to liaise with the local planning authorities to ensure use is made in the EIA of the most up to date policy documents. The SoS recommends that the 3rd edition of the GLVIA is taken into account within the assessment.</p>	Y	<p><i>Chapter 10 of the ES</i> (landscape and visual impact assessment) takes the latest planning policy documents into account. The methodology for the landscape and visual impact assessment is the Highways Agency Interim Advice Note (IAN) 135/10. Although this refers in part to the 2nd edition of the <i>Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA)</i>, information from the 3rd edition of the GLVIA has been used as appropriate and GLVIA is referenced within the assessment.</p>

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
<p>The SoS draws the attention of the applicant to the need to take into consideration the fact that the Scheme lies within four landscape character areas; the Western Claylands, Ouse Valley Chalklands and Fenlands.</p>	Y	<p><i>Chapter 10 of the ES</i> (landscape and visual impact assessment) takes into account both landscape character areas defined within published landscape character assessments and site based landscape character areas.</p> <p>Published landscape character areas within the study area are listed within <i>Table 10.8 of Chapter 10 of the ES</i>.</p>
<p>The landscape and visual assessment in the scoping report refers to the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). The SoS advises that the ES should describe the model used, provide information on the area covered and the timing of any survey work and the methodology used. The SoS recommends that the location of viewpoints should be agreed with the local authorities. The SoS recommends the use of photomontages where appropriate.</p>	Y	<p>The methodology for the generation of the ZTV is described in <i>Appendix 10.7 of the ES</i>. The visual impact on all visual receptors within the ZTV is assessed, rather than key representative visual receptors only, as advocated by the methodology (Highways Agency IAN 135/10).</p> <p>The scoping report set out the proposed methodology and approach for the LVIA. In addition to the formal public consultation which was carried out between April and June 2014, regular Environmental Stakeholder Forums have been held between December 2013 and DCO submission (refer to <i>Chapter 5 of the ES</i>).</p> <p>Photomontages to illustrate a selection of key views towards the scheme were discussed with the local authorities.</p>
<p>The SoS notes comments received from Cambridgeshire County Council stating that the choice of the detailed alignment of the route has not been adequately explained. The applicant should ensure that this detail is provided within the ES.</p>	Y	<p><i>Chapter 4 of the ES</i> includes a description of how the route alignment has been chosen and evolved.</p>

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
<p>The SoS considers that the applicant should take into account how any landscape mitigation may affect ecology. The SoS recommends that the delivery of any planting relied upon to mitigate effects can be guaranteed.</p>	Y	<p>The environmental mitigation design has been developed through integrated design across disciplines. Any planting to mitigate effects would form a permanent part of the scheme and a commitment for its long term management is included in the DCO submission.</p>
Nature conservation		
<p>The SoS recommends that surveys should be thorough, up to date and take account of other development proposed in the vicinity. The SoS welcomes the intention to update the ecological survey information with a suite of surveys summarised in Table 9.3. The SoS notes the response of Cambridgeshire County Council indicating that the incomplete ecological surveys of 2013 will need to be addressed, that important priority species will need to be taken into account within the assessment including the Whitespotted Pinion moth and large Common Toad population at Chivers Lake. Cambridgeshire County Council have also stated that adequate surveys of any off-site mitigation need to take place for those species that cannot be accommodated within the scheme footprint such as Cetti's Warbler and Grasshopper Warbler.</p>	Y	<p>Ecology surveys have been undertaken throughout 2014 to ensure comprehensive and appropriate coverage. Impacts to priority species are addressed within the <i>ES</i> and appropriate mitigation is identified.</p>

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
<p>The SoS recommends that the proposals should address fully the needs of protecting and enhancing biodiversity. The assessment should cover habitats, species and processes with the sites and surroundings. The SoS advises that Cambridgeshire County Council have confirmed that the list of local sites included in the assessment currently is out of date and recommends that this list is reviewed in the ES.</p>	Y	<p>The scope of the ecology surveys addresses the points raised. These have been designed to address gaps in survey coverage and changes in scheme design. The scheme proposals include ecological mitigation.</p> <p>The scheme is being designed in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which requires the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity, and would give due regard to all statutory and non-statutory designated sites. The list of designated sites would be reviewed and amended.</p>
<p>The assessment should take account of impacts on noise, vibration and air quality (including dust), and cross reference should be made to these specialist reports.</p>	Y	<p><i>Chapter 14 and 8 of the ES</i> consider noise and vibration and air quality, respectively.</p>
<p>The SoS notes the comments of Natural England relating to Eversden and Wimpole Woods SSSI, though located some distance from the scheme this site is also designated a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and supports a summer maternity roost of barbastelle bats. As barbastelle bats have an extensive foraging range it will be necessary to assess the impacts of this scheme on this qualifying interest feature and potential foraging habitat through the Habitats Regulation Assessments process.</p>	Y	<p><i>Appendix 11.12 of the ES</i> provides the Assessment for Implications on European Sites (AIES).</p>
<p>The SoS notes the comments made by Natural England and agrees that impacts to Portholme SAC and Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC should be assessed.</p>	Y	<p><i>Appendix 11.12 of the ES</i> provides the Assessment for Implications on European Sites (AIES).</p>

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
<p>The SoS notes Cambridgeshire County Councils comments that a long-term management strategy for biodiversity features should be implemented for the scheme in order to achieve long-term biodiversity gain.</p>	Y	<p>The measures identified in the <i>Register of environmental actions and commitments (Appendix 20.1 of the ES)</i> will be maintained in the long term where they within the scheme and will form part of the Highways Agency soft estate.</p>
<p>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA): The SoS notes that European sites are located close to the proposed development. It is the applicant's responsibility to provide sufficient information to the Competent Authority (CA) to enable them to carry out an HRA if required. The applicant should note that the CA is the SoS.</p>	Y	<p><i>Appendix 11.12 of the ES</i> provides the Assessment for Implications on European Sites (AIES).</p>
<p>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA): The applicant's attention is drawn to The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as amended) (The APFP Regulations) and the need to include information identifying European sites to which the Habitats Regulations applies or any Ramsar site or potential SPA which may be affected by a proposal. The submitted information should be sufficient for the competent authority to make an appropriate assessment (AA) of the implications for the site if required by Regulation 61(1) of the Habitats Regulations.</p>	Y	<p><i>Appendix 11.12 of the ES</i> provides the Assessment for Implications on European Sites (AIES).</p>
<p>The report to be submitted under Regulation 5(2)(g) of the APFP Regulations with the application must deal with two issues: the first is to enable a formal assessment by the CA of whether there is a likely significant effect; and the second, should it be required, is to enable the carrying out of an AA by the CA.</p>	Y	<p><i>Appendix 11.12 of the ES</i> provides the Assessment for Implications on European Sites (AIES).</p>

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
<p>When considering aspects of the environment likely to be affected by the proposed development; including flora, fauna, soil, water, air and the inter-relationship between these, consideration should be given to the designated sites in the vicinity of the proposed development.</p> <p>Further information with regard to the HRA process is contained within Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 10 available on the National Infrastructure pages on the Planning Portal website.</p>	Y	<p>The ES considers the designated sites in the vicinity of the scheme.</p> <p><i>Appendix 11.12 of the ES</i> provides the Assessment for Implications on European Sites (AIES).</p>
<p>An evidence plan is a formal mechanism to agree upfront what information the applicant needs to supply to the Planning Inspectorate as part of a DCO application. An evidence plan will help to ensure compliance with the Habitats Regulations. It will be particularly relevant to NSIPs where impacts may be complex, large amounts of evidence may be needed or there are a number of uncertainties.</p> <p>It will also help applicants meet the requirement to provide sufficient information (as explained in Advice Note 10) in their application, so the Examining Authority can recommend to the Secretary of State whether or not to accept the application for examination and whether an appropriate assessment is required.</p>	N	<p><i>Appendix 11.12 of the ES</i> provides the Assessment for Implications on European Sites (AIES), which considers the need for appropriate assessment. Extensive consultation has been carried out with Natural England on the AIES.</p>
<p>Under s28(l), the SoS must notify the relevant nature conservation body (NCB), NE in this case, before authorising the carrying out of operations likely to damage the special interest features of a SSSI. Under these circumstances 28 days must elapse before deciding whether to grant consent, and the SoS must take account of any advice received from the NCB, including advice on attaching conditions to the consent. The NCB will be notified during the examination period.</p> <p>Applicants are encouraged to consult with NE and, where required, to agree appropriate requirements to secure necessary mitigation. It would assist the examination if applicants could provide, with the application documents, confirmation from NE whether any issues have been identified which would prevent the EPS licence being granted.</p>	Y	<p>Natural England has been consulted on this scheme through their Discretionary Advice Service and discussions have been ongoing through the development of the scheme.</p> <p>There are no damaging operations on SSSIs. Consultations with Natural England are ongoing with a view to agreeing on a statement of common ground (SOCG) to facilitate the examination process.</p>

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
<p>Applicants should be aware that the decision maker under the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) has, as the CA, a duty to engage with the Habitats Directive.</p> <p>Where a potential risk to an EPS is identified, and before making a decision to grant development consent, the CA must, amongst other things, address the derogation tests² in Regulation 53 of the Habitats Regulations. Therefore the applicant may wish to provide information which will assist the decision maker to meet this duty.</p>	Y	<p>A statement of common ground (SoCG) is being sought with Natural England, which will detail how the Habitats Regulations are being addressed in terms of Regulation 53 as part of the scheme's consenting process to ensure sufficient detail is provided to sufficiently address this issue.</p> <p>The <i>ES</i> describes the mitigation measures and demonstrates that there is sufficient mitigation to be confident the tests in Regulation 53 will be met by the time licenses are applied for. The contractor will provide the detailed design of the mitigation and undertake sufficient pre-construction surveys to inform the licence application – these actions are included in the <i>Appendix 20.1 of the ES (Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments)</i>.</p> <p>Consultation with Natural England is ongoing and the development of the SoCG is part of that process.</p>
Geology and soils		
<p>Noting the information in Paragraphs 10.1.9 and 10.1.10 of the Scoping Report on the spatial scope of the assessment, the SoS advises that it will be important to carefully describe and justify the physical area for this assessment and ensure that source – pathway - receptor linkages are considered over a sufficiently wide area.</p>	Y	<p>The study area is described and explained in the <i>ES</i>. Source-pathway-receptor linkages are considered over a sufficiently wide area.</p>
<p>The SoS advises that impacts to ground and surface water quality from mobilisation of ground contaminants should be considered within the assessment, and appropriate cross-reference should be made to the topic chapter on water resources.</p>	Y	<p><i>Chapter 17 of the ES</i> addresses impacts to ground and surface water quality from mobilisation of ground contaminants. Cross-references to other <i>ES</i> chapters are provided as appropriate.</p>

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
<p>The SoS notes comments from the Environment Agency (EA) regarding the need to carry out detailed assessment work for all historic/active landfill sites along the route, including an assessment of potential pollution risks based on investigation findings. The EA would like to see a plan which specifies the nature of the potential contaminated land uses along the route, with investigation findings, chemical testing results and assessment of findings.</p>	Y	<p>These issues are addressed in the <i>ES</i>. <i>Figure 12.1 of the ES</i> shows potential areas of contaminated land in the vicinity of the scheme.</p>
Materials		
<p>As part of the assessment the SoS considers it essential to take account of materials to be removed from the site or moved between storage points and to identify where potential traffic movements would be routed.</p>	Y	<p>Construction information for the scheme is included in <i>Appendix 3.2 of the ES</i>. This sets out the envisaged construction scenario for the works, including haulage routes and traffic movements, including those relating to waste movements.</p>
<p>The SoS advises that the number and location of site compounds, storage areas, and other temporary facilities required for the construction of the scheme should be detailed within the Description of the Proposed Development section of the <i>ES</i> as well as where relevant in specialist topic chapters. Drawings or plans referred to should be clearly referenced.</p>	Y	<p>The proposals for temporary land-take for construction, including borrow pits, compounds and storage areas, is described in the <i>ES</i>. The impacts of the construction activities are assessed within the topic chapters.</p>
<p>The SoS recommends that the applicant should state clearly what regulatory areas are addressed in the <i>ES</i> and that the applicant should ensure that all relevant authorisations, licences, permits and consents that are necessary to enable operations to proceed are described in the <i>ES</i>. Also it should be clear that any likely significant effects of the proposed development which may be regulated by other statutory regimes have been properly taken into account in the <i>ES</i>.</p>	Y	<p>The <i>ES</i> indicates clearly where environmental authorisations, licences, permits and consents may be required.</p> <p>In addition, a separate list of other licence/permit/consent requirements is contained within the <i>Consents and Agreements Position Statement</i> document, DCO document no. 3.3.</p>

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
<p>It will not necessarily follow that the granting of consent under one regime will ensure consent under another regime. For those consents not capable of being included in an application for consent under the PA 2008, the SoS will require a level of assurance or comfort from the relevant regulatory authorities that the proposal is acceptable and likely to be approved, before they make a recommendation or decision on an application.</p> <p>The applicant is encouraged to make early contact with other regulators. Information from the applicant about progress in obtaining other permits, licences or consents, including any confirmation that there is no obvious reason why these will not subsequently be granted, will be helpful in supporting an application for development consent to the SoS.</p>	Y	Ongoing consultation is being progressed with regulatory authorities towards reaching a statement of common ground on these matters.
Noise and vibration		
<p>The SoS notes that the guidance described in DMRB, Volume 11 Section 3, Part 7 HD 213/11 – Revision 1 has been followed in the assessment and that a detailed assessment will be carried out. The SoS welcomes this approach to the assessment of noise impacts for this scheme.</p>	Y	Noted.
<p>The SoS recommends that the methodology and choice of noise receptors should be agreed with the relevant Environmental Health Department of the Council and with the EA.</p>	Y	Consultation has been held with local authorities for the proposed scheme alignment with respect to previous studies, baseline surveys and assessment approach/methods, receptors, night-time noise, sensitive areas, and the code of construction practice. Locations requested by stakeholders are provided in <i>Appendix 14.2 of the ES</i> .

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
<p>Information should be provided on the types of vehicles and plant to be used during the construction phase. Once operational, noise sources generated should be identified and assessed. Where appropriate, effective measures should be provided to mitigate against noise nuisance.</p>	Y	<p>The <i>ES</i> describes the potential effects associated with construction of the scheme. <i>Appendix 3.2 Annex A of the ES</i> includes a broad description of assumed types of plant. Construction vehicle movements are set out in <i>Appendix 3.2, Annex B and C of the ES</i>. Calculations of noise and vibration impacts use the procedures set out in BS5228 including types and numbers of plant to be used. Mitigation is proposed where a need is identified on the basis of these calculations. <i>Appendix 20.1 of the ES (Code of Construction Practice)</i> describes noise control processes during construction.</p>
<p>Noise impacts on people should be specifically addressed and particularly any potential noise disturbance at night and other unsocial hours such as weekends and public holidays.</p>	Y	<p>The <i>ES</i> noise assessment approach (<i>Chapter 14 of the ES</i>) reflects the requirements of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive, current best practice (including the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges), and the Government's noise policy as defined in Defra's <i>Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE)</i> and the <i>draft National Policy Statement for National Networks</i>. Further to NPSE requirements, the <i>ES</i> also examines noise change, not just absolute level. Noise and vibration impacts and effects studies are undertaken for day and night-time situations for construction and operation. <i>Appendix 3.1 of the ES</i> sets out the envisaged construction working hours including weekend, night-time and public holiday periods.</p>

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
The noise and vibration assessments should take account of the traffic movements along access routes, especially during the construction phase. The results from the noise and vibration assessments will also provide information to inform the ecological assessments.	Y	Calculations of noise and vibration effects use the procedures set out in <i>BS5228</i> , which include the use of haul routes. Information from noise and vibration assessments has been taken into account in the assessment of ecology impacts.

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
<p>The SoS notes that Girton Parish Council have specific noise concerns relating to the Bar Hill to Girton section and recommends these are taken into account as part of the assessment. The SoS notes Histon and Impington Parish Councils calls for adequate noise baseline data to be collected and recommends that their concerns be taken into account within the assessment.</p>	Y	<p>The noise study area is primarily defined in DMRB HD213/11 as 600m around new or altered highways and sections of existing roads within 1km of the new works that are predicted to be subject to a change in noise level of more than 1dB(A) as a result of the scheme on opening. Existing roads subject to a change of 1dB(A) or more are identified by traffic forecasts prediction, as required by DMRB HD213/11. Absolute levels are accounted for in relation to operational significance criteria and mitigation as set out in <i>Appendix 14.3 of the ES</i> in relation to the noise insulation guidelines and World Health Organisation criteria. Absolute levels are used as significance criteria for construction noise and for operations greater emphasis has been placed on impacts for those areas already where traffic noise levels are already high. Girton falls within the scheme study area and therefore is assessed and concerns are addressed in line with DMRB and other relevant guidance. Consultation has been undertaken with local authorities within the proposed scheme alignment with respect to previous studies and additional baseline surveys. Locations and durations of baseline surveys have been agreed. Long and short-term noise monitoring has been conducted at locations in Girton, Bar Hill, Histon and Impington and existing noise levels calculated.</p>

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
The SoS notes the comments of Huntingdonshire District Council regarding reference to noise and earth barriers being retained or replaced in Section 12.2.3, the Council has indicated that clarification around this statement is required. South Cambridgeshire District Council has echoed these comments.	Y	The Highways Agency would retain or improve existing noise mitigation. This is discussed in <i>Chapter 14 of the ES</i> .
The SoS notes the comments of South Cambridgeshire District Council relating to the list of sensitive receptors that may be affected by noise in paragraph 12.4.6. The council has indicated that a number of residential areas along the route and Blackwell Gypsy and Traveller site have not been mentioned and should be included.	Y	The list in the scoping report was not exhaustive and the assessment presented in the <i>ES</i> includes receptors identified from local authority information.
Consideration should be given to monitoring noise complaints during construction and when the development is operational.	Y	<p><i>Appendix 20.2 of the ES (Code of construction practice)</i> which requires the contractor to address noise and vibration complaints during construction works. The guidance in BS5228 on community relations is considered; this includes provision of a public liaison point of contact.</p> <p>Appropriate clauses will be included within the relevant contracts for the scheme works requiring the post completion monitoring to be undertaken.</p>
All travellers		
The SoS recommends that the <i>ES</i> should take account of the location of footpaths, cycleways, and any PRow including bridleways and byways.	Y	<i>Chapter 15 of the ES</i> and supporting figures take account of the location of footpaths, cycleways, and PRow.

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
<p>The SoS welcomes proposals to consult widely with relevant stakeholders in relation to the transport assessment and the design of the proposed development.</p>	Y	<p>Extensive consultation has been carried out with relevant stakeholders regarding the design of the scheme.</p> <p>Between 7 April and 15 June 2014 the <i>A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme Preliminary traffic report</i> (Highways Agency, April 2014) was exhibited online, at 23 local deposit points, and at the exhibition events.</p> <p>Traffic issues also raised by stakeholders as part of the regular Environmental Stakeholder Forum meetings held between December 2013 and submission of the DCO.</p>
<p>The SoS notes the comments of Cambridgeshire County Council relating to the potential benefit of clearer explanations of the role, route and services of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway in the ES. Cambridgeshire County Council have stated that this transport facility has the potential to reduce the environmental impact along the A14 corridor through offering a very attractive alternative to the use of the private car for journeys between corridor towns and in particular for access to Cambridge, for employment, shopping and leisure. The SoS recommends that the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway is taken into consideration within the cumulative assessment.</p>	Y	<p>The <i>ES</i> includes reference to the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway, as appropriate. <i>Chapter 18 of the ES</i> provides text regarding the inclusion of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway in the traffic model.</p> <p>The <i>Traffic Assessment</i> (DCO document no. 7.2) and <i>Chapter 7 of the ES</i> also outline what is included in the traffic model.</p>
<p>The SoS recommends that a Transport Assessment is completed as soon as possible as it will be important to ensure that the findings of the Transport Assessment are used to inform the relevant ES chapters. The SoS notes comments from Cambridgeshire County Council requesting the preparation of a full Transport Assessment as soon as the final traffic forecast figures are available and that the scope of the assessment be agreed with the County Council as soon as possible.</p>	Y	<p>The <i>Traffic Assessment</i> (DCO document no. 7.2) is included in the DCO submission. The scope was discussed with Cambridgeshire County Council.</p>

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
Community and private assets		
The SoS advises the applicant to have regard to the comments of Cambridgeshire County Council relating to the key role an improved A14 would play in assisting delivery of the growth of the Cambridge Sub-region. This role could be more fully explained and quantified in the ES.	Y	<i>Chapter 16 of the ES</i> considers socioeconomic impacts of the scheme in the study area which includes Cambridge.
The SoS notes the concerns of Suffolk County Council relating to the size of the study area suggested being too small to assess the wider economic benefits.	Y	Wider economic impacts are considered in the <i>Case for the Scheme</i> (DCO document no. 7.1) which forms part of the DCO submission. Socioeconomic assessment within the <i>ES</i> supports the assessment of impacts on community and private assets and is focused on a more local level.
The SoS notes that it is considered that most of the agricultural land taken by the Scheme would fall within the best and most versatile category; it is recommended that this loss should be quantified within the ES.	Y	Agricultural land take is assessed based on the ALC categorisation of land quality and is quantified by area in the <i>ES</i> .
Where impacts to bus services are considered within this assessment it should be cross referenced with the main body of work on bus services contained within the all travellers section.	Y	<i>Chapter 15 and Chapter 16 of the ES</i> provide cross referencing where appropriate.
Water environment		
The SoS welcomes the confirmation in the Scoping Report to provide a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and recommends consultation with the EA and the relevant local authorities.	Y	Liaison with the Environment Agency and other relevant authorities regarding flood risk and assessment is ongoing. The <i>Flood Risk Assessment</i> is included in <i>Appendix 17.1 of the ES</i> .
Details of the methodologies used to establish the baseline conditions in terms of water quality should be provided in the ES.	Y	The <i>ES</i> provides details of methodologies used.

Scope of issue	Adopted Y/N	Discussion/rationale
The SoS advises that reference should be made to other regimes (such as pollution prevention from the EA). On-going monitoring should also be addressed and agreed with the relevant authorities to ensure that any mitigation measures are effective.	Y	The <i>ES</i> includes reference to other regimes as appropriate. The need for on-going monitoring is described in <i>Appendix 20.1 of the ES (Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments)</i> . At a meeting with the relevant statutory body (Environment Agency) on 17 June 2014, it was agreed that there would not be a need for baseline water quality monitoring.
The SoS agrees with comments from the EA on regarding baseline water quality data including the need to provide baseline data for hydrocarbons and to assess the suitability of pollution treatment measures.	Y	The <i>ES</i> also utilises data from previous monitoring. At a meeting with the Environment Agency on 17 June 2014, it was agreed that there would not be a need for baseline water quality monitoring.
The SoS considers that the <i>ES</i> should fully assess impacts to the local drainage network and the extent to which proposals may increase any local flooding. The SoS notes the concerns of Girton Parish Council regarding impacts on Cottenham Lode, Washpit Brook and Beck Brook.	Y	Flooding is considered in <i>Chapter 17 of the ES</i> . The <i>Flood Risk Assessment</i> included in <i>Appendix 17.1 of the ES</i> , demonstrates the impact of the scheme on flood risk. This also provides details of the proposed mitigation.
The SoS notes and agrees with the comments from Natural England indicating that the <i>ES</i> will need to include detailed assessment of effects on the natural environment through changes in water quality and or hydrology on the interest features of Brampton Wood as a result of borrow pits.	Y	The <i>ES</i> includes consideration of the effects on Brampton Wood.
The SoS recommends that the sections considering the water environment should be cross referenced to other topic chapters in the <i>ES</i> as appropriate.	Y	The <i>ES</i> contains cross references as appropriate.

2 Bibliography

Act of Parliament (1981). Acquisition of Land Act 1981.

Act of Parliament (2000). Transport Act 2000.

Act of Parliament (2008). Planning Act 2008.

Act of Parliament (2014). The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) (Amendment) Regulations 2014

Highways Agency (March 2014). A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement. Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report. Available at:

[http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR010018/1.%20Pre-submission/EIA/Scoping/Scoping%20Request/A14 Applicant Scoping Report.pdf](http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR010018/1.%20Pre-submission/EIA/Scoping/Scoping%20Request/A14%20Applicant%20Scoping%20Report.pdf)

Accessed 15 September 2014.

The Planning Inspectorate (2014). Scoping Opinion. Proposed A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme. Available at:

<http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR010018/1.%20Pre-Submission/EIA/Scoping/Scoping%20Opinion/A14%20Cambridge%20to%20Huntingdon%20Scoping%20Opinion%20Report.pdf>

Accessed 15 September 2014.