



Meeting note

Project name	Trans-Pennine Upgrade Programme
File reference	TR010034
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	8 January 2018
Meeting with	Highways England
Venue	Temple Quay House
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate Richard Hunt – Senior EIA and Land Rights Adviser Karen Wilkinson – EIA and Land Rights Adviser Robert Ranger – Case Manager Kate Mignano – Case Manager Highways England Irene Ofei – Highways England Monica Corso-Griffiths – Highways England Andrew Dawson – Highways England Amarjit Doow-Powell – Highways England Ian Holmes – Highways England David Hoare – Arcadis Zoe Cartwright – Arcadis
Meeting objectives	To discuss the Scoping Opinion issued by the Planning Inspectorate
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

General Items

The Applicant sought clarification regarding general drafting of the Scoping Opinion, specifically in regard to the terminology 'significant' and 'non-significant' effects. The Inspectorate clarified that Environmental Statement's should distinguish between significant and non-significant effects and that the Schedule 4 of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 sets out the requirement to describe likely significant effects.

The Applicant enquired as to the recommended approach to be taken in relation to the assessment of pre and post-mitigation impacts, as required in paragraph 3.3.10 of the

Scoping Opinion, stating that the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) did not support this approach. The Inspectorate explained that the description of pre and post-mitigation effects allowed the Examining Authority (ExA) to understand the weight placed on any particular mitigation measure and the degree of effectiveness of any specific mitigation. The Applicant's attention was drawn to Advice Note 7 and its supporting Annex. The Inspectorate suggests that the information could be submitted in a table format, cross referencing to relevant ES chapters.

The Applicant advised that their design process incorporates embedded mitigation measures as the design is progressed. The Applicant suggested that an explanation regarding embedded mitigation could be provided to address this point.

Air Quality (4.1)

The Applicant proposes to apply the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) HA207/07 methodology to the assessment of construction dust and to define the study area. The Inspectorate at paragraph 4.1(2) of the Scoping Opinion states that the Applicant should explain and justify why more recent guidance such as the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction 2014 has not been adopted. The Applicant stated that this document doesn't replace DMRB and therefore they had continued to be guided by DMRB. Discussion was had in relation to this issue and the Inspectorate reiterated the point that the methodology for assessment should be explained and fully justified.

The Applicant responded to the Inspectorate's view in the Scoping Opinion (4.1(3)) that the ES should include an assessment of impacts associated with all relevant pollutants under the EU Ambient Air Quality Directive including increases to PM_{2.5} resulting from the proposed development and explained this assessment is qualitative. The Applicant is proposing to carry out a qualitative assessment of PM_{2.5} but are satisfied that PM_{2.5} levels will be well below the regulatory limit value.

Cultural Heritage (4.2)

The Applicant noted the Inspectorate's view in the Scoping Opinion (4.2 (6)) that due to insufficient detail provided in the Scoping Report regarding potential effects on the Grade II* listed Church of St Michael and All Angels or its setting that an assessment of the effects on this building should not be scoped out of the ES. The Applicant stated that it would include the church and its setting in the scope of the ES.

The Applicant agrees that Historic Landscape Character should be scoped into the ES and will shortly be approaching Historic England regarding this (4.2 (7)).

The Applicant agreed with the Inspectorate that geophysical surveys should be undertaken to inform the general assessment and confirmed these surveys are now taking place (4.2 (10)).

Biodiversity (4.3)

The Applicant explained the approach in the Scoping Report taken to biodiversity in relation to scoping out:

- selected species and groups/ habitats, and;

- designated sites relating to air quality on Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Special site of Scientific Interest (SSSI).

The Inspectorate explained that it might be acceptable to scope out effects on species and habitats but that insufficient evidence (eg ecological desk study and phase 1 surveys) had been provided to justify scoping out these assessments at the present time and that further justification would be required to scope these topics out. The Inspectorate highlighted that in the absence of the final traffic model, it was premature to rule out effects on designated sites. The Applicant was advised to confirm the scope of the assessment with the relevant statutory nature conservation bodies.

The Inspectorate advised that River Corridor Surveys previously undertaken in 2006 would be considered out of date. The Applicant agreed to revisit these surveys.

Landscape and Townscape Effects (4.4)

The Applicant explained that the Traffic Model was not complete when the Scoping Report was submitted and confirmed work is ongoing in relation to the processing of this information and finalising the design of the carriageways. Consideration would be given to the landscape study area following completion of the traffic modelling work.

People and Communities (4.5)

The Applicant confirmed it will assess effects on commercial enterprises ie Mottram Showground stating that other enterprises were not likely to be affected. The Inspectorate recommended agreement of the final list of enterprises with the relevant local authority. The Applicant confirmed that it would undertake an assessment of effects on agricultural land holdings based on landowner consultation.

Noise and Vibration (4.6)

The Inspectorate considers groundborne vibration from road traffic cannot be scoped out due to the proximity of existing residential receptors to the proposed tunnel at Mottram and due to the issue of increasing heavy goods vehicles. The Applicant explained its justification as the vibration emitted from vehicles passing over a new road surface which is well maintained will emit less vibration than an older, poorly maintained road. The Inspectorate requested further justification and evidence, including reference to local geology and proposed maintenance cycles to be included in the ES regarding this matter.

Road Drainage and the Water Environment (4.7)

The Applicant accepted that currently more justification is required to scope out an assessment of operational road drainage and water environment effects.

There is uncertainty of the crossing solution for the River Etherow. A clear description of the proposed bridge design and its construction methodology should be included within the ES. As the design of the scheme progresses, this will inform the FRA. The Inspectorate explained that a stand-alone FRA is helpful but not essential.

The Inspectorate highlighted that Advice Note 18: The Water Framework Directive (WFD) had been released and that this set out the Inspectorate's recommended process for undertaking WFD assessment.

Geology and Soils (4.8)

The Applicant agreed to consider geology and soils impacts within the broader assessment of impacts on population and health.

The Inspectorate explained early sight of environmental management documents helps reduce common issues at examination and it should be demonstrated how they will be secured through the Development Consent Order. The Applicant confirmed that Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMP) are a PCF product and therefore will be provided as part of the application material.

Cumulative Effects (4.11)

The Inspectorate explained that the Applicant should agree the list of 'other preferred development' with the relevant local authorities prior to submission of the application. The Applicant's attention was drawn to the Inspectorate's Advice Note 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment.

Human Health

The Applicant asked if this aspect should be addressed in a stand-alone assessment. The Inspectorate explained there is no formal requirement to produce a stand-alone assessment. Schedule 4 of the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017 requires that a description of the factors likely to be significantly affected by the development is provided, this includes human health. The assessment could therefore be produced however the Applicant deems appropriate, whether by means of a stand-alone document or within the main body of the ES with appropriate cross referencing. The Inspectorate highlighted that where effects on health are dispersed within topic chapters it may be difficult to understand the totality of an assessment. It was recommended that the Applicant consider provision of a signposting document.

Project timeline update

The Applicant confirmed consultation will commence February 2018 and the anticipated submission of the application will be winter 2018/19.

Specific decisions/ follow-up required?

The following actions were agreed:

- Arrangement of pre-consultation s46 meeting.