

A47 Wansford to Sutton Dualling

Scheme Number: TR010039

Volume 6

6.3 Environmental Statement Appendices

Appendix 4.1 – Scoping Opinion Responses

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

July 2021

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009**

A47 Wansford to Sutton
Development Consent Order 202[x]

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT APPENDICES
Appendix 4.1 - Scoping Opinion Responses

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(a)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010039
Application Document Reference	TR010039/APP/6.3
BIM Document Reference	HE551494-GTY-EGN-000-RP-LX-30009
Author:	A47 Wansford to Sutton Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	July 2021	Application Issue

Table of contents

4.	Scoping opinion responses table	1
4.1.	Introduction	1

Tables

Table 1-1:	Planning Inspectorate Scoping Opinion	2
------------	---------------------------------------	---

4. Scoping opinion responses table

4.1. Introduction

- 4.1.1. The Scoping Opinion (**TR010039/APP/6.6**) and the comments from consultees have been considered in undertaking the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and in preparing the Environmental Statement (ES) (**TR010039/APP/6.1**).
- 4.1.2. Comments from the Planning Inspectorate and responses to these are recorded in the following tables.
- 4.1.3. Further consultation with topic specific consultees is detailed in Chapters 5 to 15 of the ES (**TR010039/APP/6.1**).

Table 1-1: Planning Inspectorate Scoping Opinion

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
1.1 Background		
Paragraph 1.1.1	On 06 February 2018, the Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) on behalf of the Secretary of State (SoS) received a scoping request from Highways England (the Applicant) under Regulation 10 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) for the proposed A47 Wansford to Sutton project (the Proposed Development).	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.2	In accordance with Regulation 10 of the EIA Regulations, an Applicant may ask the SoS to state in writing its opinion ' <i>as to the scope, and level of detail, of the information to be provided in the environmental statement</i> '.	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.3	This document is the Scoping Opinion (the Opinion) provided by the Inspectorate on behalf of the SoS in respect of the Proposed Development. It is made on the basis of the information provided in the Applicant's report entitled 'A47 Wansford to Sutton EIA Scoping Report' (the Scoping Report). This Opinion can only reflect the proposals as currently described by the Applicant. The Scoping Opinion should be read in conjunction with the Applicant's Scoping Report.	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.4	The Applicant has notified the SoS under Regulation 8(1)(b) of the EIA Regulations that they propose to provide an Environmental Statement (ES) in respect of the Proposed Development. Therefore, in accordance with Regulation 6(2)(a) of the EIA Regulations, the Proposed Development is EIA development.	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.5	Regulation 10(9) of the EIA Regulations requires that before adopting a scoping opinion the Inspectorate must take into account: (a) any information provided about the proposed development; (b) the specific characteristics of the development;	N/A

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	(c) the likely significant effects of the development on the environment; and (d) in the case of a subsequent application, the environmental statement submitted with the original application.	
Paragraph 1.1.6	This Opinion has taken into account the requirements of the EIA Regulations as well as current best practice towards preparation of an ES.	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.7	The Inspectorate has consulted on the Applicant's Scoping Report and the responses received from the consultation bodies have been taken into account in adopting this Opinion.	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.8	The points addressed by the Applicant in the Scoping Report have been carefully considered and use has been made of professional judgement and experience in order to adopt this Opinion. It should be noted that when it comes to consider the ES, the Inspectorate will take account of relevant legislation and guidelines. The Inspectorate will not be precluded from requiring additional information if it is considered necessary in connection with the ES submitted with the application for a Development Consent Order (DCO).	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.9	This Opinion should not be construed as implying that the Inspectorate agrees with the information or comments provided by the Applicant in their request for an opinion from the Inspectorate. In particular, comments from the Inspectorate in this Opinion are without prejudice to any later decisions taken (eg on submission of the application) that any development identified by the Applicant is necessarily to be treated as part of a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) or associated development or development that does not require development consent.	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.10	Regulation 10(3) of the EIA Regulations states that a request for a scoping opinion must include: (a) a plan sufficient to identify the land; (b) a description of the proposed development, including its location and technical	N/A

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	capacity; (c) an explanation of the likely significant effects of the development on the environment; d) such other information or representations as the person making the request may wish to provide or make.	
Paragraph 1.1.11	The Inspectorate considers that this has been provided in the Applicant's Scoping Report. The Inspectorate is satisfied that the Scoping Report encompasses the relevant aspects identified in the EIA Regulations.	N/A
Paragraph 1.1.12	In accordance with Regulation 14(3)(a), where a scoping opinion has been issued in accordance with Regulation 10 an ES accompanying an application for an order granting development consent should be 'based on the most recent scoping opinion adopted (so far as the proposed development remains materially the same as the proposed development which was subject to that opinion)'.	The ES is based on the most recent scoping opinion received, dated March 2018.
Paragraph 1.1.12	The Inspectorate notes the potential need to carry out an assessment under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Habitats Regulations). This assessment must be co-ordinated with the EIA.	N/A
1.2 The Planning Inspectorate's Consultation		
Paragraph 1.2.1	In accordance with Regulation 10(6) of the EIA Regulations the Inspectorate has consulted the consultation bodies before adopting a scoping opinion. A list of the consultation bodies formally consulted by the Inspectorate is provided at Appendix 1. The consultation bodies have been notified under Regulation 11(1)(a) of the duty imposed on them by Regulation 11(3) of the EIA Regulations to make information available to the Applicant relevant to the preparation of the ES. The Applicant should note that whilst the list can inform their consultation, it should not be relied upon for that purpose.	N/A
Paragraph 1.2.2	The list of respondents who replied within the statutory timeframe and whose comments have been taken into account in the preparation of this Opinion is	N/A

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	provided, along with copies of their comments, at Appendix 2, to which the Applicant should refer in undertaking the EIA.	
Paragraph 1.2.3	The ES submitted by the Applicant should demonstrate consideration of the points raised by the consultation bodies. It is recommended that a table is provided in the ES summarising the scoping responses from the consultation bodies and how they are, or are not, addressed in the ES.	This table addresses this requirement.
Paragraph 1.2.4	Any consultation responses received after the statutory deadline for receipt of comments will not be taken into account within this Opinion. Late responses will be forwarded to the Applicant and will be made available on the Inspectorate's website. The Applicant should also give due consideration to those comments in carrying out the EIA.	All consultee comments have been considered in the preparation of the ES.
1.3 Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union		
Paragraph 1.3.1	On 23 June 2016, the United Kingdom (UK) held a referendum and voted to leave the European Union (EU). On 29 March 2017 the Prime Minister triggered Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union, which commenced a two year period of negotiations regarding the UK's exit from the EU. There is no immediate change to legislation or policy affecting national infrastructure. Relevant EU Directives have been transposed into UK law and those are unchanged until amended by Parliament.	N/A
The Proposed Development (2.1 Introduction)		
Paragraph 2.1.1	The following is a summary of the information on the Proposed Development and its site and surroundings prepared by the Applicant and included in their Scoping Report. The information has not been verified and it has been assumed that the information provided reflects the existing knowledge of the Proposed Development and the potential receptors/resources.	N/A
2.2 Description of the Proposed Development		

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 2.2.1	The Applicant's description of the Proposed Development and its location is provided in Scoping Report Sections 2.3 and 2.4. The Proposed Development comprises the construction of a new 2.5km dualcarriageway in Cambridgeshire, between Wansford and Sutton. It would be constructed mainly off-line, on the north side of the existing A47 just east of an existing filling station where it would cross to the south side of the A47. At the western end of the Proposed Development, near Wansford, a new slip road is proposed to improve traffic flow between the A1 southbound carriageway and the A47 eastbound carriageway. At the eastern end, the Applicant proposes to enlarge the Sutton Roundabout (to accommodate the dual carriageway).	N/A
Paragraph 2.2.2	The proposed application site is located 9km to the west of Peterborough. It is an existing single-carriageway section of the A47 connecting the A1 in the west (near the town of Wansford) to the dual-carriageway section of the A47 just north of the village of Sutton. It lies mainly within the jurisdiction of Peterborough City Council (PCC), but the site boundary is bound to the south by the River Nene which is also the border with Huntingdon District Council (HDC). A site location plan is provided at Figure A.1 (Appendix A) of the Scoping Report.	N/A
Paragraph 2.2.3	The area surrounding the Proposed Development is predominately rural, with arable farmland interspersed and small areas of woodland, farms and residential settlements.	N/A
2.3 The Planning Inspectorate's Comments - Description of the Proposed Development		
Paragraph 2.3.1 <i>Description of the Proposed Development</i>	Section 2.4 of the Scoping Report provides a very brief description of the main components of the Proposed Development. Figure 1.1 of the Scoping Report provides an indication of the dualling element of the Proposed Development; however, it is not sufficiently detailed to indicate the junction improvement works and does not clearly distinguish the existing roads and other features referenced in the text. The Scoping Report lacks detail and this does inhibit the ability of the	A full description of the Proposed Scheme is provided in Section 2.5 of Chapter 2 (The Proposed Scheme) (TR010039/APP/6.1).

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	Inspectorate to form a comprehensive understanding of the Proposed Development.	
Paragraph 2.3.2 <i>Description of the Proposed Development</i>	Paragraph 2.4.6 states that the existing A47 will be retained between the existing priority junction with Sutton Heath Road and Sutton Roundabout. However no explanation is provided about the remaining stretch of the existing road. Section 2.4 also omits to specify the anticipated overall footprint for the Proposed Development site (in hectares). Similarly, the description of development does not distinguish between land required for construction and that required for permanent land-take.	A clear and detailed description of the Proposed Scheme is provided in Section 2.5 of Chapter 2 (The Proposed Scheme) (TR010039/APP/6.1). This includes detail regarding the remaining stretch of road and permanent/ temporary land-take requirements.
Paragraph 2.3.3 <i>Description of the Proposed Development</i>	The length of the scheme (in km) and the size of the application site (in hectares) should be specified in the ES. The ES should clearly identify the land that is required, including land required temporarily during construction (including, for example, the location of construction compounds and access routes), and the land that would be required permanently for the operational phase. The DCO application site boundary must include the land-take associated with all works and elements proposed as part of the application, including requisite demolition works, drainage features, and mitigation land.	Scheme length and size, and land take requirements are detailed in Chapter 2 (The Proposed Scheme) (TR010039/APP/6.1).
Paragraph 2.3.4 <i>Description of the Proposed Development</i>	Construction of the Proposed Development is anticipated to last for approximately 16 months. The ES should set out any anticipated phased approach to construction, the likely activities, the anticipated duration and location of construction activities and any temporary laydown areas. Construction traffic routing should be described (with reference to an accompanying plan), along with anticipated numbers/types of vehicle movements, with sufficient detail to enable a robust assessment in the ES. A draft/outline Construction Traffic Management Plan should be agreed with relevant consultees and provided with the DCO application.	The construction phasing information and construction details are outlined within Chapter 2 (The Proposed Scheme) (TR010039/APP/6.1)

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 2.3.5 <i>Description of the Proposed Development</i>	The Scoping Report provides a very brief description of the location of the Proposed Development. The Inspectorate would expect a section in the ES which summarises the site and surroundings, and a location plan, to provide the context of the Proposed Development. The ES should provide a detailed description of the existing land uses and features across the land to which the proposed DCO application relates and the surrounding area.	A full description of the Proposed Scheme is provided in Section 2.5 of Chapter 2 (The Proposed Scheme) (TR010039/APP/6.1) .
Paragraph 2.3.6 <i>Alternatives</i>	The Scoping Report (Section 3) includes a description of the alternative route alignments that were considered and consulted upon. The Inspectorates notes that this section of the Scoping Report provides only limited reasons in support of the chosen option.	Further details regarding the reasons for selecting the chosen option have been provided in Section 3.3 of Chapter 3 (Consideration of alternatives) (TR010039/APP/6.1)
Paragraph 2.3.7 <i>Alternatives</i>	The EIA Regulations require that the Applicant provide 'A description of the reasonable alternatives (for example in terms of development design, technology, location, size and scale) studied by the developer, which are relevant to the proposed project and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of the environmental effects'.	A description of reasonable alternatives is provided in Section 3.2 of Chapter 3 (Consideration of Alternatives) (TR010039/APP/6.1)
Paragraph 2.3.8 <i>Flexibility</i>	The Applicant's attention is drawn to the Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine 'Using the 'Rochdale Envelope'1 , which provides additional details on the recommended approach.	Noted.
Paragraph 2.3.9 <i>Flexibility</i>	The Applicant should make every attempt to narrow the range of options and explain clearly in the ES which elements of the Proposed Development have yet to be finalised and provide the reasons. At the time of application, any Proposed Development parameters should not be so wide-ranging as to represent effectively different developments. The development parameters will need to be clearly defined in the draft DCO (dDCO) and in the accompanying ES. These should include the dimensions of structures and permanent earthworks such as, for example, embankments (taking account of existing ground levels).	Section 2.6 of Chapter 2 (The Proposed Scheme) of the ES outlines the limits of deviation considered as part of the assessment and the maximum parameters of the design (TR010039/APP/6.1)

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 2.3.10 <i>Flexibility</i>	It is a matter for the Applicant, in preparing an ES, to consider whether it is possible to robustly assess a range of impacts resulting from a large number of undecided parameters. The description of the Proposed Development in the ES must not be so wide that it is insufficiently certain to comply with the requirements of Regulation 14 of the EIA Regulations. Where flexibility is sought for any elements of the Proposed Development the ES should set out the parameters that would apply, clearly setting out any proposed limits of deviation.	The design has been developed to a level of detail that is sufficient to provide confidence during examination of an application for a DCO, with due consideration given to aspects of the design that have not yet been fixed in the light of Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 9 'Using the Rochdale Envelope'.
Paragraph 2.3.11 <i>Flexibility</i>	It should be noted that if the Proposed Development changes materially during the EIA process and prior to submission of the DCO application the Applicant may wish to consider requesting a new scoping opinion.	Noted.
3. EIA Approach – 3.1 Introduction		
Paragraph 3.1.1	This section contains the Inspectorate's specific comments on the scope and level of detail of information to be provided in the Applicant's ES. General advice on the presentation of an ES is provided in the Inspectorate's Advice Note Seven 'Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements' 2 and associated appendices.	Noted.
Paragraph 3.1.2	Aspects/matters are not scoped out unless specifically addressed and justified by the Applicant, and confirmed as being scoped out by the Inspectorate. The ES should be based on the Scoping Opinion in so far as the Proposed Development remains materially the same as the Proposed Development described in the Applicant's Scoping Report. The Inspectorate has set out in this Opinion where it has/has not agreed to scope out certain aspects/matters on the basis of the information available at this time. The Inspectorate is content that this should not prevent the Applicant from subsequently agreeing with the relevant consultees to scope such aspects/matters out of the ES, where further evidence has been provided to justify this approach. However, in order to demonstrate that the	Noted.

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	aspects/matters have been appropriately addressed, the ES should explain the reasoning for scoping them out and justify the approach taken.	
Paragraph 3.1.3	Where relevant, the ES should provide reference to how the delivery of measures proposed to prevent/minimise adverse effects is secured through DCO requirements (or other suitably robust methods) and whether relevant consultees agree on the adequacy of the measures proposed.	Noted.
3.2 Relevant National Policy Statements (NPSs)		
Paragraph 3.2.1	Sector-specific NPSs are produced by the relevant Government Departments and set out national policy for NSIPs. They provide the framework within which the Examining Authority (ExA) will make their recommendation to the SoS and include the Government's objectives for the development of NSIPs. The NPSs may include environmental requirements for NSIPs, which Applicants should address within their ES.	Noted.
Paragraph 3.2.2	The designated NPS relevant to the Proposed Development is the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN).	Noted.
3.3 Scope of Assessment		
Paragraph 3.3.1	<p>The Inspectorate recommends that in order to assist the decision-making process, the Applicant uses tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to demonstrate how the assessment has taken account of this Opinion; to identify and collate the residual effects after mitigation for each of the aspect chapters, including the relevant interrelationships and cumulative effects; to set out the proposed mitigation and/or monitoring measures including cross-reference to the means of securing such measures (eg a dDCO requirement); 	<p>This table demonstrates how the assessment has taken account of the Scoping Opinion. Each technical assessment has considered the Scoping Opinion.</p> <p>Residual effects are presented in each of the technical assessments and assessed as part of the Cumulative effects assessment (TR010039/APP/6.1)</p> <p>Mitigation measures are presented in each technical assessment and committed to in the Environmental Management Plan (TR010039/APP/7.5)</p>

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to describe any remedial measures that are identified as being necessary following monitoring; and to identify where details are contained in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA report) (where relevant), such as descriptions of European sites and their locations, together with any mitigation or compensation measures, are to be found in the ES. 	<p>Monitoring recommendations are presented in each technical assessment (TR010039/APP/6.1) and the Environmental Management Plan (TR010039/APP/7.5)</p> <p>Details of European sites are presented in the HRA (TR010039/APP/6.9) and ES Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) (TR010039/APP/6.1)</p>
Paragraph 3.3.2	The information provided in the Scoping Report contains contradictory/conflicting information within a number of the aspect chapters. The Inspectorate expects the information contained in the ES to be free from such error and provide a clear and consistent understanding of the likely significant effects associated with the Proposed Development.	Noted.
Paragraph 3.3.3	Not all of the features/relevant receptors identified in the aspect chapters of the Scoping Report are shown on the environmental constraints plans contained in Appendix B. The Inspectorate expects all features/relevant receptors considered in the aspect assessments to be clearly identified on figures accompanying the ES.	The ES (TR010039/APP/6.1) and accompanying figures (TR010039/APP/6.2) present the features/relevant receptors for each technical assessment.
Paragraph 3.3.4	The Inspectorate considers that where a DCO application includes works described as 'associated development', that could themselves be defined as an improvement of a highway, the Applicant should ensure that the ES accompanying that application distinguishes between; effects that primarily derive from the integral works which form the proposed (or part of the proposed) NSIP and those that primarily derive from the works described as associated development, for example through a suitably compiled summary table. This will have the benefit of giving greater confidence to the Inspectorate that what is proposed is not in fact an additional NSIP defined in accordance with s22 of the PA2008.	Noted.

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 3.3.5	It is noted that paragraph 1.1.3 of the Scoping Report (TR010039/APP/6.5) states that a 'final version' of the Scoping Report will be appended to the ES. The Inspectorate does not understand the purpose of this. The ES (TR010039/APP/6.1) submitted with the DCO application must be based on the most recent scoping opinion adopted (Regulation 14(3) of the EIA Regulations) (TR010039/APP/6.6). There is no requirement for the Scoping Report to be submitted with the DCO application, however, should the Applicant wish to include it, the Scoping Report must be the version on which the most recent scoping opinion is based.	The Scoping Report is not appended to the ES as this is not required, however, it is being submitted with the DCO application.
Paragraph 3.3.6	The Inspectorate understands that traffic modelling will be used to assess the likely effects of the Proposed Development. The ES should clearly explain the relationship between traffic and transport modelling and figures used in the ES. The results of the traffic modelling will directly influence other aspect-based assessments including but not limited to noise and air quality. Therefore, the ES should also identify if there are limitations to the modelling which could affect other aspects in the ES.	Where traffic data has been used for the technical assessments, the methodology and assumptions/limitations are explained (Chapter 5 Air Quality, Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration, Chapter 14 Climate) (TR010039/APP/6.1)
Paragraph 3.3.7	While the structure of the ES remains for the Applicant to decide, the information that would be expected to appear in a Transport Assessment (TA) should be provided in the ES. The Inspectorate notes that a TA is not included in the draft structure of the ES presented in the Scoping Report. The Inspectorate considers that the ES must clearly explain how the information gathered as part of the TA (including traffic modelling and baseline transport information) has informed other assessments within the ES such as, for example, air quality, noise and vibration, and people and communities.	Where traffic data has been used for the technical assessments, the methodology and assumptions/limitations are explained (Chapter 5 Air Quality, Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration, Chapter 14 Climate) (TR010039/APP/6.1)
Paragraph 3.3.8	The ES should assess the impacts from proposed construction traffic management measures including any road closures or diversions. Royal Mail Group Limited has provided comments in this regard along with information on	Where construction information has been made available, this has been taken into account in the respective ES chapters (TR010039/APP/6.1) and Environmental Management Plan (TR010039/APP/7.5).

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	their operations in the area which could have a bearing on this assessment, to which the Applicant should have regard.	
Paragraph 3.3.9	Throughout the Scoping Report, reference is made variously to 'the Proposed Scheme', 'the project', 'the site footprint', 'the construction footprint', 'the construction site', 'the red line boundary', and 'the scheme area'. Some of these terms appear to be used interchangeably. This is of particular relevance to understanding the study areas applied and how the relevant baseline information has been captured, and therefore understanding the basis of the assessments of the effects of the Proposed Development. The terminology used in the ES should be clearly explained and consistently applied throughout so that the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development can be fully understood.	Noted.
Paragraph 3.3.10 <i>Baseline scenario</i>	The ES should include a description of the baseline scenario with and without implementation of the Proposed Development as far as natural changes from the baseline scenario can be assessed with reasonable effort on the basis of the availability of environmental information and scientific knowledge.	Each technical chapter (TR010039/APP/6.1) includes the baseline scenario.
Paragraph 3.3.11 <i>Forecasting Methods or Evidence</i>	The ES should contain the timescales upon which the surveys which underpin the technical assessments have been based. For clarity, this information should be provided either in the introductory chapters of the ES (with confirmation that these timescales apply to all chapters), or in each aspect chapter.	Each technical chapter (TR010039/APP/6.1) provides these timescales where surveys have been undertaken.
Paragraph 3.3.12 <i>Forecasting Methods or Evidence</i>	The Inspectorate expects the ES to include a chapter setting out the overarching methodology for the assessment, which clearly states which effects are 'significant' and 'non-significant' for the purposes of the EIA Regulations. It is noted that descriptions of the levels of significance used are provided in Table 1.1 of the Scoping Report, under 'Approach to Assessment', and that the subsequent table (referenced as Table 1.2 but also titled Table 1.1) combines receptor sensitivity and impact magnitude values to determine the level of significance of an effect. However, the criteria used to define sensitivity and magnitude values have not been provided. The Inspectorate expects these criteria to be described in	Chapter 4 (Environmental assessment methodology) (TR010039/APP/6.1) sets out the overarching methodology followed in the ES. Each technical chapter (TR010039/APP/6.1) also provides the detailed methodology for their assessment.

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	the ES in the overarching methodology chapter or in individual aspect chapters where there is any departure from that.	
Paragraph 3.3.13 <i>Forecasting Methods or Evidence</i>	The ES should include details of difficulties (for example technical deficiencies or lack of knowledge) encountered compiling the required information and the main uncertainties involved.	Limitations to the assessment have been presented in Chapter 4 (Environmental assessment methodology) and each technical chapter (TR010039/APP/6.1) provides these details under an assumptions and limitations section.
Paragraph 3.3.14 <i>Residues and emissions</i>	The EIA Regulations require an estimate, by type and quantity, of expected residues and emissions. Specific reference should be made to water, air, soil and subsoil pollution, noise, vibration, light, heat, radiation and quantities and types of waste produced during the construction and operation phases, where relevant. This information should be provided in a clear and consistent fashion and may be integrated into the relevant aspect assessments.	This information is provided within the technical chapters (TR010039/APP/6.1).
Paragraph 3.3.15 <i>Residues and emissions</i>	The Inspectorate notes that heat and radiation effects have been scoped out for assessment on the basis that they are unlikely to arise due to the nature of the Proposed Development. The Inspectorate agrees that significant heat and radiation effects are unlikely and that this matter may be scoped out of the ES.	Noted.
Paragraph 3.3.16 <i>Mitigation</i>	The Inspectorate notes that the Applicant states in a number of chapters that mitigation measures will be set out in the application CEMP. Any mitigation relied upon for the purposes of the assessment should be explained in detail within the ES, and the likely efficacy of the mitigation proposed should be explained with reference to residual effects. The ES should also address how any mitigation proposed is secured, with crossreference made to specific DCO requirements or other legally binding agreements submitted with the DCO application.	Each technical chapter (TR010039/APP/6.1) details mitigation proposed under a 'Design, mitigation and enhancement measures' section. The embedded mitigation is secured through Schedule 1 of the DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1) and the Works Plans (TR010039/APP/2.3) and any other mitigation required is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (TR010039/APP/7.4) which will be secured by requirement 4 of the DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1).

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Paragraph 3.3.17 <i>Vulnerability of the development to risks of major accidents and/or disasters</i>	The ES should include a description of the potential vulnerability of the Proposed Development to risks of major accidents and/or disasters, including vulnerability to climate change, which are relevant to the Proposed Development. Relevant information available and obtained through risk assessments pursuant to European Union legislation such as Directive 2012/18/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council or Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom or relevant assessments carried out pursuant to national legislation may be used for this purpose provided that the requirements of this Directive are met. Where appropriate, this description should include measures envisaged to prevent or mitigate the significant adverse effects of such events on the environment and details of the preparedness for and proposed response to such emergencies.	Chapter 4 (Environmental assessment methodology), Section 4.1, highlights how accidents and disasters have been considered in the Proposed Scheme (TR010039/APP/6.1)
Paragraph 3.3.18 <i>Vulnerability of the development to risks of major accidents and/or disasters</i>	It is stated in Section 1.8 of the Scoping Report that the Applicant proposes to scope out the need for a standalone assessment of the likely significant effects resulting from major accidents or disasters. This is on the basis that specific accidents or disasters which have the potential to cause harm to the environment (including flooding, mine collapse and spillages of contaminants) can be sufficiently addressed in the scheme design and relevant ES technical chapters. The Inspectorate notes from the scoping consultation response from the Health and Safety Executive (contained in Appendix 2 of this Scoping Opinion) that there is a major accident hazard pipeline with the site boundary and another within the 500m site buffer area.	The major hazard pipelines (high pressure gas and oil) have been considered in paragraph 4.1.1 of ES Chapter 4 Environmental Assessment Methodology (TR010039/APP/6.1) and are shown on ES Figure 2.3 (TR010039/APP/6.2). The safety risk associated with the pipelines has been considered within the Proposed Scheme risk register. Therefore further assessment of these pipelines within the ES has been scoped out.
Paragraph 3.3.19 <i>Vulnerability of the development to risks of major accidents and/or disasters</i>	Having had regard to the particular nature of the Proposed Development and the justification provided in the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that the Proposed Development is unlikely to require a standalone assessment regarding the Proposed Development's vulnerability to risks of, or its potential to cause, major accidents and/or disasters, on the basis that this will be covered in the technical chapters. This should include consideration of the major accident hazard pipelines. The Inspectorate notes and welcomes the Applicant's statement that the ES will include a summary table which identifies where this	The major hazard pipelines have been considered in paragraph 4.1.1 of ES Chapter 4 Environmental Assessment Methodology (TR010039/APP/6.1) The safety risk associated with the pipelines has been considered within the Proposed Scheme risk register. Therefore further assessment of these pipelines within the ES has been scoped out.

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	has been considered in the relevant technical chapters, such as, for example, road drainage and the water environment in respect of flood risk and culvert design. The Applicant should liaise with the relevant statutory consultees to better understand the likelihood of an occurrence and the Proposed Development's susceptibility to potential major accidents and disasters.	
Paragraph 3.3.20 <i>Transboundary effects</i>	Schedule 4 Part 5 of the EIA Regulations requires a description of the likely significant transboundary effects to be provided in an ES. The Inspectorate notes that the Applicant has indicated in the Scoping Report whether the Proposed Development is likely to have significant impacts on another European Economic Area (EEA) State.	Noted. Transboundary effects are scoped out as highlighted in Section 4.1 of Chapter 4 (Environmental assessment methodology) (TR010039/APP/6.1).
Paragraph 3.3.21 <i>Transboundary effects</i>	Regulation 32 of the EIA Regulations inter alia requires the Inspectorate to publicise a DCO application on behalf of the SoS if it is of the view that the proposal is likely to have significant effects on the environment of another EEA State, and where relevant, to consult with the EEA state affected. The Inspectorate considers that where Regulation 32 applies, this is likely to have implications for the examination of a DCO application.	Noted. Transboundary effects are scoped out as highlighted in Section 4.1 of Chapter 4 (Environmental assessment methodology) (TR010039/APP/6.1).
Paragraph 3.3.21 <i>Reference List</i>	A reference list detailing the sources used for the descriptions and assessments must be included in the ES.	References are provided in each relevant chapter of the ES (TR010039/APP/6.1)
3.4 Confidential Information		
Paragraph 3.4.1	In some circumstances it will be appropriate for information to be kept confidential. In particular, this may relate to information about the presence and locations of rare or sensitive species such as badgers, rare birds and plants where disturbance, damage, persecution or commercial exploitation may result from publication of the information. Where documents are intended to remain confidential the Applicant should provide these as separate paper and electronic documents with their confidential nature clearly indicated in the title, and watermarked as such on each page. The information should not be incorporated	Noted. Confidential information will not be incorporated in other documents intended for publication. Confidential reports will be highlighted to the Planning Inspectorate.

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	within other documents that are intended for publication or which the Inspectorate would be required to disclose under the Environmental Information Regulations 2014.	
4. Aspect Based Scoping Tables		
Air Quality (Scoping Report section 5)		
	The local air quality (AQ) assessment study area is described as encompassing human health receptors and ecologically designated sites within 200m of roads that are expected to be affected by the Proposed Development, which are defined according to DMRB criteria.	This has been addressed in the ES Chapter 5 Air quality, section 5.8 and 5.9 (TR010039/APP/6.1).
	The regional AQ assessment study area is not defined. It is stated that the assessment will measure the change in emissions resulting from the Proposed Development, and that the 'affected roads' considered in the assessment will include those that meet the following criteria: where there would be a change of more than 10% Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT); a change of more than 10% to the number of Heavy Duty Vehicles (HDVs); or a change in the daily average speed of more than 20km/hr.	A regional assessment is no longer required under the new DMRB criteria. This has been included within section 5.4 of the air quality chapter (TR010039/APP/6.1), in Table 5.3 under 'updates to guidance and scope of assessment'.
	It is explained that no further details of the areas which meet the above criteria have been provided as traffic data for the Proposed Development is not yet available.	n/a
	The nearest AQMA is approximately 14.5km east of the Proposed Development. The air quality assessment will be carried out in accordance with the DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 (HA 207/07) and related HE Interim Advice Note (IANs), and Defra's Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance (LAQM.TG(16)).	With the release of the new DMRB LA105 guidance, the old DMRB and associated IANs have been superceded. The assessment has been completed in accordance with LAQM. TG16

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	A 'simple' assessment (according to the DMRB) is proposed for the operational phase of the Proposed Development. It is not stated whether a simple or 'detailed' assessment will be undertaken for the construction phase.	This has been addressed in ES Chapter 5 (Air quality) (TR010039/APP/6.1) section 5.4 paragraphs 5.4.1- 5.4.2. A detailed assessment has been chosen and justified.
	The Applicant considers that the main risks to sensitive receptors during the construction phase would include on-site dust emissions arising from construction activities and vehicle movements, but that significant effects are unlikely with mitigation measures in place.	This has been addressed in ES Chapter 5 (Air quality) (TR010039/APP/6.1) section 5.8 paragraphs 5.8.23- 5.8.24. No significant effects are considered likely under the construction phase.
	The Applicant identifies potential operational air quality effects resulting from changes in emissions associated with changes in traffic flows on the local road network, and changes in road layout which may bring road traffic emission sources closer to, or further away from, sensitive receptors, and notes that these effects will be dependent on traffic impacts yet to be determined.	Addressed in ES Chapter 5 (Air quality) (TR010039/APP/6.1) section 5.8 and 5.10.
	No matters have been proposed to be scoped out of the assessment.	The assessment has been conducted in accordance with LA105. Any aspect of the assessment which has been scoped out, has been justified in accordance with the guidance. This is included within ES Chapter 5 (Air quality) (TR010039/APP/6.1).
5.2.1 & 5.2.2	Study Area The Inspectorate acknowledges that information necessary to depict the study area eg the traffic data was not available at the time that the scoping request was submitted. However the study areas should be clearly described in the ES and delineated on plans to aid the reader.	Addressed in the ES Chapter 5 (Air quality) (TR010039/APP/6.1) section 5.6.
Section 5.2	Receptors The receptors that will be considered in the assessment are not identified in the aspect chapter and Figures B.1 and B.2 do not include, for example, any PRoW or locally designated features, so it is unclear whether this is because there are	Detail on the receptor selection process has been outlined in the chapter methodology. A full breakdown of the receptor location and type of receptors is outlined in the ES.

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	<p>none in the study area or whether they have been omitted. Although references are made to 'sensitive receptors' in the area, such as, for example, in relation to determining the worst case pollutant concentration at diffusion tube monitoring locations, these receptors are not identified. Figures B.1 and B.2 appear to be general environmental constraints plans. The Inspectorate recommends that plans are provided with the ES that specifically identify the receptors relevant to air quality.</p>	
5.3.10	<p>European Union (EU) Air Quality Directive compliance</p> <p>It is stated that the Proposed Development is unlikely to cause non-compliance with the EU Air Quality Directive on the basis that the closest Defra Pollution Climate Mapping (PCM) link is located approximately 5.5km away and had a reported annual NO₂ concentration in 2017 of 38µg/m³, which is below the annual mean limit value of 40µg/m³. Such a conclusion will need to be fully justified in the ES and include information on the contribution of the Proposed Development to area NO₂ concentrations. In addition, although no reference is made in this chapter to potential cumulative effects it is acknowledged in Chapter 15 that there is potential for cumulative air quality impacts from the Proposed Development, and this should also be considered in the context of compliance with the Directive.</p>	<p>The guidance on the assessment of PCM links has now changed under the new DMRB. Under the new criteria, the assessment of PCM links could be scoped out.</p>
5.7.1	<p>Construction Effects</p> <p>It is noted that the main impacts on sensitive receptors during construction are anticipated as arising from on-site dust emissions from construction activities and vehicle movements. The assessment should also address potential off-site</p>	<p>The construction dust assessment has been carried out in accordance with the updated guidance, the assessment of construction traffic was not required under the new criteria.</p>

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	construction impacts, such as, for example, from construction traffic on local roads.	
5.7.2	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>The Inspectorate notes that it is anticipated that construction impacts would be mitigated through measures included within a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). No reference is made to mitigation of operational impacts, or to potential residual effects. The potential impacts during all phases of the Proposed Development and the mitigation measures proposed to address them should be described in the ES and clear cross-reference made to their location within other application documents such as, for example, the CEMP, and to where they are secured in the dDCO. Any residual effects should be identified.</p>	<p>The appropriate mitigation for the construction impacts has been outlined in the ES (TR010039/APP.6.1).</p> <p>The embedded mitigation is secured through Schedule 1 of the DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1) and the Works Plans (TR010039/APP/2.3) and any other mitigation required is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (TR010039/APP/7.4) which will be secured by requirement 4 of the DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1)</p>
5.7.6	<p>Operational effects</p> <p>The Inspectorate notes that the Applicant does not intend to undertake an assessment of any potential pollutants other than those identified in Section 5.7, such as potential impacts resulting from increased fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) emissions generated by the Proposed Development. The Inspectorate considers that the ES should include an assessment of PM_{2.5} emissions, and that in determining significance the assessment should take into account performance against relevant target/limit values.</p>	<p>The assessment of the relevant pollutants has been addressed in the ES Chapter 5 (Air quality) (TR010039/APP/6.1) section 5.8 and 5.10.. Under the new criteria NO₂ and PM₁₀ were assessed. Should no exceedances of the PM₁₀ objective be observed an assumption can be made that the PM_{2.5} exceedance level is also unlikely to occur. An appropriate statement highlighting this has been added into the methodology and results sections of the ES</p>
5.8.1 & 5.8.2	<p>Levels of Assessment</p> <p>The intended approach to the assessment of air quality impacts is unclear. It is stated that only a qualitative assessment of construction phase effects will be undertaken, and that a simple assessment (according to the DMRB) will be undertaken for the operational phase. Table 16.1 (Chapter 16) indicates that a simple assessment will be undertaken in respect of air quality, however Table</p>	<p>Full assessment methodology has been outlined, justifying the approach to the assessment in line with LA105.</p>

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	16.2 indicates that a simple assessment will be used for the construction phase regional impacts and a detailed assessment for the construction phase local impacts. The approach to each assessment should be fully explained and justified within the ES and agreed with PCC and HDC.	
5.9.3	Operational phase assessment Although NO _x and carbon dioxide (CO ₂) are identified in Section 5.7 as key pollutants for consideration in the operational phase assessment, it is indicated that only NO ₂ and PM ₁₀ will be included in the simple assessment. The Inspectorate considers that NO _x and CO ₂ emissions should be included in the assessment.	A simple assessment was not conducted. Under the new criteria, the assessment of CO ₂ is not required.
5.9.3 & 5.9.5	Ecological Receptors It is noted that only designated sites are referenced in relation to the determination of significant effects. The Applicant should additionally consider and assess as appropriate non-designated sites and species that could be significantly affected by the Proposed Development. The Inspectorate recommends that the relevant ecological receptors to be included in the assessment are agreed with Natural England (NE), PCC and HDC. The assessment should be informed by the ecological assessments and cross-reference made to relevant information contained in the ES biodiversity chapter.	A full range of ecological sites has been considered in the assessment in line with LA105. The air quality specialist has worked closely with the competent expert in biodiversity to ensure assessments are appropriately cross-referenced.
4.2 Cultural Heritage (Scoping Report section 6)		
6.2.1	The ES should provide a robust justification as to why the 1km study area is appropriate and sufficient to capture all heritage assets which could experience impacts on their setting – taking into account for example, visual intrusion or increased noise emissions. To support this justification, the Applicant is advised to refer to the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) developed for the LVIA and the conclusions of the	DMRB standards have changed since scoping. The changes have been discussed with, and methodology agreed with the relevant consultees. Updates are listed within section 6.4 of Chapter 6 (TR010039/APP/6.1).

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	<p>noise impact assessment. Paragraph 6.2.2 states that a ZVI (assumed to refer to the ZTV) will be used to identify any assets that would be affected by the construction of the Proposed Development. The ZTV should also be used to identify assets affected by its operation.</p> <p>The Applicant should seek agreement with relevant consultees regarding the appropriate study area.</p>	
Table 6.1	The Applicant's attention is drawn to a third 'Building of Local Importance' adjacent to the Proposed Development, Sutton Bridge No 6-A47, which should be taken into account in the assessment, in addition to those identified in Table 6.1 of the Scoping Report.	This is addressed in the chapter as both a locally listed building in its own right and as part of a group with the former railway station. This has been discussed with the relevant consultees
Guidance	<p>The Inspectorate notes the potential for impacts on buried archaeological resources. The Applicant should set out in the ES which of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' standards and guidance have been used to inform the assessment.</p> <p>In addition to the guidance listed in the Scoping Report the assessment should take into account guidance contained in Historic England's guidance document 'Preserving Archaeological Remains'5.</p> <p>The Applicant should be aware that Historic England's 'Good Practice Advice Note 3' was revised in December 2017, and should ensure that the versions of the guidance relied on for the purposes of the assessment are current</p>	The updated guidance has been referred to and used.
Proposed Methodology	<p>The Scoping Report states that a detailed assessment will be undertaken. However the description of a detailed assessment in DMRB HA208/07 includes a number of options, which are not mentioned in the Scoping Report, and consequently the proposed scope of the assessment is unclear. The ES should include both a desk-based assessment and an archaeological field evaluation. Consultation with PCC, HDC and Historic England is recommended.</p>	The ES is based on the results of desk-based assessment and field evaluation. Relevant consultation has been undertaken however, Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) were unavailable for comment. This is not a risk to the project, as no significant effects are predicted to occur to assets in HDC territory.
4.3 Landscape (Scoping Report Section 7)		

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Study area	The Inspectorate advises that the study areas for the landscape assessment and the visual assessment need to be justified and efforts made to agree these with the relevant consultees. The ES should explain how such consultation influenced the approach taken to the assessment.	A study area of 1km radius from the proposed scheme boundary was agreed with Peterborough City Council in October 2019. The ES chapter sets out in detail the rationale for both the landscape and the visual study areas.
Methodology - Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)	The Scoping Report states that the ZTV will be established assuming a viewer height of 1.6m above ground level. However, the Inspectorate notes that DMRB recommends that the observer height is 1.8m above ground level. The ES should clearly explain the approach taken to the assessment and any assumptions made or deviation from recognised guidance should be identified and justified.	A viewer height of 1.6m has been used for the final ZTV (see Figure 7.4 Visual Context) (TR010039/APP/6.2). This is consistent with DMRB LA 107 and GLVIA3. An earlier reference in DMRB to a different height is now superseded. DMRB LA 107 does not stipulate a height and the approach taken is in accordance with guidance in GLVIA3 (paragraph 6.11).
Potential effects	To support a robust assessment of likely significant effects, the Proposed Development should be illustrated using plans and visualisations in the ES which highlight the elements of the Proposed Development which would impact on landscape character and be visually prominent to visual and amenity receptors (for example the new dual carriageway, access roads, roundabouts and embankments). Cross sections and photomontages should be included for this purpose.	Photomontage visualisations have been prepared which highlight locations where landscape character and visual amenity would be potentially most impacted. Plans have been prepared to communicate the extent of potentially significant visual effects (see Figure 7.5 Visual Receptors) (TR010039/APP/6.2). Annotations on the Environmental Masterplan highlight areas that would be potentially affected and how this has been mitigated.
Mitigation	Mitigation planting and landscape mitigation are proposed in order to mitigate the operational effects of the development. The ES should include a tree and hedge survey and a plan and schedule of what is proposed to be retained and removed. In relation to planting, the Applicant should discuss and attempt to agree the planting specification/species mix with the relevant local planning authorities. The Applicant should also seek to agree an appropriate aftercare period for the proposed landscaping. It should be clear how the proposed landscaping would mitigate the impacts on landscape and visual receptors, and how these impacts would change as the proposed planting matures. Interactions with other ES	Mitigation planting is set out within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010039/APP/6.8). Tree and hedgerow information is also provided within Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) (TR010039/APP/6.1) and within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) (Appendix 7.6 (TR010039/APP/6.3) to the landscape and visual effects chapter). The landscape and visual assessment includes consideration of effects in year 1 and in year 15 based on stated plant growth assumptions. Any beneficial effects on ecology as a consequence of new

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	aspects, for example beneficial impacts on local ecology, should be explained and assessed.	planting for landscape integration and screening are considered in that chapter. Indicative species are set out within the Environmental Masterplan (TR010039/APP/6.8). Species and aftercare will be agreed with Peterborough City Council at detailed design (the authority did not have an appointed landscape officer when consulted in September 2020).
4.4 Biodiversity (Scoping Report section 8)		
Study area Table 8.1	No explanation is provided for the study areas selected. In addition, it is unclear to what the 10km study area for "Statutory sites designated for their bird interest" refers, as a 2km study area is identified for SPAs, and for Ramsar sites, NNRS and SSSIs (which could be designated for their ornithological features). The study areas applied must be clearly described, justified and defined according to the extent of the likely impacts.	Study areas have been defined in the ES Chapter 8.6 Table 8-2.
Table 8.2 & Section 8.3 Baseline – designated sites	Natural England, in their consultation response, note that the Proposed Development falls within the Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area. The Inspectorate agrees that the ecological assessment should take into account impacts from the Proposed Development and the implications for the objectives of the Nature Improvement Area. Note that the River Wensum SAC and SSSI is located in Norfolk, not 1.6km north-east of the Proposed Scheme, as indicated in the Scoping Report.	The Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area (NIA) was not considered directly in the ES however, statutory and non statutory sites have been included in the assessment and these sites form part of the NIA network. The River Wensum SAC and SSSI was omitted from the ES as is not relevant to this Scheme and is outside the Zone of Influence outlined in section 8.6 of ES Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) (TR010039/APP/6.1).
Section 8.3 Baseline - figures	Not all of the ecological features identified in the Scoping Report, such as, for example, County and Local Wildlife Sites, are shown on the environmental constraints plans contained in Appendix B of the Scoping Report. The Inspectorate expects all features considered in the assessment to be included on the figures submitted with the ES.	An ecological constraints map has been drawn up showing these sites in the ES, Figure 8.2 (TR010039/APP/6.2).

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
Table 8.3 Location of breeding bird surveys	Table 8.3 states that breeding bird surveys will be carried out 'within the footprint of the Proposed Scheme, plus a 100m buffer'. However, the Inspectorate notes that barn owl populations within 1.5km of road boundaries are at risk of collision mortality. If barn owls are likely to be present within a 1.5km study area then the assessment should include consideration of impacts to this species. The Applicant should liaise with Natural England to ensure the assessment appropriately addresses the collision risk to barn owls.	Additional barn owl surveys have been conducted (Appendix 8.9 of the ES) (TR010039/APP/6.3). A habitat assessment has been carried out to 1.5km but due to access limitations the entire area cannot be surveyed for barn owl nests and roost. Appropriate mitigation has been included within the EMP (TR010039/APP/7.5) to reduce the risk to the barn owl population on site.
8.4.2 Field surveys - Access	The Scoping Report states that ecological surveys undertaken to date were confined to locations where landowner permission was obtained. The Applicant should ensure that the ES is accompanied by an appropriate and comprehensive set of ecological surveys sufficient to inform the assessment of likely significant effects.	Access, which was granted to enable the surveys outlined in Appendix 8.1 - 8.15 (TR010039/APP/6.3) was considered suitable to produce a robust and comprehensive assessment to inform the ES on significant effects.
8.6.2 Consultation	The Inspectorate notes that Sutton Parish Council, in their scoping consultation response (contained in Appendix 2 of this Scoping Opinion), have questioned the Applicant's findings in relation to bats. The Applicant should ensure that the information provided in the ES is sufficient to support their assessment of potential effects.	A comprehensive suite of bat surveys have been undertaken across the scheme (Appendix 8.11-8.13) (TR010039/APP/6.3). In addition, bat data searches have been received and assessed from Cambridgeshire Bat Group and Northamptonshire Bat Group. From the background data received and subsequent survey effort it is considered that the data is robust and comprehensive enough to support the assessment made within the ES.
6 8.8.5 & 8.8.12 vs 8.8.14 Field surveys - aquatic invertebrates & reptiles	Contradictory information is provided in the Scoping Report on the timing of the surveys proposed for aquatic invertebrates and reptiles. The Applicant should ensure that surveys are undertaken at an appropriate time (and any limitations explained, as above) and accurately reported in the ES.	Surveys regarding reptile and aquatic invertebrates were undertaken within the suitable survey window in accordance with best practice guidance (Table 8-3 in ES Chapter 8 (Biodiversity)) (TR010039/APP/6.1). Details of these surveys have been reported in the ES in Appendix 8.4, 8.5 and 8.7 (TR010039/APP/6.3).
8.7.1- 8.7.9 Potential effects	The Scoping Report does not identify mortality/injury of protected and/or priority species as a potential impact arising from the construction and operation of the	Mortality during the construction phase and operational phase of protected species have been considered in the ES for each

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	project. The Inspectorate considers that this should be assessed in the ES, for both the construction and operational phases of the development.	appropriate receptor. Please refer to Table 8-9 and 8-10 in ES Chapter 8 (Biodiversity) (TR010039/APP/6.1).
8.7.1- 8.7.9 Potential mitigation measures	The Inspectorate recommends that effort is made to agree any proposed mitigation and monitoring measures with relevant consultees including Natural England and the local planning authorities. The ES should detail all proposed mitigation measures and demonstrate how they will be secured.	Consultation has been undertaken with stakeholders regarding mitigation. The ES details the proposed mitigation, as agreed in principle with stakeholder, and included in the EMP (TR010039/APP/7.5). The mitigation measures set out in the EMP (TR010039/APP/7.5) will be secured through requirement 4 of the DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1).
8.8.27 vs 8.10.1 Level of assessment	The Scoping Report contradicts itself, proposing further assessment to a simple level in paragraph 8.8.27, and to a detailed level in the concluding paragraph. The Inspectorate considers further detailed level assessment is required.	A detailed assessment of each ecological receptor has been undertaken as part of the ES assessing both the characteristic of each receptor and conclusions which identified the significance of effect.
4.5 Geology and Soils (Scoping Report Section 9)		
N/A	<p>Relevant receptors - soil</p> <p>The Scoping Report omits reference to a soil assessment. The Inspectorate considers that the study area should be identified and an assessment of the potential impacts the Proposed Development may have on soils should be included in the ES.</p>	A soil assessment has been undertaken and is presented in Chapter 9 of the ES.
Section 9.2	<p>Study area</p> <p>The Scoping Report states that the study area is 'initially within a 100m radius of the Proposed Development and may 'increase depending on results of scheduled ground investigations' which will be used to establish the baseline conditions for the assessment. The extent of the proposed study area is not clear from this description. In addition, the Applicant has not identified the study area for the groundwater assessment. Within the ES the respective study areas should be</p>	The study areas are clearly defined within DMRB LA 109 and set out within the chapter, along with the application of professional judgement where required.

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	clearly defined and justified, and be sufficient to address the anticipated extent of potential impacts.	
Section 9.3	Existing and baseline knowledge The Scoping Report refers to a Preliminary Sources Study Report (PSSR) throughout but has not included the PSSR or an accessible reference to the report. If the PSSR is necessary to support the assessment of likely significant effects, it should be appended to the ES or be referenced and readily accessible.	A PSSR is referenced and appended to the chapter as Appendix 9.3 (TR010039/APP/6.3).
9.3.2 and Table 9.1	Baseline data Table 9.1 of the Scoping Report uses chainages to located and identify where changes insuperficial deposits along the route occur. No chainage sections or plans are provided within the Scoping Report. The ES should clearly describe the locations where changes in superficial deposits occur and make reference to clearly labelled plans as necessary.	Figure 9.1 Superficial deposits (TR010039/APP/6.2) shows the superficial deposits for the Proposed Scheme.
9.4.3 & 9.4.8	Assumptions and limitations The Scoping Report states that 'baseline conditions from site walkovers have been assumed to be accurate' but also that 'no site walkover was conducted'. Therefore the extent of the surveys undertaken to date is ambiguous. The ES should clearly describe the surveys that have been undertaken to inform the assessment. The surveys should be sufficient to ensure all relevant impacts have been identified and assessed where likely significant effects may occur. The Scoping Report states that 'it has been assumed that the Proposed Schemes will not disturb any areas of significantly contaminated ground'. The ES should clearly identify and justify any assumptions made.	The ES chapters include an 'assessment and limitations' section to clearly set out this information.
9.6.1	Consultation The Applicant should consult with the relevant local authority regarding the extent of known D4 contaminated land based on available data. The Applicant	Chapter 9 Geology and Soils includes details of consultation to date and sources from which the data were obtained.

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	should ensure that any data relied upon for the assessment, and the findings, are clearly presented within the ES.	
Section 9.6	<p>Consultation</p> <p>The Inspectorate has been made aware that National Grid has a high voltage power line and a high pressure gas transmission line within the Proposed Development site. The Applicant should ensure that any works or interactions with these assets that may result in likely significant effects are assessed in the ES.</p>	<p>The major hazard pipelines (high pressure gas and oil) have been considered in paragraph 4.1.1 of ES Chapter 4 Environmental Assessment Methodology (TR010039/APP/6.1) and are shown on ES Figure 2.3 (TR010039/APP/6.2). The safety risk associated with the pipelines has been considered within the Proposed Scheme risk register. Therefore further assessment of these pipeline within the ES has been scoped out.</p>
Section 9.7	<p>Monitoring and mitigation measures</p> <p>The Inspectorate notes that no reference has been made within the Scoping Report to any potential requirement for mitigation or monitoring measures. If mitigation and/or monitoring are required this should be described in the ES.</p>	<p>Mitigation is detailed in section 9.9 and monitoring in section 9.11 of ES Chapter 9 (Geology and soils) (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p> <p>The embedded mitigation is secured through Schedule 1 of the DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1) and the Works Plans (TR010039/APP/2.3) and any other mitigation required is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (TR010039/APP/7.4) which will be secured by requirement 4 of the DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1).</p>
Section 9.7	<p>Potential effects</p> <p>The Inspectorate notes that potential impacts on the Sutton Heath and Bog SSSI, which is located 50m from the Proposed Development, are not considered. The ES should include an assessment of the impacts to the SSSI if significant effects are likely to occur.</p>	<p>Within ES Chapter 9 Geology and soils (TR010039/APP/6.1) section 9.4 under 'update to guidance and scope of assessment' the assessment of designated geological sites has been scoped out of the assessment. However, section 9.10 deems impacts to Sutton Heath Bog SSSI to be low and cross references to the RDWE chapter for potential surface water impacts (TR010039/APP/6.1).</p>
4.6 Materials (Scoping Report Section 10)		

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
10.8.3	The Applicant has provided limited justification to support the approach that no significant effects to materials will occur during operation. However, having regard to the nature of the Proposed Development and its characteristics the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out.	Noted, operational effects are scoped out.
10.2.1-10.2.2	The Scoping Report has not defined the study area but states that it will be determined by 'the influence of the Proposed Scheme'. No information is provided on the methodology that will be applied to determine this. The Applicant should ensure that the study area is clearly defined and justified within the ES and encompasses the anticipated extent of potential impacts.	Assessment undertaken in (and study area and baselines defined) are per LA 110 within Chapter 10 Materials (TR010039/APP/6.1)
10.3	An assessment should be made and reported in the ES of the future baseline following construction.	The future baseline is set out and considered in the chapter, as per LA 110.
10.3.3	The ES should identify the location, capacity and existing waste infrastructure receptors in order to comprehensively assess the impacts that generation of waste during construction may have on the environment.	Location and capacity of existing landfill infrastructure and capacities established in the baseline.
10.3.4	The Inspectorate notes that baseline information on waste generation and waste management facilities will be obtained from local planning authorities in Norfolk. The Inspectorate understands that the Proposed Development is also located partly in Cambridgeshire, and therefore recommends that information should also be obtained from Cambridgeshire County Council where relevant.	Waste data taken from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency (2020) Waste Data Interrogator 2019 (December 2020). • Environment Agency (2020) Remaining Landfill Capacity (December 2020).
10.3.4	The Materials aspect chapter methodology should be set out in the ES in accordance with the methods recommended in the Highways Agency's Interim Advice Note (IAN) 153/11.	The methodology used for the assessment is set out within the Materials chapter 10 (TR010039/APP/6.1) in section 10.4 and is set out in LA 110.
10.9.2	The Scoping Report states that specific quantities of materials and waste generated by the Proposed Development will be estimated at a later stage as its design progresses. The ES should include an estimation of the quantity of	In accordance with LA 110, the ES includes an estimation of the quantity of construction materials required and waste arising. In accordance with LA 110, the scope no longer includes

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	construction materials required and waste arising. The packaging from construction materials should be included within the estimate of waste arising.	packaging from construction materials should be included within the estimate of waste arising.
4.7 Noise and vibration (Scoping Report Section 11)		
Temporal scope	The Scoping Report does not define either the 'long-term' or the 'future assessment year'. The temporal scope of the assessment must be clearly described in the ES.	<p>Appendix 11.1 'Glossary of terms' (TR010039/APP/6.3) defines 'Long-term' as "Noise change based on the +15 year assessment (for example Do-minimum opening year scenario (DMOY) against Do-minimum future year scenario (DMFY) and DMOY against Do-something future year scenario (DSFY)."</p> <p>Appendix 11.1 'Glossary of terms' defines 'Future year' as "The 15th year after opening."</p>
Survey data	The Scoping Report refers to results of 'previous assessments', although no other information is provided in respect of these. Survey data which is relied upon for the purposes of the assessment must be clearly referenced and be accessible or appended to the ES, as necessary.	The findings of a baseline noise survey undertaken in May & June 2018 are referenced in ES Chapter (Noise and Vibration) (TR010039/APP/6.1) and presented in Appendix 11.3 'Baseline noise survey' (TR010039/APP/6.3). This appendix describes the baseline noise survey study area, methodology (that is measurement procedure, equipment used etc), presents results in tabular and graphical format and includes photographs taken at site.
Receptors	The Scoping Report identifies two noisesensitive areas (NSAs) but only Sutton Heath Road is specifically named. The ES should include figures to support the textual description and that clearly identify the location of the relevant noise and vibration receptors for the assessment.	Figure 11.1 (Noise Location Plan) (TR010039/APP/6.2) presents the Noise Important Areas, noise sensitive receptors (dwellings), other-sensitive receptors, PRoW and SSSI. In addition Figure 11.1 presents the study areas for each of the assessments undertaken (TR010039/APP/6.2).
Receptors	Table 11.1 of the Scoping Report does not include hospitals, non-designated sites, or species, in the list of typical sensitive noise and vibration receptors.	Table 11-5: 'Operational noise model assumptions and limitations' (TR010039/APP/6.1) states the assumptions and

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	Impacts on such receptors should be assessed if it is considered that any could be significantly affected by the Proposed Development.	sources regarding noise-sensitive receptors. Section 11.7 paragraphs 11.7.9 to 11.7.13 (TR010039/APP/6.1) describe the types of receptors within the Operational Study Area and includes PRow, a hotel, a B&B etc. In addition NIAs and SSSIs are identified and discussed. Non-human receptors have not been included in the assessments undertaken.
Methodology	The Inspectorate notes that the Scoping Report states that surveys undertaken will be 'broadly in accordance' with 'The Calculation of Road Traffic Noise' (CRTN) methodology (HMSO, 1988). The methodological approach should be clearly set out in the ES and any departure from the standard guidance should be explained and justified.	Appendix 11.3 'Baseline noise survey' describes the baseline noise survey study area and includes a section on assessment methodology (TR010039/APP/6.3).
Assumptions and Limitations	The approach to the assessment set out in the Scoping Report has been provided in the absence of relevant information on potential noise and vibration impacts eg construction traffic movements, forecast traffic flows, speeds and percentage heavy goods data. Without this information it is difficult for Inspectorate and consultees to make meaningful comment. The ES should describe and assess impacts associated with these matters with sufficient detail and certainty where significant effects are likely to occur.	The ES describes and assesses the impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme in accordance with DMRB LA 111 Revision 2.
Terminology	The Scoping Report refers to potential impacts in the vicinity of the 'Proposed Scheme envelope'. This term is not explained or used elsewhere in the Scoping Report and it is unclear how it relates to the Proposed Development site or the study area. 'NIAs' is used in this chapter (and also in Chapter 1, paragraph 1.11.9) to refer to both 'Noise Impact Areas' and 'Noise Important Areas'. The terminology used in the ES should be applied correctly and consistently throughout in order to avoid confusion.	The term 'Proposed Scheme envelope' has not been used in the ES. The study areas associated with the operation and construction phases of the Proposed Scheme have been defined in the ES. The term 'Noise Impact Areas' has not been used in the ES. The term 'Noise Important Areas' has been used and a definition given in the ES chapter.
Methodology	The Inspectorate notes that the approach set out in BS5228-1:2009+A1:2014 (BSI, 2014) will be adopted for the construction	The assessment methodology for determining potential construction noise and vibration impacts associated with the Proposed Scheme has been described in the ES.

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	noise assessment. In addition to identifying the title of the guidance on which the Applicant intends to rely, the methodology should be described in the ES.	
	<p>The Scoping Report does not provide criteria for determining the sensitivity of receptors. This should be set out in the ES.</p> <p>The rationale for deciding what constitutes the 'Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level' (LOAEL) and the 'Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level' (SOAEL) has not been provided. The LOAEL and SOAEL used for the purposes of the assessment should be agreed with PCC and HDD, and justified in the ES.</p>	The ES states which sensitive receptors have been included in the assessments undertaken. LOAELs and SOAELs at all receptors for each of the assessments undertaken are stated and justifications provided in the ES.
4.8 Population and Human Health (formally People and Communities)		
Study area	<p>The ES should include a clear justification in support of the study areas especially given that they are in part based on professional judgement. The ES should also ensure that the study areas used are clearly depicted on corresponding figures to aid understanding.</p> <p>The Inspectorate notes that DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 8, paragraph 2.2 states that community facilities "and their catchment areas" should be addressed by the assessment. The ES should clearly explain how this requirement has been taken into account in the selection of appropriate study areas.</p>	The study area for land use and accessibility is 500m from the proposed scheme boundary in line with DMRB. The study area for human health has been determined depending on the communities likely to be affected by the Proposed Scheme. The 'catchment area' communities that will use community facilities have been included in the ES when assessing changes to access.
Baseline- Public right of way (PRoW)	The Scoping Report states that surveys undertaken in February 2017 revealed low usage of PRoW. The Inspectorate considers that further surveys should be undertaken at including at other times of the year as usage could vary according to the season.	Further surveys have been undertaken in May and June 2018, and their results used to inform the assessment.
Baseline- community	No baseline information is presented for community severance. The ES must include a description of the baseline conditions against which the Proposed Development is assessed. The baseline conditions should be informed by relevant local information,	The ES Chapter 12 (Population and human health) (TR010039/APP/6.1) includes baseline description of community severance. Relevant local information from Sutton Parish Council on use of Wansford picnic area included.

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	including information provided by Sutton Parish Council relating to use of the Wansford picnic area and pedestrian and cyclist usage.	Consultation undertaken with Sutton Parish Council on usage of PRoW. This information is detailed under 'Consultation' in section 12.4 Assessment Methodology (TR010039/APP/6.1).
Baseline- local economy	The baseline information to inform the assessment on local economy uses an index of deprivation alone. The Inspectorate considers that data on local levels of employment should also be used to inform the assessment.	Information on the local economy has been included in the Economic Appraisal Package. A cross reference to this has been included in the chapter, under 'update to guidance and scope of assessment'.
Construction	Adverse impacts from construction (eg from community severance, land-take, etc) have been identified as temporary. The ES should explain the duration of impacts and what constitutes a temporary impact for the purposes of the assessment.	Where temporary impacts have been identified, their duration has been stated (i.e, a construction phase, or when all construction has finished). Permanent impacts from construction have also been identified; these are stated as permanent and reasoning for this provided.
Methodology- view from the road	The Scoping Report states that in the assessment of views from the road, "consideration will not be given to the existing conditions experienced by motorised travellers or construction stage effects, as DMRB considers only impacts for the new road". The Inspectorate does not agree and requires that the ES must consider the baseline conditions and assess the impacts of the Proposed Development against this baseline for all phases of development (including construction) where it is considered that significant effects are likely to occur.	Views from the road is no longer a requirement to be included in the Population and human health chapter due to the revised DMRB guidance.
4.9 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Scoping Report Section 13)		
13.2.1	The Scoping Report states that 'a number of water features within a 1km area' are included within the study area. No explanation or justification is provided in support of the 1km study area. Anglian Water note in their scoping consultation response (contained in Appendix 2 of this Opinion) that there are existing water	The study area is based on professional judgement to ensure that effects are sufficiently identified and a 1km corridor surrounding the footprint of the proposed scheme boundary is considered appropriate.

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	<p>mains within the site boundary. The Inspectorate considers that potential impacts on this infrastructure should be assessed in the ES where significant effects are likely.</p> <p>The study area used should be clearly defined and justified in the ES</p>	Impacts on existing water infrastructure are considered within Chapter 13 of the ES.
13.2.1	The Inspectorate notes that the Scoping Report fails to state the study area to be used for the assessment of groundwater impacts. The ES should include a relevant study area for the assessment of groundwater impacts.	The study area is also appropriate for groundwater impacts, and the description of the study area clearly makes reference to both surface water and groundwater impacts in the ES chapter.
13.5.3	Reference is made to implementing the requirements of 'The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017'. The Applicant should take care to ensure that the EIA accords with the 2017 Infrastructure Planning EIA Regulations, and that the correct legislation is reflected in the ES.	Noted. The ES chapter does not make reference to the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.
13.7	The Scoping Report refers to 'appropriate mitigation' and states that 'mitigation measures will be set out in the CEMP'. Required mitigation measures must be described in the ES and an assessment of their efficacy included. The ES should cross-refer confirming where and how mitigation relied upon in the assessment is secured.	<p>Mitigation measures are described in the ES chapter, and an assessment of their efficacy is included in the impact assessment tables.</p> <p>The embedded mitigation is secured through Schedule 1 of the DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1) and the Works Plans (TR010039/APP/2.3) and any other mitigation required is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (TR010039/APP/7.4) which will be secured by requirement 4 of the DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1).</p>
13.7.1 and 13.7.14	The Inspectorate notes that the Sacrewell Farm overbridge would require demolition and that 'significant embankment construction' would be required. An assessment of the environmental impacts that may occur from these works should be included within the ES.	Design changes have occurred since the scoping report, and the access road to Sacrewell Farm now passes through an underpass as opposed to an overbridge. The ES considers environmental impacts that may occur from this, although

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
		further information (via supplementary GI) is required to fully confirm the dewatering requirements.
13.7.7	The extent of any works required to the public sewerage system is unclear. Noting that the potential for water pollution and flooding impacts is identified in the Scoping Report, the Applicant is advised to consult Anglian Water at the earliest opportunity in relation to works that may be needed during the construction and/or operational phases of the Proposed Development.	<p>A number of utilities diversions are required as part of the scheme, and where details are available these have been considered in the ES chapter.</p> <p>Anglian Water has been consulted on historic flooding. Discussions are ongoing with Anglian Water in relation to their infrastructure and whether any protective provisions are required in the DCO for their benefit.</p>
13.8.2	The Applicant may wish to consider whether it would be more appropriate for the assessment of aquatic ecology to be undertaken within the Biodiversity aspect chapter rather than this aspect chapter.	The RDWE chapter considers impacts in terms of conveyance of flow and water availability for aquatic ecology only. It follows the LA113 standard for assessment of Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems.
4.10 Climate (Scoping Report section 14)		
Section 14.2	The extent of the study area for this aspect assessment is not included in the Scoping report. It must be described and justified in the ES.	This is provided within the ES Chapter 14 Climate Section 14.6 (TR010039/APP/6.1).
1.1.1 (below 14.2.2)	The Inspectorate notes that the Applicant considers that there may be interrelationships between this and other aspects that are assessed elsewhere in the ES. The ES should describe the nature of the inter-relationships and clearly crossrefer relevant information contained in other aspect chapters.	This is provided within the ES Chapter 15, Cumulative Effects Assessment (TR010039/APP/6.1).
14.3.1	The Scoping Report refers to 'Peterborough County Council greenhouse gas emissions', and references a footnote which may provide an explanation but is missing. The Applicant should ensure that all information relevant to the assessment of likely significant effects is provided in the ES.	The update to DMRB LA 114 requests the baseline data to "include current operational maintenance GHG emissions and operational user GHG emissions". This baseline data is presented within the ES Chapter 14 Climate Section 14.7.2 (TR010039/APP/6.1).

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
14.3.8	As set out in the NPSNN, the Applicant's assessment of likely significant effects should take into account the potential impacts of climate change using the latest UK climate projections. This should include the anticipated UKCP18 projections where appropriate.	UKCP18 data has been applied and reported on in the ES Climate Chapter 14 Section 14.7.5 (TR010039/APP/6.1).
Section 14.7	The Inspectorate notes that mitigation intended to address the effects during construction of the Proposed Development on and its vulnerability to climate change would be contained in a CEMP. The ES should identify the potential impacts and the specific mitigation measures required providing a clear cross-reference to information contained in the CEMP (where relevant) and explaining how and where such measures are secured.	This is provided within the ES Chapter 14 Section 14.9 (TR010039/APP/6.1). The embedded mitigation is secured through Schedule 1 of the DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1) and the Works Plans (TR010039/APP/2.3) and any other mitigation required is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (TR010039/APP/7.5) which will be secured by requirement 4 of the DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1).
14.9.6	The Inspectorate notes that the Applicant intends to use the 'Mott MacDonald Carbon Portal' to predict the CO2 and greenhouse gases emissions of the Proposed Development. The methodology applied to the assessment should be clearly set out in the ES and include details of the model used to inform the assessment and how it relates to relevant national policy, guidance and standards.	The use of the Mott MacDonald Carbon Portal was not carried out in the final assessment as Sweco did not have access to this tool. We used the Highways England tool only, the methodology is provided within the ES Chapter 14 Section 14.4 (TR010039/APP/6.1) and associated ES appendix 14.1 (TR010039/APP/6.3).
Section 14.9	It is not explained in the Scoping Report how the significance of effects resulting from the Proposed Development will be determined and what would constitute a significant effect. This should be included in the ES within the description of the methodology section.	This is provided within the ES Chapter 14 Climate Section 14.4 (TR010039/APP/6.1).
4.11 Combined and cumulative effects (Scoping Report Section 15)		
	The rationale for selecting a 2km ZOI for the CEA is unclear, as it is indicated under 'Assumptions and Limitations' that the other developments to be included in the CEA have not yet been identified. The Applicant should ensure that the study area is sufficient to encompass all developments that together with the Proposed Development could generate significant cumulative effects, and must justify the	The ES includes a justification of the CE study area within the assessment methodology section. The 2km study area/ ZOI has been selected as 2km is the largest study area within the ES topics (biodiversity) and ensures that potential cumulative

Topic or aspect and Scoping Opinion paragraph reference	Scoping Response	Where Addressed in the ES
	<p>approach in the ES. Effort should be made to agree the study area with relevant consultees including PCC and HDC.</p>	<p>impacts would be identified between the Proposed Scheme and other developments.</p> <p>Emails and follow up made to Peetrborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council. No response received.</p>
	<p>The Applicant should consult relevant consultees including HDC and PCC in effort to agree the baseline information and the list of developments to be included in the CEA.</p> <p>In addition to identifying the combined and cumulative residual effects following the implementation of mitigation, the ES should identify the potential effects prior to mitigation and the measures proposed to address them. Mitigation measures relied upon in the ES should be identified and cross-reference should be made to information confirming where and how these measures are secured.</p>	<p>Emails and follow up made to Peetrborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council. No response received.</p> <p>Potential effects prior to mitigation are included in the single project effects table. Mitigation measures are secured in the Environmental Management Plan- this has been included in the chapter.</p> <p>The embedded mitigation is secured through Schedule 1 of the DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1) and the Works Plans (TR010039/APP/2.3) and any other mitigation required is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (TR010039/APP/7.5) which will be secured by requirement 4 of the DCO (TR010039/APP/3.1).</p>
	<p>The significance criteria that will be used for the assessment is unclear. Reference is made to Table 15.4 of the DMRB as setting out the combined and cumulative effects significance criteria that will be applied to</p> <p>the assessment. However, the only table contained in the DMRB which appears relevant is Table 2.6 'Determining Significance of Cumulative Effects', and it is not clear how this relates to the information contained in Table 15.2 in the Scoping Report, titled 'Combined and Cumulative Significance Criteria', as they reflect different terminology and criteria. The criteria used for the assessment must be clearly and consistently described and applied throughout the aspect chapter.</p>	<p>Significance criteria is outlined in the 'Methodology' section of ES Chapter 15 (Cumulative effects) (TR010039/APP/6.1) and is consistent with the methodology required in advice note 17.</p>