

<b>Principal Issue in Question</b>	<b>The brief concern held by Climate Emergency Planning and Policy as reported on in full in WR</b>	<b>What needs to; change, or be included, or amended so as to overcome the disagreement</b>	<b>Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination.</b>
<p><b>1</b> CATEGORICALLY, there is no assessment of the impact of cumulative carbon emissions in the ES.</p>	<p>Categorically, no such cumulative assessment has been attempted. It is <b>not</b> that a cumulative assessment of carbon emissions has been attempted, and I disagree with the way it has been done. It is that a cumulative assessment of carbon emissions has not been done at all in the ES and the Application. See my Written Representation [REP1-nnn], section 5.</p>	<p>The Applicant needs to amend the assessment in ES, Chapter 7, Climate. The amendment should extend the existing assessment so that there is an assessment of the impact of cumulative carbon emissions.</p>	<p>The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.</p>
<p><b>2</b> It is a legal requirement in assessing the significance of the scheme to include the cumulative impact of the Scheme with existing and/or approved projects and that the Applicant has, instead, considered only the impact of the Scheme in isolation in Table 7-24 (the only assessment made of carbon emissions).</p>	<p>As above, the omission is unlawful with respect to the EIA Regulations 2017 (“the 2017 Regulations”).</p> <p>See section 5.5 and Appendix A of my Written Representation [REP1-nnn].</p>	<p>As above, the Applicant needs to amend the assessment in ES, Chapter 7, Climate.</p>	<p>Should the concern not be addressed by the Applicant, then the Examining Authority is respectfully requested to consider whether it is necessary for the ES to contain further information. The Examining Authority is requested to give consideration to Reg 20 (1) of the 2017 Regulations which provides the Examining authority with the option to ‘suspend consideration of the application’ if it is necessary for</p>

<b>A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project Planning Examination 2022-2023</b>	<b>Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statements (PADSS) Working version at Deadline 1 (D1), December 18<sup>th</sup> 2022</b>
--	---

			the ES to contain further information.
<p><b>3</b> Table 7-2 of “Relevant NPSNN Policies” fails to include NPSNN 4.4.</p>	<p>NPS NN 4.4: <i>“In this context, environmental, safety, social and economic benefits and adverse impacts, should be considered at national, regional and local levels.”</i></p> <p>This should, at least, be included under the “Carbon Emissions” part of the Table.</p>	<p>For NPSNN 4.4 to be included in Table 7-2 under “Carbon Emissions”, and then to be followed in the assessment.</p>	<p>The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.</p>
<p><b>4</b> At 7.5.22, the Applicant states that operational emissions will only be assessed against the 6th carbon budget period (and Table 7.24 reflects this).</p>	<p>This does not follow the applicant’s own LA114 guidance as above to report GHG emissions against each carbon budget period (5th and 6th carbon budgets for operational emissions, see also WR section 3.3.</p>	<p>The assessment of operational emissions should be extended to the 5<sup>th</sup> carbon budget in-line with DMRB guidance.</p>	<p>The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.</p>
<p><b>5</b> The ‘Do-minimum’ (“DM”) GHG scenarios at ES section 7.8.3, Table 7-10 are different baselines between the base year 2019 and the other years 2029 and 2044.</p>	<p>The DM baseline for GHGs should be the same at each year considered, see WR section 2.1. This is a key causal factor why the ES contains no cumulative assessment of the climate impacts from carbon emissions.</p>	<p>The 2029 and 2044 years should have a baseline based only on “The baseline traffic model”.</p> <p>“Other schemes promoted by National Highways” (null in this case), and “Local land based and road developments” should be excluded from the DM model so these elements may be cumulatively assessed.</p>	<p>The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.</p>

<p><b>6</b> The Applicant makes the claim that the IEMA guidance says that a spatial approach to a cumulative assessment for GHG emissions is not appropriate. [APP-050]/section 7.4.4.</p>	<p>This is not correct. See section 5.6 of my Written Representation [REP1-nnn].</p>	<p>ES section 7.4.4 requires redrafting to properly reflect the IEMA guidance, and genuinely report the Applicant’s alignment to it.</p>	<p>The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.</p>
<p><b>7</b> The applicant refers to IEMA as relevant guidance, and that ES “broadly aligns with IEMA guidance” (see WR, section 6.1).</p>	<p>This is false as the applicant has taken the very opposite approach to the best practice guidance from IEMA for making an EIA assessment of carbon emissions and assessing significance. IEMA guidance says that contextualisation of the carbon emissions assessment should be done, and the Applicant has not done this.</p>	<p>ES section 7.4.4 requires redrafting to properly reflect the IEMA guidance, and genuinely report the Applicant’s alignment to it.</p>	<p>The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.</p>
<p><b>8</b> The impact of the A66 scheme is reported as being estimated, and is then assessed by reference to, the ‘difference’ between the DS and DM scenarios. Therefore, the resulting assessment of the significance of impact is actually based only on the emissions from the Scheme itself and is not cumulative.</p>	<p>See section 5.7 of my Written Representation [REP1-nnn].</p>	<p>The Applicant needs to amend the assessment in ES, Chapter 7, Climate. The amendment should extend the existing assessment so that there is an assessment of the impact of cumulative carbon emissions.</p>	<p>The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.</p>

<p><b>9</b> The applicant has said, on other projects, that the Applicant’s ES achieved a cumulative assessment as the emissions from the Scheme were compared against the benchmark of a national carbon budget. This is illogical as national carbon budgets are being used as a <u>benchmark</u> in the comparison being made. They are not being used as an estimate of the Scheme’s cumulative emissions.</p>	<p>See section 5.7 of my Written Representation [REP1-<u>nnn</u>].</p>	<p>The Applicant needs to amend the assessment in ES, Chapter 7, Climate. The amendment should extend the existing assessment so that there is an assessment of the impact of cumulative carbon emissions.</p>	<p>The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.</p>
<p><b>10</b> The Applicant claims that the ES “broadly aligns with IEMA guidance” at ES 7.4.4. This is false because the IEMA guidance says that a comparison against national budgets is only a starting place and a limited method of assessment, but the Applicant only makes such a comparison against national budgets.</p>	<p>See section 6.2 of my Written Representation [REP1-<u>nnn</u>].</p>	<p>ES section 7.4.4 requires redrafting to properly reflect the IEMA guidance, and genuinely report the Applicant’s alignment to it.</p>	<p>The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.</p>
<p><b>11</b> The Applicant claims that the ES “broadly aligns with IEMA guidance”. This is false because the IEMA guidance says that contextualisation of the carbon emissions assessment should be done, and the Applicant has not done this.</p>	<p>See section 6.2 of my Written Representation [REP1-<u>nnn</u>].</p>	<p>ES section 7.4.4 requires redrafting to properly reflect the IEMA guidance, and genuinely report the Applicant’s alignment to it.</p>	<p>The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.</p>

<p><b>12</b> The Applicant claims that the ES “broadly aligns with IEMA guidance”.</p>	<p>This is false because the IEMA guidance says that contextualisation of the carbon emissions assessment should be done against local, regional and sectorial budgets and targets, but the Applicant has attempted none of these.</p>	<p>ES section 7.4.4 requires redrafting to properly reflect the IEMA guidance, and genuinely report the Applicant’s alignment to it.</p>	<p>The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.</p>
<p><b>13</b> The scheme is an EIA scheme, but the ES fails to follow the EIA guidance from the European commission.</p>	<p>See section 6.2 of my Written Representation [REP1-nnn].</p>	<p>The Applicant needs to amend the assessment in ES, Chapter 7, Climate. The amendment should extend the existing assessment so that there is an assessment of the impact of cumulative carbon emissions.</p>	<p>The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.</p>
<p><b>14</b> The ES for the scheme fails to follow NPSNN 4.4</p>	<p>See section 6.2 of my Written Representation [REP1-nnn].</p>	<p>The Applicant needs to amend the assessment in ES, Chapter 7, Climate. The amendment should extend the existing assessment so that there is an assessment of the impact of cumulative carbon emissions.</p>	<p>The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.</p>
<p><b>15</b> The scheme, when assessed against the IEMA significance schema in the IEMA guidance, is “Major Adverse” and significant.</p>	<p>This has been demonstrated by three contextualisation methods in section 7 of Written Representation [REP1-nnn].</p>	<p>The assessment in the ES needs to be replaced.</p>	<p>The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.</p>

<b>A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project Planning Examination 2022-2023</b>	<b>Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statements (PADSS) Working version at Deadline 1 (D1), December 18<sup>th</sup> 2022</b>
--	---

<b>16</b> The impact on Climate Change from the carbon emissions of the scheme is non-negligible. The increase in carbon emissions resulting from the proposed scheme are so significant that it would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction target,	This has been demonstrated by three contextualisation methods in section 7 of Written Representation [REP1-nnn].	The assessment in the ES needs to be replaced.	The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.
<b>17</b> The data in Table 7-24 is incorrect	see section 3 of my Written Representation [REP1-nnn].	I have provided a corrected versions for the Applicant to agree at Table CEPP.WR.2 of my Written Representation [REP1-nnn].	The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.
<b>18</b> The applicant failed for follow DMRB LA114	see section 3.3 of my Written Representation [REP1-nnn].	DMRB LA114 needs to be followed	The concern may be addressed by the Applicant on its own volition acknowledging the issue, and amending the ES as required to rectify it.