

M60/M62/M66 Simister Island Interchange

TR010064

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT APPENDICES

APPENDIX 4.1 SCOPING OPINION RESPONSE TABLE

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)

Planning Act 2008

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

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

**M60/M62/M66 Simister Island Interchange
Development Consent Order 202[]**

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT APPENDICES
APPENDIX 4.1 SCOPING OPINION RESPONSE TABLE**

Regulation Reference	Regulation 5(2)(a)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010064
Application Document Reference	TR010064/APP/6.3
Author	M60/M62/M66 Simister Island Interchange Costain Jacobs Partnership Project Team & National Highways

Version	Date	Status of Version
P01	April 2024	DCO APPLICATION ISSUE

CONTENTS

Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion response table	1
1.1 Scoping Opinion request.....	1
1.2 Scoping Opinion comments and signposting to the Applicant's responses.....	1
Acronyms and initialisms	35

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Scoping Opinion comments and signposting to the Applicant's responses.....	2
--	---

Appendix 4.1 Scoping Opinion response table

1.1 Scoping Opinion request

1.1.1 A Scoping Opinion was sought from the Planning Inspectorate in July 2021, with the submission by National Highways (the Applicant) of an Environmental Scoping Report to the Planning Inspectorate under Regulation 10 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The Environmental Scoping Report set out the scope of works and methods to be applied in carrying out the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), as well as the structure and contents of the Environmental Statement. The Environmental Scoping Report is included in Volume 6.6 of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application (TR010064/APP/6.6).

1.2 Scoping Opinion comments and signposting to the Applicant's responses

1.2.1 A Scoping Opinion was issued by the Planning Inspectorate on 12 August 2021. The Scoping Opinion is included in Volume 6.7 of the DCO application (TR010064/APP/6.7).

1.2.2 Table 1.1 signposts to where each of the comments provided in the Scoping Opinion have been responded to within the Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1). Some of the comments in Sections 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 and 2.2 of the Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion (TR010064/APP/6.7) have not been reproduced in Table 1.1 as these comments only provided context to the Planning Inspectorate's specific comments from Section 2.3 of the Scoping Opinion (TR010064/APP/6.7) onwards.

1.2.3 No late responses to the Scoping Opinion (TR010064/APP/6.7) were received by the Applicant from the Planning Inspectorate. However, Bury Metropolitan Borough Council subsequently provided their comments on the Environmental Scoping Report (TR010064/APP/6.6) directly to the Applicant. Table 4.2 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology of the Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) provides Bury Metropolitan Borough Council's comments on the Environmental Scoping Report (TR010064/APP/6.6) and the Applicant's responses.

Table 1.1 Scoping Opinion comments and signposting to the Applicant's responses

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
Scoping Opinion Chapter 1. Introduction		
1.1.13	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 <i>'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)'</i> .	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
1.1.14	As set out at paragraphs 5.5.2, 6.3.25 and 9.7.7 – 9.7.8 of the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate notes the potential need to carry out an assessment under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 ('the Habitats Regulations') (HRA) as amended by The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. Any HRA must be co-ordinated with the EIA in accordance with Regulation 26 of the EIA Regulations.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
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.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
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 provided, along with copies of their comments, at Appendix 2, to which the Applicant should refer in preparing their ES.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
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.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
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 preparing their ES.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
Scoping Opinion Chapter 2. The Proposed Development		
2.3.1	The Inspectorate notes references in section 2.4.3 that <i>“the source of potential material for earthworks has not yet been determined”</i> and that <i>“there is still expected to be a significant shortfall of material, estimated at approximately 163,000m³. Various options will be explored to obtain this material from local sources, including other nearby construction projects which have a surplus of suitable fill, as well as local quarries”</i> . The Environmental Statement (ES) should describe the land use requirement of the Proposed Development and the nature and quantity of materials and natural resources to be used during construction and operation, including water, land, soil and biodiversity. This should include materials to be imported (and their source), exported, excavated or stored on site and a description of any topographical and landscape changes as a result of the Proposed Development.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
2.3.2	The Inspectorate also notes the current uncertainty in the locations for the main construction compound and smaller satellite compounds, with the state locations only “likely to be” those stated. The ES should present fixed locations and specifications for these compounds or otherwise present an assessment of effects of specified options that are under consideration and for which consent is sought under the DCO.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
2.3.3	The Proposed Development “ <i>would result in an additional paved area of approximately 1.27ha, which would require additional attenuation storage to reduce the risk of flooding</i> ”. It is explained that this additional increase would be met by balancing ponds, ditches, swales or online storage in pipes. The description of the Proposed Development in the ES should clearly define and identify the locations and parameters of such features as part of the description of the design so that they can be properly considered across relevant aspects of the ES.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
2.3.4	Paragraph 5.2.4 of the ES defines the assumptions around ‘opening year’ and ‘design year’ for the purpose of the construction and operational assessment in the EIA. No reference is made in the EIA scoping report to the design life of the Proposed Development or any approach to the assessment of effects of decommissioning. The Inspectorate understands that the road would likely remain a permanent and integral part of the strategic road network, but the approach to the assessment of decommissioning should be set out in the ES.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
2.3.5	The EIA Regulations require that the Applicant provide ‘ <i>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</i> ’.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
2.3.6	The Inspectorate acknowledges the Applicant’s intention to consider alternatives within the ES, and that an outline of such considerations to date is provided in chapter 3 of the Scoping Report. The ES will provide a full description of the alternatives considered and should include justification as to why the preferred options were selected taking into account environmental effects.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
2.3.7	The Inspectorate acknowledges the Applicant's intention to consider alternatives within the ES, and that an outline of such considerations to date is provided in chapter 3 of the Scoping Report. The ES will provide a full description of the alternatives considered and should include justification as to why the preferred options were selected taking into account environmental effects.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
2.3.8	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 wideranging as to represent effectively different developments. The development parameters should be clearly defined in the draft DCO (dDCO) and in the accompanying ES. 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.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
2.3.9	It should be noted that if the Proposed Development materially changes prior to submission of the DCO application, the Applicant may wish to consider requesting a new scoping opinion.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
Scoping Opinion Chapter 3. Environmental Statement (ES) Approach		
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' and associated appendices.	Noted. No response required.

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
3.1.2	Aspects/ matters (as defined in Advice Note Seven) 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.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.1.3	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 the receipt of a Scoping Opinion should not prevent the Applicant from subsequently agreeing with the relevant consultation bodies 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 aspects/ matters have been appropriately addressed, the ES should explain the reasoning for scoping them out and justify the approach taken.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.1.4	The ES should provide reference to how the delivery of measures proposed to prevent/ minimise adverse effects is secured through dDCO requirements (or other suitably robust methods) and whether relevant consultation bodies agree on the adequacy of the measures proposed.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.2.1	Sector-specific National Policy Statements (NPSs) are produced by the relevant Government Departments and set out national policy for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (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.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.2.2	The designated NPS in respect of the Proposed Development is the NPS for National Networks (NPS NN).	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
3.3.1	<p>The Inspectorate recommends that in order to assist the decision-making process, the Applicant uses tables to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate how the assessment has taken account of this Opinion; • Identify and collate the residual effects after mitigation for each of the aspect chapters, including the relevant interrelationships and cumulative effects; • Set out the proposed mitigation and/ or monitoring measures including cross-reference to the means of securing such measures (eg a dDCO requirement); • Describe any remedial measures that are identified as being necessary following monitoring; • Identify where details are contained in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA report) (where relevant), such as descriptions of National Site Network sites and their locations, together with any mitigation or compensation measures, that inform the findings of the ES. 	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.2	<p>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. This could be presented in 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.</p>	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.3	<p>The ES should include a description of the baseline scenario with and without implementation of the 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.</p>	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
3.3.4	In light of the number of ongoing developments within the vicinity of the Proposed Development site, the Applicant should clearly state which developments will be assumed to be under construction or operational as part of the future baseline. The Inspectorate makes these comments particularly in respect of the “ <i>Significant road developments and improvements</i> ” proposed as part of the Manchester North-West Quadrant (MNWQ) scheme and the 55,000 additional homes and 50,000 additional jobs by predicted by 2031 within the Greater Manchester City Region. The ES should distinguish between developments in the future baselines that form part of any cumulative impact assessment or are inherent in traffic forecasting and any other assumptions.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology Table 15.5 of Chapter 15: Assessment of Cumulative Effects
3.3.5	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.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.6	The Inspectorate expects the ES to include a chapter setting out the overarching methodology for the assessment, which clearly distinguishes effects that are 'significant' from 'non-significant' effects. Any departure from that methodology should be described in individual aspect assessment chapters.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.7	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.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.8	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.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
3.3.9	Any mitigation relied upon for the purposes of the assessment should be explained in detail within the ES. 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 reference to specific dDCO requirements or other legally binding agreements, particularly making clear distinctions between mitigation that is assumed as embedded in the design and any proposed as additional measures in response to significant adverse effects identified.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.10	There are also references to a “1 st Iteration of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP)” being provided as part of the Application, containing all measures, including a Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC). Although the Inspectorate acknowledges that the First Iteration EMP will provide framework for the future production of a “more detailed 2 nd Iteration”, the EMP that supports the DCO Application should be sufficiently detailed so as to understand the reliance being placed upon it as mitigation in avoiding potentially significant adverse effects.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.11	The ES should identify and describe any proposed monitoring of significant adverse effects and how the results of such monitoring would be utilised to inform any necessary remedial actions.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.12	<p>Paragraphs 5.2.9 – 5.2.13 of the Scoping Report sets out the Applicant’s approach to consideration of major accidents and disasters. The Applicant has undertaken a risk assessment in Appendix C to the Scoping Report, concluding that that there are two residual risks remaining that would need to be addressed through the design of the Proposed Development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inland floods; and • Mass movements and ground hazards. 	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.13	The Inspectorate notes that consideration of these matters will be given in the following proposed chapters within the ES:	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 10: Geology and Soils • Chapter 13: Population and Human Health • Chapter 14: Road Drainage and the Water Environment; and • Chapter 15: Climate. 	
3.3.14	The Inspectorate acknowledges the assessment provided in Appendix C of the Scoping Report and is content that the ES does not need to include a standalone major accidents and/or disaster aspect chapter, on the basis that such impacts which have the potential for significant effects are to be assessed in the relevant aspect chapters.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.15	The ES should ensure that the consideration of major accidents and/or events reflects the Proposed Development for which development consent is being sought, acknowledging that some of these matters will be addressed through further design iteration post-EIA scoping.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.16	The Applicant should make use of appropriate guidance (e.g. that referenced in the Health and Safety Executives (HSE) Annex to the Inspectorate's Advice Note 11) to better understand the likelihood of an occurrence and the Proposed Development's susceptibility to potential major accidents and hazards. The description and assessment should consider the vulnerability of the Proposed Development to a potential accident or disaster and also the Proposed Development's potential to cause an accident or disaster. Any measures that will be employed to prevent and control significant effects should be presented in the ES.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.17	Relevant information available and obtained through risk assessments pursuant to national legislation may be used for this purpose. 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.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
3.3.18	The ES should include a description and assessment (where relevant) of the likely significant effects the Proposed Development has on climate (for example having regard to the nature and magnitude of greenhouse gas emissions) and the vulnerability of the project to climate change. This is acknowledged by the Applicant at Chapter 15 of the Scoping Report. Where relevant, the ES should describe and assess the adaptive capacity that has been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development. This may include, for example, alternative measures such as changes in the use of materials or construction and design techniques that will be more resilient to risks from climate change. Further comments on this aspect are provided in section 4.10 of this Scoping Opinion.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.19	Schedule 4 Part 5 of the EIA Regulations requires a description of the likely significant transboundary effects to be provided in an ES.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.20	Paragraphs 5.2.16 – 5.2.18 and Appendix D of the Scoping Report set out the Applicant’s position that the Proposed Development is not likely to have significant effects on a European Economic Area (EEA) State.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.21	Having considered the nature and location of the Proposed Development as set out in the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate is not aware that there are potential pathways of effect to any EEA states.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.3.22	A reference list detailing the sources used for the descriptions and assessments must be included in the ES.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.4.1	The Inspectorate understands government enforced measures in response to COVID-19 may have consequences for an Applicant’s ability to obtain relevant environmental information for the purposes of their ES. The Inspectorate understands that conducting specific surveys and obtaining representative data may be difficult in the current circumstance.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
3.4.2	The Inspectorate has a duty to ensure that the environmental assessments necessary to inform a robust DCO application are supported by relevant and up to date information. Working closely with consultation bodies, the Inspectorate will seek to adopt a flexible approach, balancing the requirement for suitable rigour and scientific certainty in assessments with pragmatism in order to support the preparation and determination of applications in a timely fashion.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.4.3	Applicants should make effort to agree their approach to the collection and presentation of information with relevant consultation bodies. In turn the Inspectorate expects that consultation bodies will work with Applicants to find suitable approaches and points of reference to allow preparation of applications at this time. The Inspectorate is required to take into account the advice it receives from the consultation bodies and will continue to do so in this regard.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.4.4	The ES should include information to demonstrate how such further engagement has been undertaken and how it has influenced the scope of the assessments reported in the ES. The Applicant recognises these needs in paragraph 5.3.5 of the Scoping Report. The ES should clearly state where restrictions have impacted on proposed survey effort, the revised approach and any limitations to the assessment of likely significant effects.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.5.1	In some circumstances it will be appropriate for information to be kept confidential. In particular, this may relate to personal information specifying the names and qualifications of those undertaking the assessments and / or 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.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
3.5.2	Where documents are intended to remain confidential the Applicant should provide these as separate documents with their confidential nature clearly indicated in the title and watermarked as such on each page, and a narrative as to the particular nature of sensitivity of the information. The information should not be incorporated within other documents that are intended for publication or which the Inspectorate would be required to disclose under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
3.5.3	The Inspectorate adheres to the data protection protocols set down by the Information Commissioners Office. Please refer to the Inspectorate's National Infrastructure privacy notice ⁴ for further information on how personal data is managed during the Planning Act 2008 process.	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
Scoping Opinion Chapter 4. Aspect-based Scoping Tables		
4.1.1	Paragraph 6.2.1 states <i>"it is assumed that road traffic assessment of changes in road traffic during construction is scoped out"</i> . Paragraph 6.4.2 appears to be contradictory, stating that <i>"construction traffic screening will be undertaken for the worst-case construction year as per DMRB LA 105...it is unlikely that any road will meet the screening criteria and therefore further assessment is likely to be scoped out"</i> . The same paragraph also states that <i>"a construction traffic assessment should be completed if the construction duration is longer than 2 years"</i> . For the avoidance of doubt (and as the construction traffic screening exercise remains to be carried out), the Inspectorate does not agree that this matter can be scoped out of the assessment at this stage.	Table 5.7 of Chapter 5: Air Quality
4.1.2	The Inspectorate agrees that the assessment of construction dust effects on human and ecological receptors is, by definition, limited to the construction phase and that this matter can be scoped out.	Table 5.7 of Chapter 5: Air Quality

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
4.1.3	<p>The Applicant states that as per DMRB LA 105 paragraph 2.21.4, it is not proposed to model PM_{2.5} concentrations. The DMRB paragraph in question states that “<i>modelling of PM₁₀ can be used to demonstrate the project does not impact on the PM_{2.5} air quality threshold</i>”. Whilst the definition of the Affected Road Network (ARN), Traffic Reliability Area (TRA) and subsequent detailed modelling of PM₁₀ are to be confirmed and undertaken at a later stage in the EIA process, the Inspectorate does not agree that significant effects in terms of PM_{2.5} increases can be entirely discounted at this stage. The ES should therefore demonstrate how PM₁₀ modelling allows significant effects in terms of PM_{2.5} to be discounted or otherwise provide an assessment of such effects.</p>	Table 5.7 of Chapter 5: Air Quality
4.1.4	<p>Figure 6.1 appears to show the alignment of the “<i>Stage 2 Affected Road Network</i>” nodes being somewhat distant from the actual alignments of the road as shown on the base map. This then potentially affects the inclusion / identification of receptors within the 200m buffer zone. The ES should present how the modelled nodes are more accurately representative of the road network and sensitive / representative human health and ecological receptors depicted on the same plan.</p>	Table 5.7 of Chapter 5: Air Quality
4.1.5	<p>The ES should clearly present and define the extents of both the TRA (extent of the traffic model) and the ARN, particularly where the ARN extends beyond the TRA. The additional traffic data used to screen in additional links into the assessment of air quality effects (ie the ARN) should be referenced and justified as being fit for purpose in effectively necessitating and supporting an extension to the TRA. These additional ARN links should be considered in terms of sensitive human health and ecological receptors.</p>	Table 5.7 of Chapter 5: Air Quality

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
4.1.6	Figure 6.3 shows an “AQMA study area” which is not defined in the text. It appears to show the extent of the ARN within the AQMA but does not show the AQMA in its entirety. The “AQMA study area” should be separately defined in the ES and the extents of the Greater Manchester AQMA shown in the context of the ARN and the DCO application site boundary as part of the assessment of significance of effects on the AQMA.	Table 5.7 of Chapter 5: Air Quality
4.2.1	The Applicant concludes there is limited potential for significant physical impacts on historic buildings and archaeological remains during operation. Previously unknown archaeological assets that may be present within the footprint of the Proposed Development will be assessed as part of the construction phase assessment. Effects on setting of historic buildings will be assessed as part of the operational assessment. On this basis, the Inspectorate agrees that physical impacts on historic buildings and archaeological remains during operation can be scoped out.	Table 6.5 of Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage
4.2.2	Limited detail is given as to what is sought to be scoped out under a generic reference to “new land take” and the chapter goes on to state that further investigation of previously undeveloped areas will be carried out. For the avoidance of doubt, the Inspectorate does not agree that effects on archaeological remains due to new land take can be scoped out at this stage and that such matters should be considered as part of the construction phase assessment.	Table 6.5 of Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage
4.2.3	Whilst it is noted that there are no designated or non-designated historic buildings within the Proposed Development site boundary, Figure 7.1 indicates that there are a number of non-designated historic buildings immediately adjacent to the boundary, and therefore may be subject to construction works in close proximity. The ES should consider the effects of vibration or other construction activities on these non-designated assets immediately adjacent to the site boundary, in addition to the dewatering listed within paragraph 7.4.2.	Table 6.5 of Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
4.2.4	<p>Paragraph 7.5.2 states that additional mitigation is likely to include a programme of archaeological investigation and recording, prior to commencement of construction. Paragraph 7.7.5 states that trial trenching is considered but it is not clear whether this will inform the assessment in the ES or will be undertaken prior to construction. Where intrusive surveys have not been undertaken, the ES should appraise the limitations in the methodology in the absence of this data and set out how any mitigation measures that are to be agreed post-consent have been relied upon as part of the assessment of significance of effects. Any outline archaeological scheme of investigation should be agreed with the relevant local authority, and where required Historic England, in advance of works being undertaken.</p>	Table 6.5 of Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage
4.2.5	<p>Paragraph 7.5.3 states that enhancement measures could include provision of interpretation boards at key sites. Based on the location of known archaeological remains, consideration should be given as to whether public access is possible in these locations, and therefore the value / benefit of any interpretation boards may be questionable. The ES should also confirm the mitigation measures to be adopted in the event of discovery of archaeological remains of importance, either during pre-construction surveys or during construction.</p>	Table 6.5 of Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage
4.3.1	<p>Paragraph 8.3.5 states that <i>“there are three Conservation Areas within the study area, located between 400m and 900m from the M60...The location of the Conservation Areas are beyond the influence of the Scheme and have therefore been scoped out of the LVIA”</i>. Paragraph 8.2.11 explains that the LVIA study area will focus on potentially significant effects within a 2km radius. Figure 8.2 of the Applicant’s interactive Scoping Report appears to show a total of 21 conservation areas as being ‘Scoped In’ on the basis that they are “Located within [the] overarching 5km study area”. This would appear to contradict the Applicant seeking to scope out assessing effects on conservation outside of the 2km study area. Given the nature and location of the Proposed Development, the Inspectorate agrees that conservation areas outside of 2km from the Proposed Development are unlikely to be significantly affected and that this matter can be scoped out.</p>	Table 7.5 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
4.3.2	Based on the existing environment (ie the presence of the M60 J18, wider motorway network and surrounding urban environments) the Inspectorate agrees that an assessment of effects on the night skies in their own right is not required. In addition, no dark skies have been identified by CPRE within the study area and that night-time changes for landscape and visual receptors will be considered as part of the construction and operational assessments.	Table 7.5 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual
4.3.3	Figure 8.2 details that the Proposed Development is partially located within an area of green belt, however the approach to the assessment of greenbelt is not referenced anywhere within Chapter 8 of the Scoping Report (other than paragraph 8.3.4). The Inspectorate considers that the effect of increased urbanisation / built form on the Green belt should be considered within the ES.	Table 7.5 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual
4.3.4	Paragraph 8.4.11 of the Scoping Report identifies the loss of mature vegetation. The ES should clarify the definition of mature vegetation, and confirm whether any ancient woodland or veteran trees are to be affected by the Proposed Development (with cross reference to any arboricultural assessment) plus any assumptions made in that regard in relation to year 1 and year 15 assessments of effects. Although the legend on figure 8.2 shows sub-categories of woodland within “ <i>Existing Significant Woodland Belts</i> ”, there are no categories showing ancient woodland or veteran trees.	Table 7.5 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual
4.3.5	Justification should be provided as the validity of the assumption that the screening or filtering effect of existing vegetation outside the Proposed Development boundary will be as per its ‘current condition’, and at what point the ‘current condition’ will be defined for the purposes of the assessment. Whilst the Inspectorate appreciates that the management and retention of such vegetation is outside the control of the Applicant, key assumptions in this respect should be clearly set out such that the implications for the assessment of effects of the Proposed Development can be understood.	Table 7.5 of Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
4.4.1	There are no European sites or SSSI within 2km of the Proposed Development and no pathways of effect during the construction of the Proposed Development have been identified. As set out in item 4.1.1 of this Scoping Opinion, the Inspectorate does not agree that air quality effects of changes in road traffic during construction can be scoped out whilst the traffic screening exercise remains to be carried out. On this basis, the Inspectorate considers that there could be effects on the Rochdale Canal SAC and SSSI. For all other European sites and SSSI and other pathways of effect (with the exception of air quality), the Inspectorate agrees that these can be scoped out of the assessment of effects during construction.	Table 8.6 of Chapter 8: Biodiversity
4.4.2	No NNR have been identified within the study area or within 2km of the site or ARN. The Inspectorate agrees that these matters can be scoped out of the assessment.	Table 8.6 of Chapter 8: Biodiversity
4.4.3	Paragraphs 9.4.8 and 9.4.24 explain that potential for INNS effects during construction will be considered. However, the Inspectorate agrees that significant effects during operation are not likely and that this matter can be scoped out of the assessment.	Table 8.6 of Chapter 8: Biodiversity
4.4.4	The Applicant states that <i>“Species scoped in for further assessment at this stage may be scoped out in future if the value assigned to them is reduced following additional surveys and data collection. Receptors will only be scoped out following consultation and agreement with statutory bodies”</i> . Paragraphs 9.3.10 – 9.3.12 identify protected and notable species within the study area, but that <i>“2021 surveys are ongoing and data sets are not sufficiently complete to contribute to this scoping report”</i> . The Inspectorate draws the Applicants attention to comments made in paragraphs 3.1.3 - 3.1.4 of this Scoping Opinion. Where matters are scoped in at this stage but later scoped out, further evidence which has been gathered to justify that approach should be clearly cited alongside agreement with relevant consultees and presented as part of the ES.	Table 8.6 of Chapter 8: Biodiversity

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
4.4.5	<p>Chapters 10 and 15 of the Scoping Report (sections 4.5 and 4.10 of this Scoping Opinion) describe the potential presence of localised peat deposits within the study area, and their potential removal. The ecological / biodiversity value of peat as a resource is not specifically considered as part of Chapter 9 of the Scoping Report, nor is the potential loss of peat (and any mitigation that may or may not be required) described as part of the scope of the biodiversity assessment. The biodiversity chapter of the ES should therefore specifically outline the potential ecological significance of effect of peat loss. In this regard the Inspectorate would expect cross reference to the assessments of Geology and Soils, Water Environment and Climate as appropriate.</p>	Table 8.6 of Chapter 8: Biodiversity
4.4.6	<p>Paragraphs 9.7.7 – 9.7.8 of the Scoping Report note the potential need to carry out a HRA. There are other sections of the Scoping Report which refer to HRA and which appear to be somewhat contradictory. Paragraph 5.5.2 seemingly concludes that there would be no likely significant effects on any European sites, whereas paragraphs 6.3.25, 9.7.7 and 9.7.8 identify the Rochdale Canal SAC as requiring further consideration as part of the assessment of air quality effects. The ES should be clear in establishing pathways of effect to European sites and ensure that any HRA is co-ordinated with the EIA in accordance with Regulation 26 of the EIA Regulations.</p>	Table 8.6 of Chapter 8: Biodiversity
4.5.1	<p>Impacts to geology are proposed to be scoped out on the basis that no sensitive geological receptors are identified within the study area. Considering the baseline geological information presented, and the description of the Proposed Development, the Inspectorate is content that this matter can be scoped out.</p>	Table 9.5 of Chapter 9: Geology and Soils
4.5.2	<p>On the basis that impacts to soil will be assessed during construction (as permanent and temporary losses), the Inspectorate considers that effects on soils during operation can be scoped out.</p>	Table 9.5 of Chapter 9: Geology and Soils

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
4.5.3	<p>This matter is proposed to be scoped out as contamination is anticipated to be removed during construction therefore, contact with contamination from residents or construction workers during operation is unlikely to occur. Additionally, site-specific risk assessments and method statements will reduce exposure. The Inspectorate agrees to this matter being scoped out, with the exception of ground gas as set out below. However, impacts are scoped in for maintenance and residential properties located in close proximity to the Proposed Development due to the possibility of being affected by ground gas during operation. Elaboration on this is not provided. The ES should explain the type, extent and sources of ground gas contamination anticipated during operation and assess the significant effects on receptors likely to be impacted by it. Any appropriate mitigation should be detailed and secured via the dDCO.</p>	Table 9.5 of Chapter 9: Geology and Soils
4.5.4	<p>Operational effects on surface water and groundwater from contaminated land are scoped out of further assessment on the basis that potential contaminated land linkages would have been assessed as part of the construction phase assessment and contaminated land would only be disturbed during construction. The Inspectorate is content that this matter can be scoped out of the operational assessment.</p>	Table 9.5 of Chapter 9: Geology and Soils

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
4.5.5	<p>There are multiple references to a programme of ground investigations leading to production of a Ground Investigation (GI) report in Chapter 5 and Chapter 10 of the Scoping Report. Paragraph 10.5.2 states that a GI is to be completed in 2021. The Inspectorate understands that a GI report will be provided in support of the Application and as part of the ES. The scope of the assessment presented in Chapter 10 of the Scoping Report is, in many places, caveated by the statement that no ground investigation data were available at the time of preparing the report (e.g. paragraphs 10.4.10, 10.4.12 and 10.6.1). The location, extent and method of the proposed GI should be described in the ES and be supported by relevant figures. Effort should be made to agree these surveys with the relevant consultation bodies so as to ensure a robust baseline from which to assess the significance of effects. The ES should also be clear about any additional ground investigation that may be proposed as mitigation and which is to be delivered post-consent. Where <i>“ground investigation data are unavailable at the time of drafting the Environmental Statement”</i> (paragraph 10.8.2), the assessment should be clear as to methodological assumptions and inherent limitations and implications for the confidence of the assessment of residual effects.</p>	Table 9.5 of Chapter 9: Geology and Soils
4.6.1	<p>The mineral safeguarding areas (MSA) identified in the study area are not resources that could be worked/extracted and therefore do not meet criteria to be defined as Mineral Safeguarding Sites required to be assessed by definition in DMRB LA110; this is supported through consultation with Greater Manchester Minerals and Waste Planning Unit and the Coal Authority detailed in Scoping Report paragraph 11.4.10. On this basis, the Inspectorate is content that impacts to MSAs can be scoped out.</p>	Table 10.6 of Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste
4.6.2	<p>The Applicant states that peat deposits present within the study area are not existing or potential peat extraction sites in terms of peat as material asset / resource. On the basis of the information provided, the Inspectorate agrees to scope out impacts to peat deposits as a material asset / resource. Comments have been made elsewhere in this Scoping Opinion about potential impacts on peat in terms of biodiversity, soils, carbon emissions and in terms of drainage.</p>	Table 10.6 of Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
4.6.3	<p>These matters are proposed to be scoped out of the assessment on the basis that maintenance activities would be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of DMRB LA110 and are not expected in the first year of operation (timescale defined by DMRB LA110) or beyond. The Inspectorate is content to agree to scope this matter out on this basis.</p>	<p>Table 10.6 of Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste</p>
4.7.1	<p>On the basis that the maintained road surface once complete will be free of irregularities under general maintenance provisions, the Inspectorate agrees that operational vibration can be scoped out of the ES due to the low likelihood of long-term significant effects. The Inspectorate also notes the presence of the existing road network in terms of future baseline conditions.</p>	<p>Table 11.5 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration</p>
4.7.2	<p>Figure 12.1 and section 12.2 refers to <i>“three study areas”</i> that are <i>“generally sufficient for most projects”</i>. It is also stated that the assessment <i>“will not be limited to these distances if it is considered there is a risk of likely significant effects beyond 100m for construction vibration, 300m for construction noise, or 600m for operational noise”</i>. The ES should provide a clear definition of the individual study areas and set out where potential for likely significant effects has been assessed beyond the <i>“generally sufficient”</i> study areas and the locationally specific circumstances under which additional receptors are considered beyond those areas.</p>	<p>Table 11.5 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration</p>
4.7.3	<p>Reference is made to the presence of existing noise mitigation along some sections of the M60 and M66, but that further details of location, length and height of these barriers are needed to inform the assessment. The ES should be clear about any assumptions made within the assessment and how they are taken into account at part of any modelling (eg assumptions around efficacy and condition of these features). The ES should be particularly clear about whether or not existing noise mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be removed / altered as part of the Proposed Development (and if not, how its retention will be safeguarded as part of the design) 	<p>Table 11.5 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration</p>

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fits in as part of any wider mitigation package of new / extended noise barriers to be installed. 	
4.7.4	<p>Paragraphs 12.3.12 and 12.3.14 state that cumulative impacts are both implicit in the future “Do-Minimum” and “Do-Something” scenarios traffic modelling but also would need to be considered in terms of the introduction of any new noise sensitive receptors from future development. With reference to the transport assessment(s), the noise chapter of the ES should clearly present these distinct strands of the cumulative assessment and clearly identify representative “worst case” receptor locations for modelling of any future noise sensitive receptors, identify any mitigation needs for these future receptors and set out how they would be secured and delivered as part of the dDCO.</p>	Table 11.5 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration
4.8.1	<p>It is unclear whether this is proposed to be scoped in or out of the ES assessment as Table 13.7 states that it will be scoped in for construction and operation but the scoping summary in Table 13.8 proposes to scope it out during construction. As the construction phase has potential to disrupt connectivity through traffic management and alterations of public rights of way, the Inspectorate considers that this matter should be scoped into assessment. Where the Applicant proposes to scope a matter out, sufficient evidence and reasoning must be provided.</p>	Table 12.23 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health
4.8.2	<p>Community severance is defined as a “longer-term issue” and therefore, as the construction phase is temporary in duration (3 years) and phased, construction impacts would not constitute a longterm change. Therefore, this matter is proposed to be scoped out of the assessment during construction but will be addressed in terms of operational effects. Accessibility is scoped in as a different impact. Based on the information provided, and in particular the statements at paragraphs 13.6.4 and 13.6.5 that severance during construction has the potential to be significant, the Inspectorate does not agree that this matter can be scoped out at this stage and should be considered alongside longer term severance during operation.</p>	Table 12.23 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
4.8.3	No clear explanation is provided as to why employment opportunities during operation are scoped out of the assessment, however, due to the nature of the Proposed Development, the Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out.	Table 12.23 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health
4.8.4	Whilst there is potential for disruption to public transport services, the Applicant considers that these may reroute and the overall provision would remain unchanged by the Proposed Development and ultimately have limited effects on human health. Whilst there is no specific details of potential rerouting of coach and bus services (and there are 4 tram stops are located within the study area), the Inspectorate agrees that effects in terms of population and human health from rerouting and disruption to public transport is are unlikely to be significant given the nature, location and objectives of the scheme.	Table 12.23 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health
4.8.5	For the reasons given in table 13.7 of the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that these matters can be scoped out during construction and operation in terms of the Proposed Development's potential effects to population and human health.	Table 12.23 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health
4.8.6	Scoping Report paragraph 13.3.31 states that those values shaded in Table 13.5 are ' <i>significantly worse</i> ' than the national average (also displayed in the Table). However, there is no explanation or set threshold provided to determine what above the national average is considered ' <i>significantly worse</i> '. Should these figures be used to inform the baseline of the assessment in the ES, there should be an explanation as to how these figures have been separated from others as ' <i>significantly worse</i> ' than the national average and how this influences the assessment of significant effects under the EIA Regulations.	Table 12.23 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
4.8.7	<p>Scoping Report paragraph 13.7.13 states that no judgement of significance will be made for human health impacts. Regulation 14(2)(b) of The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2017 states that the environmental statement must include a description of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. Section 5(d) of Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations states that information for inclusion in environmental statements includes a description of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on the risks to human health.</p> <p>Therefore, the ES should describe the methodology for determining the significance of effects and report the significance of effects on human health.</p>	Table 12.23 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health
4.9.1	Tidal flood risk is proposed to be scoped out on the basis that none of the watercourses within the study area are tidal rivers and the Irwell Catchment Flood Management Plan does not identify tidal flooding as a source of flood risk in the catchment; the nearest tidal point is approximately 28km downstream. Based on this information, the Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out.	Table 13.6 of Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment
4.9.2	The Applicant highlights that the potential extent of reservoir flooding (in accordance with Environment Agency guidance) reaches residential areas in Prestwich and Whitefield to the west of the M60 J18 but on the basis that the risk of failure is considered to be very low (due to their monitoring and inspection regime), reservoir flood risk should be scoped out. The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out on this basis and taking into account the prevailing baseline and future baseline environment in and around the Proposed Development.	Table 13.6 of Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment
4.9.3	Canal flood risk is proposed to be scoped out of the assessment as no canals are identified in the study area with the closest canal located approximated 3km from the Proposed Development. Based on this information, the Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out.	Table 13.6 of Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
4.9.4	<p>Table 14.8 displays the value of receptors as based on the DMRB LA 113 guidance. Scoping Report paragraph 14.3.88 states that ponds will be assigned a <i>'medium'</i> value of importance on a precautionary basis as ponds are unlikely to be more than low importance. Scoping Report paragraph 14.3.87 states that the majority of ponds will not be affected and can be scoped out but does not specify which ponds are proposed to be scoped out.</p> <p>Scoping Report Chapter 9 Biodiversity, paragraph 9.3.12 states that whilst surveys are ongoing, notable results to date include the presence of great crested newts which are a European Protected Species. <i>'Protected species'</i> are not included as criteria for designating receptor value in Scoping Report Table 14.8 although they are included in the guidance used for assessment; DMRB LA113 Table 3.70 used presence of protected species as criteria for surface water receptors of high importance, therefore there remains potential for ponds to be high value receptors.</p> <p>The ES should provide an explanation where it diverges from appropriate guidance (that is referenced in the Scoping Report). The Inspectorate does not agree to scope out impacts to ponds based on the current information as there remains potential for the Proposed Development to impact high value receptors.</p>	Table 13.6 of Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment
4.9.5	<p>This matter is proposed to be scoped out on the basis that the working area for construction is likely to be relatively small in comparison to the aquifers being crossed and therefore effects would be negligible.</p> <p>Scoping Report paragraph 2.4.2 states that currently, total areas required for temporary and permanent land take in the Order Limits will be defined in the DCO application.</p>	Table 13.6 of Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
	<p>Whilst the Inspectorate cannot agree to scope out this matter due to a lack of evidence based on current information, should evidence be provided in the application to support this statement, the Inspectorate would be content to scope out this matter. Such evidence would include results of any site investigation to ascertain whether sand bands within superficial drift soils have the potential to provide a source of water, the value of such a resource and the extent to which there may or may not be impact pathways from the Proposed Development as the design evolves.</p>	
4.9.6	<p>Table 14.10 proposes to scope out impacts on floodplains but provides little or no explanation as to why. There are multiple references to construction activities potentially taking place in floodplains Figure 14.5 identifies Parr Brook floodplain (zones 2 and 3) as located within the 1km study area where impacts to and from flood risk may occur.</p> <p>Based on this information, the Inspectorate considers that there is potential for impacts to floodplains and insufficient evidence has been provided to suggest they will not be impacted. Therefore, the Inspectorate does not agree to scope this matter out.</p>	Table 13.6 of Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment
4.9.7	<p>Currently the extent of peatland within the study area and the amount of peat to be removed to construct the Proposed Development is unknown. Potential impacts listed in Scoping Report section 14.4 do not include potential hydrological impacts due to the removal of peat.</p> <p>The ES should provide baseline data as to the locations of the peat present within the study area and describe the extent that is proposed to be removed and the method by which this will be done. The ES should assess significant effects from disturbance to peat where they are likely to occur on hydrology, groundwater and flood risk.</p>	Table 13.6 of Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment
4.10.1	No matters have been proposed to be scoped out of the assessment.	Table 14.6 of Chapter 14: Climate

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
4.10.2	Scoping Report paragraph 15.7.1 states that whether greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions will be significant against Government targets will be determined through professional judgement, acknowledging that construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development will extend over multiple carbon budget periods. The ES should set out how this judgement has been applied to changes brought about by the Proposed Development in relation to emission sources to reach conclusions to support the definition of significance.	Table 14.6 of Chapter 14: Climate
4.10.3	It is noted that there are a number of peat deposits within the red line boundary which are carbon stores. Effort should be made to avoid/reduce impact to these areas to avoid/reduce impacts from GHG emissions as part of the mitigation embedded into the design.	Table 14.6 of Chapter 14: Climate
4.10.4	Traffic management measures have potential to cause congestion/vehicles to find alternative, longer routes which may increase GHG emissions. The ES should consider this as part of the assessment of construction traffic effects and, where possible, set out traffic management measures for the Proposed Development to minimise these impacts.	Table 14.6 of Chapter 14: Climate
4.10.5	Whilst the Inspectorate acknowledges there is uncertainty surrounding the future composition of the UK's vehicle fleet towards net zero(e.g. proposed ban on petrol cars), the ES should set out and justify a proportionate worst case scenario on which to base the ES assessment with appropriate cross referencing to the air quality assessment.	Table 14.6 of Chapter 14: Climate
4.11.1	On the basis that the assessment proposed in the materials and waste aspect chapter will consider the impact of the Proposed Development on national material recovery targets, regional recycled aggregate targets, sub-regional minerals sterilisation and regional landfill capacity, the Inspectorate agrees that relevant consideration of cumulative effects will be inherent in that assessment. The Inspectorate therefore agrees that these can be scoped out of further specific consideration in the cumulative effects assessment.	Table 10.6 of Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste Table 15.5 of Chapter 15: Assessment of Cumulative Effects

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
4.11.2	<p>The assessment proposed in the climate aspect chapter considers the Proposed Development's effect on the global climate and the effect of changes in climate on the Proposed Development (ie vulnerability to climate change).</p> <p>On the basis that consideration of the extent to which climate exacerbates or ameliorates the effects of the Proposed Development will be presented in the climate aspect chapter of the ES, the Inspectorate agrees that it can be scoped out of further specific assessment in terms of cumulative effects and this approach accords with industry standard guidance of the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA).</p>	<p>Table 14.6 of Chapter 14: Climate</p> <p>Table 15.5 of Chapter 15: Assessment of Cumulative Effects</p>
4.11.3	<p>The traffic modelling upon which the air quality and noise assessment are based will take into account committed development in the future traffic flow forecasts and therefore these two aspect chapters are "<i>inherently cumulative</i>". On the basis of the approach to the assessment set out in 16.3.13 - 16.3.25, the list of cumulative development schemes should be confirmed within the ES as being within the scope of the operational traffic scenario modelling to demonstrate that all relevant pathways of cumulative noise and air quality effects have been considered.</p>	<p>Table 15.5 of Chapter 15: Assessment of Cumulative Effects</p>
Appendix 2, Responses from Consultation Bodies		
Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council	<p>Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council has no comment to make in relation to this consultation.</p>	<p>Noted. No response required.</p>
Cadent Gas Limited	<p>Should any diversion be required to facilitate the scheme, Cadent will require adequate notice and discussions should be started at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of Cadent's apparatus, Cadent will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights including adequate Protective Provisions.</p>	<p>Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology</p>

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
	<p>Where diversions are required to facilitate the scheme, it is essential that adequate temporary and permanent land take, land rights and consents are included within the Order to enable works to proceed in time and to provide appropriate rights for Cadent to access, maintain and protect apparatus in future.</p> <p>Cadent has a Deed of Grant of Easement for each pipeline, which prevents the erection of permanent/temporary buildings, or structures, change to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc.</p> <p>Please be aware that written permission is required before any works commence within the Cadent easement strip.</p> <p>The below guidance is not exhaustive and all works in the vicinity of Cadent's asset shall be subject to review and approval from Cadent's plant protection team in advance of commencement of works on site.</p> <p>You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 41 "<i>Avoiding Danger from Underground Services</i>", and Cadent's Dial Before You Dig Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of Cadent Assets. There will be additional requirements dictated by Cadent's plant protection team.</p> <p>Cadent will also need to ensure that its pipelines remain accessible during and after completion of the works.</p> <p>The actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trail hole investigation under the supervision of a Cadent representative. Ground cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased.</p> <p>If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of Cadent High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 metres of an AGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actual position and depth of the pipeline must be established on site in the presence of a Cadent representative. A safe working method agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensure the final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline.</p>	

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
	<p>Below are some examples of work types that have specific restrictions when being undertaken in the vicinity of gas assets therefore consultation with Cadent's Plant Protection team is essential: Demolition; Blasting; Piling and boring; Deep mining; Surface mineral extraction; Landfilling; Trenchless Techniques; Wind turbine installation; Solar farm installation; and Tree planting schemes.</p>	
<p>Canal and Rivers Trust</p>	<p>The Canal & River Trust do not own any waterways within the immediate vicinity of the proposed development, our closest waterway is the Manchester Bolton, & Bury Canal which is over 3km from the existing junction. The Rochdale Canal which is a designated Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC) due to the aquatic flora it supports, is over 4km from the junction. We do however note that the report mentions at 9.4.14 that the Rochdale Canal is within 200m of the Stage 2 Affected Road Network and as such would be scoped in as a potential receptor. We have been unable to find any further details/plans showing this within the submitted document. But we would agree with the Rochdale Canal, due to its International and National Designations is scoped into the report for further assessment.</p>	<p>Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology Table 8.6 of Chapter 8: Biodiversity</p>
<p>The Coal Authority</p>	<p>We note that the submission is supported by an Environmental Scoping Report, dated 29 June 2021 and that this report provides commentary on ground conditions and risks posed by coal mining legacy. This report notes that a ground investigation is programmed to inform an assessment of the ground conditions along the route of the scheme. Any identified risks encountered arising from past coal mining activity at surface or shallow depth during these works should be properly considered and remediated, where necessary, to ensure the safety and stability of the development. However, on the basis of our records, in respect of the route of the scheme as indicated, we would not expect a Coal Mining Risk Assessment to be included as part of the EIA assessment.</p>	<p>Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology Table 9.5 of Chapter 9: Geology and Soils</p>

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
Environment Agency	<p>The Environment Agency provided comment on the Biodiversity, Geology and Soils, and Road Drainage and the Water Environment chapters of the Environmental Scoping Report (TR010064/APP/6.6), and also Environmental Permitting Requirements and Environment Agency Land Ownership. Due to the length of the response, the response is not replicated here in full.</p>	<p>Table 8.6 of Chapter 8: Biodiversity Table 9.5 of Chapter 9: Geology and Soils Table 10.6 of Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste Table 13.6 of Chapter 13: Road Drainage and the Water Environment</p>
ESP Utilities Group Ltd	<p>ESP Utilities Group Ltd has no gas or electricity apparatus in the vicinity of this site address and will not be affected by your proposed works.</p> <p>ESP Utilities Group Ltd are continually laying new gas and electricity networks and this notification is valid for 90 days from the date of this letter. If your proposed works start after this period of time, please re-submit your enquiry.</p>	Noted. No response required.
Highways England (now National Highways)	<p>We note, of course, that this is a Highways England scheme, and we are familiar with the current proposals. As such, our Planning Team will offer no comment as this time regarding the Simister Island scheme.</p>	Noted. No response required.
Historic England	<p>It is for the local authority to determine whether an EIA should be prepared for the proposed development. However, from the information given, we consider that there appears to be minimal impact on the historic environment and therefore an EIA may not be required in relation to the historic environment.</p> <p>We would also recommend that the applicant seeks confirmation from the relevant local authority Historic Environment staff for an informed local opinion of need.</p> <p>If further information becomes available which might result in a change to this, then we would like to be informed and provided with that information so that we can consider the matter further and respond to you as appropriate.</p>	Table 6.5 of Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
Health and Safety Executive	<p><u>Will the proposed development fall within any of HSE’s consultation distances?</u></p> <p>According to HSE’s records there are no major accident hazard installations with Hazardous Substances Consent or pipelines in the vicinity of the road improvement scheme (based on the ‘Provisional Order Limits’ shown in Figure 1.1 ‘Location Plan and Local Planning Authority Boundaries’, Drawing Number: HE548642-JAC-GEN-SII_MLT-SK-LE-001, Revision: P01, Dated: Jun 21) and, therefore, we would not wish to comment on its siting. If in the intervening period we are notified of a change to this situation, the developer would need to seek advice from us.</p> <p><u>Hazardous Substances Consent</u></p> <p>Not applicable to this road improvement scheme.</p> <p><u>Explosives sites</u></p> <p>HSE have no comment to make on the proposed development since there are no licensed explosives sites in the vicinity of the proposed development.</p> <p><u>Electrical Safety</u></p> <p>No comment, from a planning perspective.</p>	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
Natural England	<p>Natural England provided comment on the Habitats Regulations Assessment, Air Quality, Biodiversity, Geology and Soils, and Climate aspects of the Environmental Scoping Report (TR010064/APP/6.6). Natural England also provided additional advice on the scope of the EIA (Annex A to Natural England’s response letter). Due to the length of the response, the response is not replicated here in full.</p>	<p>Table 5.7 of Chapter 5: Air Quality</p> <p>Table 8.6 of Chapter 8: Biodiversity</p> <p>Table 9.5 of Chapter 9: Geology and Soils</p> <p>Table 14.6 of Chapter 14: Climate</p>
Public Health England	<p>Public Health England provided comment on environmental public health. Public Health England also attached an appendix to their response letter summarising their requirements and recommendations regarding the content of and methodology used in preparing the Environmental Statement. Due to the length of the response, the response is not replicated here in full.</p>	<p>Table 10.6 of Chapter 10: Material Assets and Waste</p> <p>Table 11.5 of Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration</p>

Comment reference	Scoping Opinion comment	Response provided in Environmental Statement (TR010064/APP/6.1) chapter
		Table 12.23 of Chapter 12: Population and Human Health
Rochdale Borough Council	<p>The council, in principle supports the proposal to improve capacity and traffic flows through Simister Island Interchange.</p> <p>The scoping report reviewed is considered to be comprehensive and robust in its approach to topics to be included within the future Environmental Statement and its consideration of the baseline conditions and assessment methodology. Rochdale BC concurs with the report's selected topics to be scoped in and out as set out at Table 17.1 of the report.</p> <p>The council can confirm it has also been contacted separately by the applicant's consultants to provide input on the detailed proposals for preparation of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. In line with Regulation 11(3) of the EIA Regulations, Rochdale will make available any information in our possession which is considered relevant to the preparation of the ES and will provide direct feedback and correspondence with the applicant where this will aid in the preparation of the ES.</p>	Table 4.1 of Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology
Royal Mail	<p>Royal Mail and its advisor BNP Paribas Real Estate have reviewed Highways England's Environmental Scoping Report dated 29 June 2021.</p> <p>This scheme has been identified as having potential for impact on Royal Mail operational interests. However, at this time Royal Mail is not able to provide a consultation response due to insufficient information being available to adequately assess the level of risk to its operation and the available mitigations for any risk. Therefore, Royal Mail wishes to reserve its position to submit a consultation response/s at a later stage in the consenting process and to give evidence at any future Public Examination, if required.</p>	Noted. No response required.

Acronyms and initialisms

Acronym or initialism	Definition
AGI	Above Ground Installation
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
ARN	Affected Road Network
CPRE	Campaign to Protect Rural England
DCO	Development Consent Order
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order
DMRB	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
EEA	European Economic Area
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMP	Environmental Management Plan
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examining Authority
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GI	Ground Investigation
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
HSE	Health and Safety Executive
IEMA	Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment

Acronym or initialism	Definition
INNS	Invasive Non-Native Species
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
MNWQ	Manchester North-West Quadrant
MSA	Mineral Safeguarding Area
NNR	National Nature Reserve
NPS	National Policy Statement
NPS NN	National Policy Statement for National Networks
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
PA2008	Planning Act 2008
PM _{10/2.5}	Particulate matter (the number denotes the diameter in microns of the particle)
REAC	Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments
s22	Section 22 (of the Planning Act 2008)
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
TRA	Traffic Reliability Area