

A46 Newark Bypass

TR010065/APP/6.3

6.3 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.3 HEWRAT Assessment

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)

Planning Act 2008

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

Volume 6

April 2024

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

A46 Newark Bypass

Development Consent Order 202[x]

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

APPENDIX 13.3 HEWRAT ASSESSMENT

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(a)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme	TR010065
Reference	
Application Document Reference	TR010065/APP/6.3
Author:	A46 Newark Bypass Project Team, National Highways

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 1	April 2024	DCO Application



Contents

1 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of the report	1
2 Methodology	2
2.1 Guidance	2
2.2 HEWRAT	3
2.3 M-BAT	5
2.4 Spillage Risk Assessment	6
2.5 Groundwater Assessment	
2.6 Assumptions and Limitations	9
3 HEWRAT Assessment	11
3.1 Model input parameters	11
3.2 Baseline drainage conditions	12
3.3 Proposed Drainage Strategy	12
3.4 HEWRAT parameters	17
3.5 HEWRAT Results	20
3.6 M-BAT	27
3.7 Cumulative HEWRAT Assessment	31
4 Spillage risk assessment	42
4.1 Input parameters	42
4.2 Results	45
5 Groundwater Assessment	47
5.2 Results	47
6 Summary	49
7 References	50
Appendix A: M-Bat Results	52
A.1 Non-cumulative assessments	52
A.2 Cumulative assessments	62



1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the report

- 1.1.1 This report forms a technical appendix to Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the Environmental Statement (ES) (TR010065/APP/6.1) for the A46 Newark Bypass Scheme (the Scheme). This report presents a summary of the water quality assessment undertaken to assess potential impacts of routine runoff and accidental spillage risk to watercourses resulting from the Scheme.
- 1.1.2 A detailed description of the Scheme is contained within Chapter 2 (The Scheme) of the ES **(TR010065/APP/6.1)**. The Scheme would increase the impermeable road surface area and will also alter the current traffic flows through the creation of new road sections consisting of dualling of the existing carriageways. This has the potential to increase the volume of surface water runoff as well as affecting the water quality of the surface water runoff.
- 1.1.3 The purpose of the Highways England Water Risk Assessment Tool (HEWRAT) is to assess the potential impacts that the Scheme would have on water quality in the receiving watercourses. The assessment confirms whether the proposed mitigation measures within the drainage strategy are necessary, and if so, whether they adequately reduce the impact on the water quality for the receiving watercourses. Details of the drainage strategy mitigation can be found in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES Appendices (TR010065/APP/6.3).
- 1.1.4 The assessment does not consider the construction phase of the Scheme, only the operational phase. This is because the HEWRAT tool does not have a capability for temporary construction assessments and only considers the operational impact on water quality.



2 Methodology

2.1 Guidance

Г

- 2.1.1 The assessment methodology follows the guidance set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 113 Road drainage and the water environment¹.
- 2.1.2 Table 2-1 is an extract from DMRB LA 113 Table 3.2, detailing the methods of assessment.

Potential Mechanism(s) impact		Lev	Level and methods of assessment			
		Scoping	Simple	Detailed		
Water quality	Routine runoff	Following	Routine runoff	No detailed assessment		
(surface	(acute impacts from	requirement in	and surface	method available – pass or		
water)	soluble pollutants	DMRB LA 103:	water quality	fail at simple assessment		
	and chronic impacts	Scoping	assessment			
	from sediment	projects for	(HEWRAT)			
	related pollutants)	Environmental				
	Routine runoff	Assessment		Bioavailability assessment		
	(annual average			using UKTAG Rivers and		
	soluble			Lakes Metal Bioavailability		
	concentrations)			Assessment Tool (M-BAT)		
	Spillage		Spillage	No detailed assessment		
			assessment	method available – pass or		
				fail at simple assessment		
Water quality	Routine runoff		Routine runoff	Site specific method to be		
(groundwater)			and	devised. Approach to be		
			groundwater	discussed and agreed with		
			quality	the relevant consultation		
			assessment	body.		
	Spillage		Spillage	No detailed assessment		
			assessment	method available – pass or		
				fail at simple assessment		

Table 2-1: Levels and methods of assessment

Source: DMRB LA 113 Table 3.2

¹ National Highways (2023) Design Manual For Roads and Bridges LA113 Road drainage and the water environment [online]. Available at: <u>LA 113 - Road drainage and the water environment (standardsforhighways.co.uk)</u> (Last accessed December 2023).



2.2 HEWRAT

2.2.1 The HEWRAT assessment tool assesses the impact of soluble pollutants (associated with acute pollution impacts) and sediment related pollutants (associated with chronic pollution impacts on surface water).

Soluble (acute impacts)

- 2.2.2 HEWRAT uses Runoff Specific Thresholds (RSTs) developed for dissolved copper and dissolved zinc. The RSTs are intended to protect organisms in receiving waters from short-term (acute) exposure (six hours and 24 hours) to these pollutants. The approach used to generate the RSTs is consistent with that adopted for the derivation of Environmental Quality Standards (EQSs) under the Water Environment (WFD) (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations WFD 2017².
- 2.2.3 An assessment of the long-term risks is also required to complete the risk assessment process. HEWRAT estimates in-river annual average concentrations for dissolved copper and dissolved zinc, taking into account current background concentrations. These concentrations can be compared with published EQSs as shown in Table 2-2, to assess whether there is likely to be a long-term impact on ecology.

Table 2-2: EQS limits for copper and zinc required to achieve 'Good' under the Water Environment Regulations

Pollutant	Annual mean bioavailable concentrations (µg/l)
Dissolved copper	1
Dissolved zinc	10.9

- 2.2.4 HEWRAT calculates concentrations for total dissolved copper and zinc, and in the absence of long-term water quality data, a comparison is made for exceedance against EQS for bioavailable copper and zinc. This results in a conservative 'worst-case' assessment, assuming that all dissolved copper and zinc is bioavailable and therefore has the potential to have long-term negative environmental impacts on aquatic flora and fauna.
- 2.2.5 The Metal Bioavailability Assessment Tool (M-BAT) removes this limitation as it calculates the bioavailable copper and zinc concentrations. This is described in more detail in Section 2.3 of this report.

² The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations (2017) His Majesty's Government [online]. Available at: <u>The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales)</u> <u>Regulations 2017 (legislation.gov.uk)</u> (Last accessed December 2023).



Sediment (chronic impacts)

2.2.6 The procedure for assessing sediment impacts is based on Threshold Effect Levels (TELs) and Probable Effect Levels (PELs), as well as toxicity thresholds. A calculation is also made about whether sediments will accumulate in the stream / river downstream of the outfall. This calculation is based on estimating the stream velocity under low flow conditions and comparing this with a threshold velocity. Velocity thresholds and deposition index thresholds are shown in Table 2-3 and Table 2-4 respectively. If sediment is predicted to accumulate, the potential extent of sediment coverage (i.e. the deposition index) is also considered.

Table 2-3: Velocity thresholds for sediment

Estimated stream velocity at low flow conditions	Type of site
≤0.1m/s	Accumulating
>0.1m/s	Dispensing

Table 2-4: Deposition index thresholds for sediment

Estimated deposition index	Type of site
<100	Low extent of deposition
≥100	High extent of deposition

Three step approach

- 2.2.7 The HEWRAT assessment adopts a stepped approach as follows:
 - Step 1: Runoff quality. Predicts concentrations of pollutants in untreated and undiluted highway runoff prior to any treatment and dilution in a waterbody.
 - Step 2: In-river impacts. Predicts concentrations of pollutants after mixing within the receiving waterbody. At this stage, the ability of the receiving watercourse to disperse sediments is considered. Step 2 also incorporates 2 'tiers' of assessment for sediment accumulation, based on different levels of input parameters. If 1 or more risks are defined as unacceptable at Tier 1, i.e. 'fail', then a more detailed Tier 2 assessment is undertaken, requiring values for additional parameters relating to the physical dimensions of the receiving watercourse.
 - Step 3: In-river impacts with mitigation. Steps 1 and 2 assume that the road drainage system incorporates no mitigation measures to reduce the risk. Step 3 includes mitigation in the form of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), taking into account the risk reduction associated with any existing measures or any proposed new measures.



2.2.8 Table 2-5 defines all outcome combinations for the routine runoff and surface water quality assessment and the action shall be applied to the relevant scenario.

Acute-soluble and chronic- sediment impacts	Annual average concentrations (compliance with EQS)	Action
Pass	Pass	No further action
Fail	Pass	Factor in effect of proposed mitigation and reassess Determine implications of redesign and reassess Weigh up benefits over whole project Discuss with Overseeing Organisation and EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) and agree action
Pass	Fail	Factor in effects of proposed mitigation and reassess Check sensitivity of modelling to input parameters e.g. Q95 Discuss with Overseeing Organisation and EPA and agree action
Fail	Fail	Factor in effect of proposed mitigation and reassess Redesign and assess Discuss with Overseeing Organisation and EPA and agree action

Table 2-5: Assessment outcomes and actions

2.3 **M-BAT**

- 2.3.1 Where the discharge fails the HEWRAT simple assessment for annual average concentrations of soluble pollutants, and proportionate mitigation cannot be readily incorporated, a detailed assessment must be carried out using the UKTAG Rivers and Lakes Metal Bioavailability Assessment Tool (M-BAT) to provide a representative picture of bioavailability.
- 2.3.2 The M-BAT takes account of the water chemistry, particularly the pH, dissolved calcium and dissolved organic carbon, to calculate the bioavailable copper and zinc, since these factors influence the toxicity of metals to aquatic organisms.
- 2.3.3 To comply with the Water Environment (WFD) (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations WFD 2015 the annual average concentrations predicted by HEWRAT, or M-BAT, must be lower than the EQS given in those regulations (see Table 2-2 for the EQS limit).



2.4 Spillage Risk Assessment

- 2.4.1 The assessment aims to ensure provision of appropriate drainage design measures where the risk of a serious pollution incident is more frequent than the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) (or more frequent than a 1 in 100-year return period). For more sensitive watercourses (which are located within approximately 1 kilometre of the Scheme), a higher level of protection is applied, up to the 0.5% AEP (or more frequent than 1 in 200 years).
- 2.4.2 The receiving watercourses the River Trent, the Old Trent Dyke and The Fleet are not sensitive watercourses since they are not within 1 kilometre of a designated site therefore the accidental spillage must be less than or equal to 1% AEP.
- 2.4.3 The results of the assessment are reported as 'pass' or 'fail'. The risk of an acute pollution incident, due to accidental spillage or vehicle fire, is considered proportionate to the risk of a Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) road traffic collision, and the volume of traffic. Therefore, the percentage of HGVs on a given road is the main parameter used in the assessment of the risk of serious pollution incidents.
- 2.4.4 To calculate the annual probability of a spillage, the following formula (from DMRB LA 113) is used:

P_{SPL} = RL x SS x (AADT x 365 x 10⁻⁹) x (%HGV/100)

where:

- PSPL = annual probability of a spillage with potential to cause pollution incident
- RL = road length (km)
- SS = spillage rates (from table D1.1, DMRB LA113)
- AADT = annual average daily traffic
- %HGV = percentage of heavy goods vehicles
- 2.4.5 To calculate the predicted annual probability of a serious pollution incident on each section of road, the following formula is used:

PINC = PSPL X PPOL

where:

- PINC = probability of a spillage with associated risk of a serious pollution event occurring
- PPOL = the probability, given a spillage, that a serious pollution incident will result. Dependant on sensitivity of watercourse and response time of emergency services
- 2.4.6 The Spillage Risk Assessment will determine what the 'risk of accidental spillage' and a 'risk of pollution incident'. If the risk of accidental spillage is less than or equal to 1% AEP, the risk is considered acceptable. The assessment will also provide a 'return



period', which calculates the risk of a pollution incident with and without pollution reduction measures.

2.4.7 It should be noted that mitigation measures which are to be implemented in the drainage design have not been applied to these calculations. Therefore, the assessment follows a precautionary approach.

2.5 Groundwater Assessment

- 2.5.1 Basins are formed with material, where appropriate, to impede ingress from ground water or water from land drainage interactions or to impede the infiltration of pollutants. However, where not possible or not appropriate there is a risk that groundwater will be affected by the surface runoff within the basins. Therefore, a groundwater assessment was undertaken.
- 2.5.2 Impacts of infiltration of routine road runoff on the quality of the underlying groundwater at surface water drainage networks have been assessed in accordance with the assessment method set out in Method C of LA 113³.
- 2.5.3 The DMRB (Table C1.2) sets out a matrix that has been designed to assess the potential overall risk to groundwater and to highlight any sites at high risk, where additional measures may be required. The risk assessment matrix uses the Source-Pathway-Receptor (S-P-R) protocol developed for use in risk assessment procedures for contaminated land evaluation. For road systems, the road drainage provides the source term. The pathway is represented by the processes by which road drainage is transported and discharged. The receptor is the groundwater. The parameters used in the risk assessment matrix are taken from Table C.1 within Appendix C of DMRB guidance document LA 113: Road Drainage and the Water Environment and are shown in Table 2-6 below.

Table 2-6: Groundwater	assessment parameters	(Table C.1 of LA 113)

	Weightin	Parameter		Input		
	g Factor		Low Risk (Score 1)	Medium Risk (Score 2)	High Risk (Score 3)	
Source	10	Traffic flow	<= 50,000 AADT	50,000 to 100,000 AADT	>= 100,000 AADT	Obtained from traffic model

³ National Highways (2023) LA113 DMRB Vol. 11, Section 3, Part 10 Road Drainage and the Water Environment [online]. Available at: <u>d6388f5f-2694-4986-ac46-b17b62c21727 (standardsforhighways.co.uk)</u> (Last accessed December 2023).



	Weightin	Parameter	Input			Source
	g Factor		Low Risk (Score 1)	Medium Risk (Score 2)	High Risk (Score 3)	
	10	Rainfall depth (annual averages)	<= 740mm	740mm to 1060mm	>= 1060mm	SAAR from FEH data
	10	Drainage area ratio	<= 50	50 to 150	>= 150	Calculated by dividing the surface area of basins by the catchment area.
	15	Infiltration method	"Continuous" , shallow linear (e.g. unlined ditch, swale, grassed channel)	"Region", shallow infiltration systems (e.g. infiltration basin)	"Point" systems (e.g. chamber soakaways, deep shafts)	Drainage design
	20	Unsaturate d zone	Depth to water table >=15 m	Depth to water table <15 m to >5 m	Depth to water table <=5 m	Groundwat er assessment s.
Pathway	20	Flow type (Incorporat es flow type an effective grain size)	Dominantly intergranular flow (e.g. non- fractured consolidated deposits or unconsolidat ed deposits of fine- medium sand or finer)	Mixed fracture and intergranular flow (e.g. consolidated deposits or unconsolidat ed deposits of medium – coarse sand)	Flow dominated by fractures/ fissures (e.g. well consolidated sedimentary deposits, igneous and metamorphic rocks or unconsolidat ed deposits of very coarse sand and coarser)	Based on superficial deposit description on BGS and UK Soil Observator y maps.
	5	Unsaturate d Zone Clay Content	>=15% clay minerals	<15% to >1% clay minerals	<=1% clay minerals	Based on historical borehole logs in the vicinity of the Scheme



Weightin	Parameter	Input			Source
g Factor		Low Risk (Score 1)	Medium Risk (Score 2)	High Risk (Score 3)	
5	Organic Carbon	>=15% SOM	<15% to >1% SOM	<=1% SOM	Based on the UK Soil Observator y online maps
5	Unsaturate d zone soil pH	pH >=8	pH <8 to >5	рН <=5	Based on the UK Soil Observator y maps

- 2.5.4 The corresponding category risk score (low risk 1, medium risk 2, high risk 3) is multiplied by the weighting factor for each parameter, then summed. The overall risk of impact to groundwater is determined as:
 - Overall risk score <150 Low risk of impact
 - Overall risk score 150 to 250 Medium risk of impact
 - Overall risk score >250 High risk of impact.

2.6 Assumptions and Limitations

- 2.6.1 The following limitations and assumptions apply to this assessment:
 - Water quality surveys were undertaken to obtain the EQS values however, the results were imprecise for the criteria needed for the HEWRAT assessment. The water quality survey results for copper were <8 µg/s. These results were deemed less precise than those found on the UK-SCAPE hydrological sensor data⁴, therefore the EQS values for this report were taken from the nearest data source to each outfall catchment; at 'MD-36732350, Non-Tidal Trent Hoval Farrar Ltd intake' (0.7 kilometres east of Cattle Market Roundabout, on the River Trent), 'MD-36731820, River Trent at Winthorpe (new)' (0.7 kilometres Northwest of Winthorpe village, on the River Trent) and 'MD-42980429, Slough Dyke at Langford' (2 kilometres north of Winthorpe village, on The Fleet).
 - Stream flow data is required for each receiving watercourse; however, gauge flow data was not available for all receiving watercourses as not all receiving watercourses are classified as 'main rivers'. Commissioning surveys for every ditch and stream is not economically feasible. The Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH) catchment

⁴ UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology (2023) UK-SPACE hydrological sensor data integration tool [online]. Available at: <u>https://eip.ceh.ac.uk/hydrology-ukscape/#close</u> (Last accessed December 2023).



descriptors have therefore been used from the nearest gauging station (listed above).

- To calculate the Q95 values, an area scaling method was used due to the absence of gauge data. This took flow rates from a gauge upstream of the Scheme for which online data is available and scales the measured Q95 value by the contributing areas for each outfall compared to the total catchment area for this gauge⁵.
- Long and side slopes, river width and bed width have had to be estimated from topographical data.
- Due to lack of detail for stream and river dimensions in the topographical survey, the same values have been used for bed width (for the Tier 2 assessments) and river width (used in Tier 1 assessments).
- The split between the permeable and impermeable areas used in step 2 of the HEWRAT calculations, has been assumed based on available information for the proposed system.
- Annual Average Daily traffic (AADT) data received from the traffic model was taken from the design year 2028- 'Do something' scenario. The 2028 AADT value is at an average of 32,719 (compared to 38,044 from the 2028 'Do Minimum' scenario). Traffic flows reduce with the Scheme because the new bridge over the A1 would carry all of the mainline A46 flow.

⁵ National River Flow Archive (2018) Catchment Rainfall data [online]. Available at: <u>Catchment Info for 28022 - Trent at</u> <u>North Muskham (ceh.ac.uk)</u> (Last accessed December 2023).



3 HEWRAT Assessment

3.1 Model input parameters

- 3.1.1 The HEWRAT assessment requires a series of inputs to determine the impacts of routine runoff from the Scheme. The HEWRAT adopts a tiered, consequential approach to the assessment and reports results at three different stages:
 - Step 1 runoff quality (prior to any pre-treatment)
 - Step 2 in river impacts (after dilution and dispersion)
 - Step 3 in river impacts (post mitigation)
- 3.1.2 The inputs required for each stage of the routine runoff assessment (used to run the HEWRAT model) are summarised in Table 3-1.

Stage of assessment	Inputs
Step 1 (run	Outfall information (location)
off quality)	Traffic volume (AADTs)
	Geographic location
	10 years of rainfall data (Standard Annual Average Rainfall (SAAR) values embedded in HEWRAT) for various areas around the country
Step 2 (in	Area draining to outfall (impermeable and permeable)
river impacts)	Characteristics of receiving watercourse:
	Q956
	Base flow index ⁷
	Water hardness
	EQS values
	River width
	Bed width
	Manning's coefficient ⁸
	Side slope

Table 3-1: HEWRAT – Model input parameters

⁶ The flow within the watercourse in cubic metres per second that is equalled or exceeded for 95% of the flow record i.e. the low flow value.

⁷ Base flow index is a measure of the ratio of long term base flow to a watercourse and gives an indication of the groundwater contribution to river flow.

⁸ A measure of the roughness of the riverbed, and the effects that this friction has on flow speeds.



Stage of assessment	Inputs
	Long slope
Step 3 (post	Existing and proposed mitigation measures
mitigation)	Treatment of soluble pollutants
	Flow attenuation
	Settlement of sediments

3.2 Baseline drainage conditions

- 3.2.1 The existing drainage mitigation measures in place for the existing A46 are kerb, gullies, and concrete ditches alongside the majority of the existing highway. Site visits show that the existing system does not appear to be working as designed. The proposed drainage strategy will retrofit or replace the majority of the existing drainage.
- 3.2.2 As a sensitivity check, five HEWRAT assessments were run, with and without the existing mitigation measures. All assessments showed that there were no differences in the results since the existing measures did not have any treatment capacity and are therefore not working as designed. The HEWRAT assessments therefore assumed that the existing mitigation measures reflect a "no existing mitigation measures" scenario.
- 3.2.3 Therefore, the 'Step 2' results which show the impact of pollution at the outfall without mitigation represent the 'Baseline' conditions for the Scheme and 'Step 3' which refers to in river impact with mitigation represents the proposed mitigation measures with the Scheme.

3.3 Proposed Drainage Strategy

- 3.3.1 Infiltration of runoff to ground is not considered to be a viable option for the Scheme therefore Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES Appendices **(TR010065/APP/6.3)** proposes to drain the highway runoff to multiple watercourses within the vicinity of the Scheme – The River Trent, The Old Trent Dyke and The Fleet.
- 3.3.2 SuDS treatment features have been proposed throughout the Scheme design to maximise the treatment efficiency as well as providing environmental co-benefits such as biodiversity.
- 3.3.3 Attenuation features have been designed to accommodate the 1 in 30 year pluvial storm event (plus a 20% climate change allowance). This reduction in attenuation volume, from the 1 in 100 year (plus 20% climate change allowance) was accepted by the lead local flood



authority if it could be shown that the proposal had no significant detrimental impact on the surrounding areas. For full details of the reduction please refer to Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES appendices **(TR010065/APP/6.3)**. Attenuation features will discharge at a restricted green field runoff rate, Qbar.

- 3.3.4 A raised toe swale with baffles will act as the primary treatment stage. Most road catchments will also receive treatment through the attenuation basins, forebays and ponds.
- 3.3.5 One catchment features a filter drain rather than a swale due to space restrictions.
- 3.3.6 Two catchments receive treatment only via the swale and baffles.
- 3.3.7 Two catchments do not receive treatment.

Catchment descriptions

3.3.8 Figure 3-1 shows the proposed outfall locations assessed in the HEWRAT.

Figure 3-1: Outfall locations assessed during HEWRAT assessment





3.3.9 The outfalls shown in Figure 3-1 take in the catchments of the Scheme as described in Table 3-2.

Outfall	Receiving Watercourse	Catchment description
01	River Trent	West carriageway and embankment from Farndon roundabout to the River Trent.
02	Old Trent Dyke	West carriageway and embankment from the River Trent to the Old Trent Dyke.
O3	Old Trent Dyke	East carriageway and embankment from the River Trent to Nottingham to Lincoln railway bridge.
04	Old Trent Dyke	West carriageway and embankment from the Old Trent Dyke to Nottingham to Lincoln railway bridge.
O5	Old Trent Dyke	West carriageway and embankment from Nottingham to Lincoln railway bridge to the Old Trent Dyke.
O6	Old Trent Dyke	West carriageway and embankment from Old Trent Dyke to Kelham Road underpass.
07	Tributary of the River Trent	Southeast carriageway and embankment from Kelham Road underpass to Cattle Market Roundabout and Southeast quadrant of roundabout.
O8	Tributary of the River Trent	Northwest carriageway and embankment from Kelham Road underpass to Cattle Market Roundabout, Roundabout and carriageway and embankment up to East Coast Mainline railway bridge, carriageway up to River Trent
O9	River Trent	Embankment from East Coast Mainline railway bridge to the River Trent.
O9A	River Trent	Bridge deck of Nether Lock Viaduct
O10	Tributary of the River Trent	West carriageway and embankment from the River Trent to Alexander Avenue.
O11	Slough Dyke	Slip road and slip road roundabout by flyover.
012	Slough Dyke	Southern slip roads and A46 flyover until A1.
013	NH Drain	Southern embankment from A1 to Friendly Farmer Roundabout slip road.
O14	Tributary of the Fleet (1)	Carriageway and northern embankment from A1 to Friendly Farmer Roundabout slip road.
O15	Tributary of the Fleet (1)	Carriageway from friendly farmer roundabout to Winthorpe roundabout
O16	Tributary of the Fleet (1)	North eastern lane from Friendly Farmer Roundabout slip road to Winthorpe Roundabout.

Table 3-2: Catchment descriptions for proposed drainage strategy



Outfall	Receiving Watercourse	Catchment description
017	Tributary of The Fleet (2)	Winthorpe Roundabout.

3.3.10 Details of the drainage strategy can be found in Appendix 13.4 (Drainage Strategy Report) of the ES appendices (TR010065/APP/6.3).

Treatment efficiencies

3.3.11 Treatment efficiencies values as shown in Table 3-3 have been determined from Table 8.3.2N1 'Pollution and flow control measures options'⁹.

Table 3-3: Indicative treatment efficiencies taken from DMRB CG 501guidance Table 8.3.2N1 Pollution and Flow control measures options

Measure	Suspended solids (% removal)	Treatment of Solutes (% removal, average of copper and zinc removal efficiencies)
Swale/ grassed channel	80	50
Baffle	0	0
Penstock	0	0
Catchpit	0	0
Detention Basin	50	0
Pond	60	35
Filter Drain	60	22.5

^{3.3.12} The cumulative effect of mitigation measures was calculated by the method outlined in the CIRIA SuDS Manual¹⁰:

Total mitigation index = mitigation index1 + 0.5 (mitigation index2)

3.3.13 Where the mitigation indices are considered in the order of the treatment train.

Outfall O1, O9A and O15

3.3.14 Outfalls O1, O9A and O15 penstocks which do not provide any treatment.

⁹ Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (2022). CG 501 Design of highway drainage systems [online]. Available at: <u>6355ee38-413a-4a11-989b-0f33af89c4ed (standardsforhighways.co.uk)</u> (Last accessed December 2023).

¹⁰ CIRIA (2015) Report C753 The SuDS Manual V6 [online]. Available at: <u>The SuDS Manual - CIRIA - [PDF Document]</u> (<u>vdocuments.mx</u>) (Last accessed December 2023).



- 3.3.15 No flow restriction is provided for these outfalls.
- 3.3.16 The combined suspended solid treatment (CSST) for these outfalls is 0%.
- 3.3.17 The combined solute removal (CSR) for these outfalls is 0%.
- 3.3.18 Outfall O15 is a volume displacement catchment. Although it takes catchment from a new section of the highway, there is insufficient space to attenuate this. Therefore, O16 attenuates the same volume of existing highway to compensate. However, this means that runoff from O15 is not treated.

Outfalls O11 and O13

- 3.3.19 O11 and O13 are treated by swales only.
- 3.3.20 The CSST for these outfalls is 80%.
- 3.3.21 The CSR for these outfalls is 50%.

Outfall O16

- 3.3.22 Outfall O16 has a filter drain, wetland, detention basins, penstocks, ponds and catchpits.
- 3.3.23 The CSST was calculated as: CSST (%) = $60_{\text{filter drain}} + 0.5 (50_{\text{detention basin}} + 60_{\text{pond}}) = 115\%$
- 3.3.24 Therefore, a value of 100% was used.
- 3.3.25 The CSR was calculated as: CSR (%) = 22.5filter drain + 0.5 (35pond) = 40%

All other outfalls

- 3.3.26 All outfalls, apart from O1, O11, O13, O15 and O16, have swales, baffles, detention basins, penstocks, ponds and catchpits.
- 3.3.27 The CSST was calculated as: CSST (%) = 80_{swale} + 0.5 (50_{detention basin} + 60_{pond}) = 135%
- 3.3.28 Therefore, a value of 100% was used.
- 3.3.29 The CSR was calculated as:

 $CSR(\%) = 50_{swale} + 0.5(35_{pond}) = 67.5\%$

Discharge rates

3.3.30 Greenfield runoff rates have been used for all outfalls unless these were calculated to be below 5 litres per second.



3.3.31 Five litres per second has been used as the minimum discharge rate due to physical practicalities in terms of maintenance and operation.

Outfall	Restricted discharge rate (I/s)	
01	No restriction	
02	5.00	
03	5.61	
O4	5.00	
O5	5.00	
O6	5.00	
07	9.65	
08	13.04	
O9	7.07	
O9A	No restriction	
O10	5.00	
011	5.47	
012	11.46	
013	5.00	
014	5.00	
O15	No restriction	
O16	5.00	
017	5.00	

Table 3-4: Restricted discharge rate

3.4 HEWRAT parameters

3.4.1 Steps 1 and 2 assume that the existing road drainage system incorporates no mitigation measures, which therefore demonstrates the 'baseline' of what currently exists at each outfall. The input parameters to run the HEWRAT model are summarised in Table 3-5 for Step 1 and Table 3-6 for Step 2.

Table 3-5: HEWRAT	step 1	parameters	
Table 3-5: HEWRAT	step 1	parameters	

HEWRAT parameters	Parameter	Source
AADT	AADT was used for the design year 2028. The AADT flows for the Scheme fall within the >10,000 and <50,000 category. (The AADT are approximate).	Project traffic team
Climatic region	Colder Dry	HEWRAT Help Guide v1.0
Rainfall site	SAAR rainfall has been taken from the Lincoln rainfall series (600mm). This is close to the Scheme and best reflects the nearest SAAR rainfall measurement at North Muskham gauging station (28022) (received from FEH catchment descriptor data) which is 574mm ¹¹ .	HEWRAT Help Guide v1.0

¹¹ National River Flow Archive (2018) Catchment Rainfall data [online]. Available at: <u>Catchment Info for 28022 - Trent at</u> <u>North Muskham https://nrfa.ceh.ac.uk/data/station/spatial/28022</u> (Last accessed December 2023).



Table 3-6: HEWRAT step 2 parameters

Outfal I	Q95 (m³/s)	Impermeabl e road area drained (ha)	Permeabl e road area drained (ha)	Baseflow index	Water Hardness	Proximity of designate d sites	Ambient background copper concentratio n	Structure in vicinity	Estimated river width (m)	Outfall watercours e
Sourc e	FEH Catchme nt descriptor s	Project drainage team	Project drainage team	FEH Catchme nt descriptor s	UK-Scape Hydrologic al sensor data integration tool ⁴	MAGIC Maps	UK-Scape Hydrological sensor data integration tool	Obtained from topographic al survey	Obtained from topographic al survey	Online mapping
01	0.004	0.281	0.191	0.58	High	No	4.39	No	30.62	River Trent
O2	0.004	1.036	0.717	0.58	High	No	4.39	No	1.17	Old Trent Dyke
O3	0.004	1.033	0.972	0.58	High	No	4.39	No	2.00	Old Trent Dyke
04	0.004	1.036	0.717	0.58	High	No	4.39	Yes	1.83	Old Trent Dyke
O5	0.006	0.418	0.205	0.58	High	No	4.39	No	4.61	Old Trent Dyke
O6	0.006	0.523	0.243	0.58	High	No	4.39	No	4.61	Old Trent Dyke
07	0.007	4 000	4 707	0.58	High	No	4.00	No	0.00	Tributary of the River
07	0.007	1.660	1.787	0.58	High	No	4.39	No	2.22	Trent Tributary of the River
O8	0.007	3.424	1.233				4.39		2.22	Trent
09	1.346	0.000	2.526	0.58	High	No	4.39	No	47.59	River Trent
				0.58	High	No		No	29.12	
O9A	1.346	0.268	0.000				4.39			River Trent
				0.58	High	No		Yes		Tributary of the River
O10	0.003	1.086	0.000				4.39		1.50	Trent



Outfal I	Q95 (m³/s)	Impermeabl e road area drained (ha)	Permeabl e road area drained (ha)	Baseflow index	Water Hardness	Proximity of designate d sites	Ambient background copper concentratio n	Structure in vicinity	Estimated river width (m)	Outfall watercours e
				0.58	High	No		No		Slough
O11	0.003	0.397	1.558		_		2.64		1.45	Dyke
				0.58	High	No		No		Slough
012	0.003	3.311	0.781		_		2.64		0.80	Dyke
013	0.003	0.000	0.316	0.58	High	No	2.64	No	1.04	NH Drain
014	0.002	0.895	0.320	0.58	High	No	2.64	No	1.68	The Fleet
015	0.002	3.181	0.000	0.58	High	No	2.64	No	1.68	The Fleet
O16	0.002	1.271	0.000	0.58	High	No	2.64	No	1.68	The Fleet
				0.58	High	No		No		Tributary of
017	0.002	1.665	0.000		-		2.64		0.94	The Fleet



3.4.2 Step 3 of the HEWRAT assessments assesses in-river impacts with mitigation. Step 3 included mitigation in the form of SuDS, taking into account the risk reduction associated with any proposed new measures (refer to section 3.3 of this report for the mitigation measures at each outfall).

3.5 HEWRAT Results

- 3.5.1 An individual assessment has been carried out for the 18 outfalls required for the Scheme, to assess the potential effects from sediments and soluble pollutants within the surface water runoff.
- 3.5.2 Acute impact of soluble pollutants and chronic impact of sediments is shown as either pass or fail based on the inbuilt thresholds for each pollutant. When a downstream structure that has potential to reduce velocity within 100 metres of the point of discharge is present, no overall result for the sediment impact could be obtained by the HEWRAT and is thus shown as "Alert. D/S Structure" in the results in Table 3-7 below.
- 3.5.3 The EQS assessment compares the annual average concentration of copper and zinc to the threshold values published by the Environment Agency. These are 1 μ g/l for copper and 10.9 μ g/l for zinc.

Tier 1

3.5.4 A Tier 1 assessment uses the estimated river width to calculate the water quality impacts. For each outfall a Step 1 (runoff quality), Step 2 (in-river impacts) and Step 3 (in-river impacts with mitigation) approach was used, as described in Section 2.2 HEWRAT - Three step approach for the EQS – annual average concentration results. All results failed for Step 1 therefore these were not included in the results table. These results are outlined in Table 3-7.



Table 3-7: Tier 1 HEWRAT results for the Scheme

Outfall	Step	EQS - Annu Concen	Acute Impact		Se	Sediment - Chronic Impact									
		Copper (µg/l)	Zinc (µg/l)	Copper	Zinc	Accumulating? And low flow velocity	Extensive? If yes, % settlement needed to pass, and deposition index	Result							
01	Step 2	Fail - 4.46	Pass - 0.11	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.00 m/s	No - 1.72	Pass	Fail						
	Step 3	Fail - 4.46	Pass - 0.11				No - 1.72								
O2	Step 2	Fail - 4.50	Pass - 0.39	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.03 m/s	No - 83.70	Pass	Fail						
	Step 3	Fail - 4.38	Pass - 0.13				No - 0.00								
O3	Step 2	Fail - 4.49	Pass - 0.38	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.01 m/s	No - 79.75	Pass	Fail						
	Step 3	Fail - 4.38	Pass - 0.13				No - 0.00								
O4	Step 2	Fail - 4.50	Pass - 0.39	Pass Pass	s - 0.39 Pass Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.01 m/s	No - 82.56	Alert. D/S	Fail					
	Step 3	Fail - 4.38	Pass - 0.13				No - 0.00	Structure							
O5	Step 2	Fail - 4.46	Pass - 0.11	Pass Pass	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.00 m/s	No - 16.47	Pass	Pass	Pass	Fail			
	Step 3	Fail - 4.39	Pass - 0.04					No - 0.00							
O6	Step 2	Fail - 4.46	Pass - 0.14	Pass Pass	ass Pass	Pass Pass	Pass Pass	Pass Pass	Yes - 0.00 m/s	No - 20.60	Pass	Fail			
	Step 3	Fail - 4.39	Pass - 0.05			No - 0.00	No - 0.00								
07	Step 2	Fail - 4.49	4.49 Pass - 0.35 Pass F	Pass Pass	Pass Pass	Pass	Pass	s Pass	s Pass	ss Pass	ass Pass	Yes - 0.02 m/s	Yes - 101.17 - 2%	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.38	Pass - 0.12				No - 0.00								
O8	Step 2	Fail - 4.54	Pass - 0.67	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.02 m/s	Yes - 208.68 - 53%	Pass	Fail						
	Step 3	Fail - 4.38	Pass - 0.22				No - 0.00								
O9	Step 2	Fail - 4.44	Pass - 0.00	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.02 m/s	No - 0.00	Pass	Fail						
	Step 3	Fail - 4.39	Pass - 0.00				No - 0.00								
O9A	Step 2	Fail - 4.44	Pass - 0.00	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.04 m/s	No - 0.47	Pass	Fail						
	Step 3	Fail - 4.44	Pass - 0.00	1			No - 0.47								
O10	Step 2	Fail - 4.52	Pass - 0.53	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.01 m/s	Yes - 103.87 - 4%		Fail						



Outfall	Step	EQS - Annual Average Concentration		Acute	Acute Impact		Sediment - Chronic Impact		
		Copper (µg/l)	Zinc (µg/l)	Copper	Zinc	Accumulating? And low flow velocity	Extensive? If yes, % settlement needed to pass, and deposition index	Result	
	Step 3	Fail - 4.39	Pass - 0.17				No - 0.00	Alert. D/S Structure	
011	Step 2	Fail - 2.70	Pass - 0.20	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.01 m/s	No - 38.60	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 2.65	Pass - 0.10	-			No - 7.72		
012	Step 2	Fail - 2.91	Pass - 1.28	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.04 m/s	Yes - 248.25 - 60%	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 2.67	Pass - 0.42				No - 0.00		
O13	Step 2	Fail - 2.67	Pass - 0.00	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.02 m/s	No - 0.00	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 2.64	Pass - 0.00				No - 0.00		
014	Step 2	Fail - 2.78	Pass - 0.62	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.01 m/s	No - 92.35	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 2.66	Pass - 0.20				No - 0.00		
O15	Step 2	Fail - 2.99	Pass - 1.68	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.01 m/s	Yes - 328.23 - 70%	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 2.99	Pass - 1.68				Yes - 328.23 - 70%		
O16	Step 2	Fail - 2.83	Pass - 0.85	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.01 m/s	Yes - 131.15 - 24%	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 2.72	Pass - 0.51				No - 0.00		
017	Step 2	Fail - 2.86	Pass - 1.05	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.02 m/s	Yes - 220.12 - 42%	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 2.67	Pass - 0.34				No - 0.00		



- 3.5.5 The results from the HEWRAT Tier 1 assessment (runoff quality) acute impacts indicate both copper and zinc would pass the assessments after step 2. However, the results the EQS Annual Average Concentration indicated that runoff from all outfalls would fail for copper and a pass for zinc. This failure is largely due to high existing background concentrations within the catchments. The Tier 1 assessment indicates that all outfalls, bar outfall 15, pass the sediment accumulation assessment at step 3.
- 3.5.6 Outfall 15 fails the sediment assessment at step 3.
- 3.5.7 The overall result for all outfalls was 'Fail' due to the copper values failing the EQS assessment, therefore a Tier 2 assessment was carried out.

Tier 2

3.5.8 A Tier 2 assessment uses the channel dimensions (including the longitudinal slope), in addition to the river width from Tier 1. The channel dimensions used for the Tier 2 assessment are summarised in Table 3-8.

Outfall	Outfall watercourse	Bed width (m)	Manning's n	Side slope (m/m)	Long slope (m/m)
Source		the topo surface		the topo	Measured from the topo surface
01	River Trent	30.62	0.0290	0.524	0.0001
02	Old Trent Dyke	1.17	0.0400	0.691	0.0100
O3	Old Trent Dyke	2.00	0.0400	0.416	0.0001
O4	Old Trent Dyke	1.83	0.0400	0.467	0.0008
O5	Old Trent Dyke	4.61	0.0400	0.368	0.0007
O6	Old Trent Dyke	4.61	0.0400	0.368	0.0007
07	Tributary of the River Trent	2.22	0.0400	0.579	0.0001
O8	Tributary of the River				
00	Trent Diver Trent	2.22	0.0400	0.579	0.0001
09 09A	River Trent River Trent	47.59 29.12	0.0290 0.0290	1.802	0.0001
USA	River rient	29.12	0.0290	1.802	0.0001
O10	Tributary of	1.50	0.0400	0.238	0.0001

Table 3-8: Watercourse dimensions used in Tier 2 assessments



Outfall	Outfall watercourse	Bed width (m)	•		Long slope (m/m)
Source		the topo surface		the topo	Measured from the topo surface
	the River Trent				
O11	Slough Dyke	1.45	0.0300	0.909	0.0018
O12	Slough Dyke	0.80	0.0300	1.249	0.0010
O13	NH Drain	1.04	0.0300	0.572	0.0056
O14	The Fleet	1.68	0.0300	0.333	0.0050
O15	The Fleet	1.68	0.0300	0.333	0.0050
O16	The Fleet	1.68	0.0300	0.333	0.0050
017	Tributary of The Fleet	0.94	0.0300	0.784	0.0018

3.5.9 The results from the Tier 2 assessment are outlined in Table 3-9.



Table 3-9: Tier 2 HEWRAT results for the Scheme

Outfall	Step		ual Average	Acute	Impact	Sed	iment - Chronic Impact		Overall result
		Copper (µg/l)	Zinc (µg/l)	Copper	Zinc	Accumulating? And low flow velocity	If yes, % settlement needed to pass, and deposition index	Result	
01	Step 2	Fail - 4.46	Pass - 0.11	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.02 m/s	No - 1.72	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.46	Pass - 0.11				No - 1.72	1	
O2	Step 2	Fail - 4.50	Pass - 0.39	Pass	Pass	No - 0.20 m/s	No*	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.38	Pass - 0.13				No*	1	
O3	Step 2	Fail - 4.49	Pass - 0.38	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.04 m/s	No - 82.00	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.38	Pass - 0.13				No - 0.00	1	
O4	Step 2	Fail - 4.50	Pass - 0.39	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.08 m/s	No - 33.68	Alert. D/S	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.38	Pass - 0.13				No - 0.00	Structure	
O5	Step 2	Fail - 4.46	Pass - 0.11	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.06 m/s	No - 10.28	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.39	Pass - 0.04				No - 0.00	-	
O6	Step 2	Fail - 4.46	Pass - 0.14	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.06 m/s	No - 12.87	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.39	Pass - 0.05				No - 0.00	-	
07	Step 2	Fail - 4.49	Pass - 0.35	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.05 m/s	Yes - 110.55 - 10%	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.38	Pass - 0.12				No - 0.00	-	
O8	Step 2	Fail - 4.54	Pass - 0.67	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.05 m/s	Yes - 228.02 - 57%	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.38	Pass - 0.22				No - 0.00	-	
O9	Step 2	Fail - 4.44	Pass - 0.00	Pass	Pass	No - 0.14 m/s	No*	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.39	Pass - 0.00				No*	-	
O9A	Step 2	Fail - 4.44	Pass - 0.00	Pass	Pass	No - 0.17 m/s	No*	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.44	Pass - 0.00				No*	1	
O10	Step 2	Fail - 4.52	Pass - 0.53	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.04 m/s	No - 98.80	Alert. D/S	Fail
Step 3						No - 0.00	Structure		



Outfall	Step		ual Average Intration	Acute	Impact	Sed		Overall result		
		Copper (µg/l)	Zinc (µg/l)	Copper	Zinc	Accumulating? And low flow velocity	If yes, % settlement needed to pass, and deposition index	Result		
011	Step 2	Fail - 2.70	Pass - 0.20	Pass	Pass	No - 0.11 m/s	No*	Pass	Fail	
	Step 3	Fail - 2.65	Pass - 0.10				No*			
O12	Step 2	Fail - 2.91	Pass - 1.28	Pass	Pass	No - 0.12 m/s	No*	Pass	Fail	
	Step 3	Fail - 2.67	Pass - 0.42				No*			
O13	Step 2	Fail - 2.67	Pass - 0.00	Pass	Pass	No - 0.37 m/s	No*	Pass	Fail	
	Step 3	Fail - 2.64	Pass - 0.00				No*			
O14	Step 2	Fail - 2.78	Pass - 0.62	Pass	Pass	No - 0.13 m/s	No*	Pass	Fail	
	Step 3	Fail - 2.66	Pass - 0.20				No*			
O15	Step 2	Fail - 2.99	Pass - 1.68	Pass	Pass	No - 0.13 m/s	No*	Pass	Fail	
	Step 3	Fail - 2.99	Pass - 1.68				No*			
O16	Step 2	Fail - 2.83	Pass - 0.85	Pass	Pass	No - 0.13 m/s	No*	Pass	Fail	
	Step 3	Fail - 2.72	Pass - 0.51				No*			
017	Step 2	Fail - 2.86	Pass - 1.05	Pass	Pass	No - 0.11 m/s	No*	Pass	Fail	
	Step 3	Fail - 2.67	Pass - 0.34				No*			

*The automated HEWRAT assessment results for Outfall O2, O9, O9A, O11, O12, O13, O14, O15, O16 and O17 displayed '-'. A deposit index was not calculated as the low flow velocities

were too great and settlement does not accumulate.



- 3.5.10 The results from the HEWRAT Tier 2 assessment (in-river impacts) acute impacts indicate both copper and zinc would pass the assessment at step 2. However, the results the EQS Annual Average Concentration from outfall would fail for copper and pass for zinc. The Tier 2 assessment indicates that all outfalls pass the sediment accumulation assessment at step 3.
- 3.5.11 The overall result for all outfalls was 'Fail' due to the copper values failing the EQS assessment, therefore a Tier 2 assessment with M-BAT was carried out.

3.6 **M-BAT**

Input parameters

- 3.6.1 A M-BAT assessment was required due to all outfalls failing for the EQS annual average concentration of copper, at both Tier 1 and Tier 2 with mitigation.
- 3.6.2 The Tier 1 and Tier 2 HEWRAT assessment assume that all dissolved copper is bioavailable.
- 3.6.3 The M-BAT is a tool to estimate the bioavailable concentrations of a metal under the conditions found on site, which can then be compared to the EQS limits to assess compliance.
- 3.6.4 Copper concentration was obtained from the HEWRAT assessment results for Tier 2. Dissolved organic carbon (DOC), pH and calcium have been obtained from the UK-SCAPE hydrological sensor data integration. Median values were used for DOC.
- 3.6.5 The resulting bioavailable copper concentrations, output from the M-BAT, are recorded in Table 3-10.

Table 3-10: Input parameters for the M-BAT assessment

Outfall	Input parameters				Results
	Measured Copper Concentration (µg/I)	рН	DOC (mg/l)	Calcium (mg/l)	Bioavailable Copper Concentration (µg/l) results from M-BAT
01	4.46	8	6.2	89.48	0.22
02	4.50	8	6.2	89.48	0.22
O3	4.49	8	6.2	89.48	0.22
O4	4.50	8	6.2	89.48	0.22
O5	4.46	8	6.2	89.48	0.22
O6	4.46	8	6.2	89.48	0.22
07	4.49	8	6.2	89.48	0.22
O8	4.54	8	6.2	89.48	0.23
O9	4.44	8	6.2	89.48	0.22
O9A	4.44	8	6.2	89.48	0.22



Outfall	Input parameters				Results
	Measured Copper Concentration (µg/I)	рН	DOC (mg/l)		Bioavailable Copper Concentration (µg/l) results from M-BAT
O10	4.52	8	6.2	89.48	0.22
011	2.70	8.1	6.2	89.48	0.15
012	2.91	8.1	6.2	89.48	0.16
O13	2.67	7.9	5.22	89.97	0.15
O14	2.78	7.9	5.22	89.97	0.15
O15	2.99	7.9	5.22	89.97	0.16
O16	2.83	7.9	5.22	89.97	0.16
017	2.86	7.9	5.22	89.97	0.16

Results

3.6.6 A Tier 2 assessment (with mitigation) was re-run with results of the dissolved copper values from the M-BAT assessment. The Tier 1 and Tier 2 HEWRAT assessments failed as the measured copper values (4.46 μ g/l for outfall 1 for example) were higher than the EQS limits. For outfall 1, only 0.22 μ g/l is bio-available, as calculated by the M-BAT seen above, therefore this is below the EQS limit of 1 μ g/l. Table 3-11 outlines these results.



Table 3-11: Tier 2 HEWRAT results with M-BAT for the Scheme

Outfall	Step	Step EQS - Annual Average Concentration			Impact	s	Sediment - Chronic Impact		Overall result
		Copper (µg/l)	Zinc (µg/l)	Copper	Zinc	Accumulating? And low flow velocity	Extensive? If yes, % settlement needed to pass, and deposition index	Result	
O1	Step 2	Pass - 0.25	Pass - 0.11	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.02 m/s	No - 1.72	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.25	Pass - 0.11				No - 1.72		
02	Step 2	Pass - 0.31	Pass - 0.39	Pass	Pass	No - 0.20 m/s No* No*		Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.25	Pass - 0.13						
O3	Step 2	Pass - 0.31	Pass - 0.38	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.04 m/s	No - 82.00	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.25	Pass - 0.13				No - 0.00		
O4	Step 2	Pass - 0.31	Pass - 0.39	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.08 m/s	No - 33.68	Alert. D/S	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.25	Pass - 0.13				No - 0.00	Structure	
O5	Step 2	Pass - 0.25	Pass - 0.11	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.06 m/s	No - 10.28	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.23	Pass - 0.04				No - 0.00		
O6	Step 2	Pass - 0.25	Pass - 0.14	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.06 m/s	No - 12.87	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.23	Pass - 0.05				No - 0.00		
07	Step 2	Pass - 0.30	Pass - 0.35	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.05 m/s	Yes - 110.55- 10%	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.25	Pass - 0.12				No - 0.00		
O8	Step 2	Pass - 0.39	Pass - 0.67	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.05 m/s	Yes - 228.02 - 57%	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.28	Pass - 0.22				No - 0.00		
O9	Step 2	Pass - 0.22	Pass - 0.00	Pass	Pass	No - 0.14 m/s	No*	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.22	Pass - 0.00				No*		
O9A	Step 2	Pass - 0.22	Pass - 0.00	Pass	Pass	No - 0.17 m/s	No*	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.22	Pass - 0.00				No*		
O10	Step 2	Pass - 0.34	Pass - 0.53	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.04 m/s	No - 98.80		Pass



Outfall	Step		ual Average ntration	Acute	Impact	s		Overall result	
		Copper (µg/l)	Zinc (µg/l)	Copper	Zinc	Accumulating? And low flow velocity	Extensive? If yes, % settlement needed to pass, and deposition index	Result	
	Step 3	Pass - 0.26	Pass - 0.17				No - 0.00	Alert. D/S Structure	-
O11	Step 2	Pass - 0.20	Pass - 0.20	Pass	Pass	No - 0.11 m/s	No*	Pass	Pass
I	Step 3	Pass - 0.17	Pass - 0.10				No*		
O12	Step 2	Pass - 0.46	Pass - 1.28	Pass	Pass	No - 0.12 m/s	No*	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.25	Pass - 0.42				No*		
O13	Step 2	Pass - 0.15	Pass - 0.00	Pass	Pass	No - 0.37 m/s	No*	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.15	Pass - 0.00				No*		
O14	Step 2	Pass - 0.30	Pass - 0.62	Pass	Pass	No - 0.13 m/s	No*	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.20	Pass - 0.20				No*		
O15	Step 2	Pass - 0.55	Pass - 1.68	Pass	Pass	No - 0.13 m/s	No*	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.55	Pass - 1.68				No*		
O16	Step 2	Pass - 0.36	Pass - 0.85	Pass	Pass	No - 0.13 m/s	No*	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.28	Pass - 0.51				No*		
017	Step 2	Pass - 0.40	Pass - 1.05	Pass	Pass	No - 0.11 m/s	No*	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.24	Pass - 0.34				No*		

* The automated HEWRAT assessment results for Outfall O2, O9, O9A, O11, O12, O13, O14, O15, O16 and O17 displayed '-'. A deposit index was not calculated as the low flow velocities

were too great and settlement does not accumulate.



- 3.6.7 Both the baseline and the post mitigation (step 2 and 3) results 'Pass' the HEWRAT soluble impact assessment with the M-BAT. The postmitigation copper values are 0.058 µg/l lower than the baseline copper results on average.
- 3.6.8 The post-mitigation scenario passes the sediment chronic impact assessment for all outfalls.
- 3.6.9 The overall result for all outfalls is pass.

3.7 Cumulative HEWRAT Assessment

- 3.7.1 Input parameters
- 3.7.2 3.7.1 In accordance with DMRB methodology, the HEWRAT assessment should include a cumulative assessment that considers other outfalls located within 100 metre and 1 kilometre of each other that drain to the same watercourse, for sediment and soluble impacts respectively. Beyond 1 kilometre it is assumed dilution would take place and impacts would be less significant.
- 3.7.3 3.7.2 In the proposed drainage design, outfalls which are within 100 metre of each other are:
 - O5 and O6
 - 07 and 08
 - O9 and O9A
 - 014, 015 and 016
- 3.7.4 Outfalls which are between 100 metre and 1 kilometre from each other are:
 - O2, O3 and O4
 - 011 and 012
- 3.7.5 Input parameters used in the cumulative assessment are shown in Table 3-12. Impermeable and permeable areas for each outfall are summed, other values are worked out based on a weighted average of those values for each outfall.
- 3.7.6 For mitigation indices the percentage removal of copper and zinc and the percentage settlement of sediment was determined by weighting the proposed mitigation with the catchment areas.
- 3.7.7 The calculations for these values can be seen in section 3.3.14 and 3.3.11 respectively.



Table 3-12: Input parameters used in the cumulative assessment

Type of assessmen t	Outfal I	(m³/s)	Impermeabl e road area drained (ha)	e road	Baseflow index		Proximity of designate d sites	Ambient background copper concentratio n	Structure in vicinity	Estimated river width (m)	sediment	t for	Restricte d discharge rate (I/s)
	Sourc e		Sum of cumulative areas	Sum of cumulative areas	t	Hydrologica I sensor	MAGIC Maps	UK-Scape Hydrological sensor data integration tool	Obtained from topographica I survey	Obtained from topographica I survey (average used)			Weighted average of greenfield runoff rates
Outfalls within 100m	O5 and O6	0.006	0.941	0.448	0.58	High	No	4.39	No	4.61	100%	67.5%	5.00
	O8	0.007	5.085	3.019	0.58	High	No	4.39	No	2.22	100%	67.5%	11.35
	O9 and O9A	1.346	0.268	2.526	0.58	High	No	4.39	No	38.35	90.4%	61.0%	6.72
	014, 015 and 016	0.002	5.347	0.320	0.58	High	No	2.64	No	1.68	43.9%	23.4%	2.19
Outfalls between	O2, O3	0.004	3.105	2.406	0.58	High	No	4.39	Cumulative as between 100r consider wate this only asse	n and 1km do rcourse dime	es not nsions as	67.5%	5.20



Type of assessmen t	Outfal I		Impermeabl e road area drained (ha)	e road		Hardness	Proximity of designate d sites	Ambient background copper concentratio n		Estimated river width (m)	Treatmen t for sediment s (%)	Treatmen t for solutes (%)	Restricte d discharge rate (I/s)
		Catchmen	Sum of cumulative areas	cumulative areas	Catchmen t descriptor s	Hydrologica I sensor	MAGIC Maps	UK-Scape Hydrological sensor data integration tool	from topographica I survey	Obtained from topographica I survey (average used)		s section of	Weighted average of greenfield runoff rates
	O11 and O12	0.003	3.708	2.339	0.58	High	No	2.64	impact.			61.8%	5.15



HEWRAT Results for outfalls within 100 meters

Tier 1

3.7.8 Table 3-13 outlines the results from the Tier 1 assessment.



Outfall	Step		nual Average entration	Acute	mpact		Sediment - Chronic Impact		
		Copper	Zinc	Copper	Zinc	Accumulating? And low flow velocity	Extensive? If yes, % settlement needed to pass, and deposition index	Result	
O5 and O6	Step 2	Fail - 4.48	Pass - 0.25	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.00 m/s	No - 37.07	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.39	Pass - 0.08				No - 0.00		
O7 and O8	Step 2	Fail - 4.57	Pass - 0.92	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.02 m/s	Yes - 309.92 - 68%	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.38	Pass - 0.30				No - 0.00		
O9 and O9A	Step 2	Fail - 4.44	Pass - 0.00	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.03 m/s	No - 0.64	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.39	Pass - 0.00				No - 0.06		
O14, O15 and O16	Step 2	Fail - 2.90	Pass - 2.33	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.01 m/s	Yes - 551.73 - 82%	Fail	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 3.01	Pass - 2.31				Yes - 309.52 - 82% needed 43.9% proposed		

Table 3-13: Cumulative assessment of outfalls within 100 metres - Tier 1 results



- 3.7.9 The results from the HEWRAT Tier 1 assessment for cumulative outfalls within 100m (runoff quality) acute impacts indicate both copper and zinc would pass the assessments. However, the results the EQS Annual Average Concentration indicated that runoff from all outfalls would fail for copper and a pass for zinc. This failure is largely due to high existing background concentrations in the catchment. The Tier 1 indicates that the cumulative effects of outfalls O5 and O6, O7 and O8 and O9 and O9A passes the sediment deposit assessment.
- 3.7.10 The Tier 1 indicates that the cumulative effects of outfalls O14, O15 and O16 fails the sediment deposit assessment.
- 3.7.11 The Tier 1 assessment failed at step 3 for the EQS assessment of copper, therefore a Tier 2 assessment was carried out.

Tier 2

3.7.12 Table 3-14 outlines the results from the Tier 2 assessment.



			nual Average entration	Acute Impact		5		Overall result	
		Copper	Zinc	Copper	Zinc	Accumulating? And low flow velocity	Extensive? If yes, % settlement needed to pass, and deposition index	Result	
O5 and O6	Step 2	Fail - 4.48	Pass - 0.25	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.06 m/s	No - 23.15	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.39	Pass - 0.08				No - 0.00		
O7 and O8	Step 2	Fail - 4.57	Pass - 0.92	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.05 m/s	Yes - 338.70 - 71%	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.38	Pass - 0.30				No - 0.00		
O9 and O9A	Step 2	Fail - 4.44	Pass - 0.00	Pass	Pass	No - 0.16 m/s	No*	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 4.39	Pass - 0.00				No*		
O14, O15 and O16	Step 2	Fail - 2.90	Pass - 2.33	Pass	Pass	No - 0.13 m/s	No*	Pass	Fail
	Step 3	Fail - 3.01	Pass - 2.31				No*		

Table 3-14: Cumulative assessment of outfalls within 100 metres - Tier 2 results

*The automated HEWRAT assessment results for Outfalls 'O9 and O9A' and 'O14, O15 and O16' displayed '-'. A deposit index was not calculated as the low flow velocities were too great and settlement does not accumulate.



- 3.7.13 The results from the HEWRAT Tier 2 assessment for cumulative outfalls within 100 metres (in-river impacts) acute impacts indicate both copper and zinc would pass the assessment. However, the results the EQS Annual Average Concentration from both cumulative outfalls would fail for copper and pass for zinc. The Tier 2 indicates that the cumulative effects of all outfalls O5 and O6, O7 and O8, O9 and O9A and O14, O15 and O16 pass the sediment deposit assessment.
- 3.7.14 The Tier 2 assessment failed at step 3 for all EQS assessments of copper, therefore a Tier 2 assessment with M-BAT input criteria was carried out.

Tier 2 with M-BAT

- 3.7.15 A M-BAT assessment was required due to the cumulative assessments failing for the EQS annual average concentration of copper, at both Tier 1 and Tier 2 with mitigation.
- 3.7.16 The Tier 1 and Tier 2 HEWRAT assessment assume that all dissolved copper is bioavailable. However, the dissolved copper may be above the EQS limits, causing the HEWRAT to fail.
- 3.7.17 Copper concentration was obtained from the HEWRAT assessment results for Tier 2. Dissolved organic carbon (DOC), pH and calcium have been obtained from the UK-SCAPE hydrological sensor data integration. Median values were used for DOC.
- 3.7.18 The resulting bioavailable copper concentrations, output from the M-BAT, are recorded in Table 3-15.

Outfalls	Input parameters				Results
	Measured Copper Concentration (µg/I)	рН	DOC (mg/l)	Calcium (mg/l)	Bioavailable Copper Concentration (μg/l) results from M-BAT
O5 and O6	4.48	8	6.2	89.48	0.22
O7 and O8	4.57	8	6.2	89.48	0.23
O9 and O9A	4.44	8	6.2	89.48	0.22
O14, O15 and O16	2.90	7.9	5.22	89.97	0.14

Table 3-15: Input parameters for the M-BAT assessment

3.7.19 Table 3-16 outlines the results.



Table 3-16: M-BAT assessment results

Outfall	Step	EQS - Annual Average Concentration		Acute Impact			Overall result		
		Copper	Zinc	Copper	Zinc	Accumulating? And low flow velocity	Extensive? If yes, % settlement needed to pass, and deposition index	Result	
O5 and O6	Step 2	Pass - 0.28	Pass - 0.25	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.06 m/s	No - 23.15	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.24	Pass - 0.08			-	No - 0.00		
O7 and O8	Step 2	Pass - 0.43	Pass - 0.92	Pass	Pass	Yes - 0.05 m/s	Yes - 338.70 - 71%	Pass	Pass
	Step 3	Pass - 0.30	Pass - 0.30				No - 0.00		
O9 and	Step 2	Pass - 0.22	Pass - 0.00	Pass	Pass	No - 0.16 m/s	No*	Pass	Pass
O9A	Step 3	Pass - 0.22	Pass - 0.00			-	No*		
014, 015	Step 2	Pass - 0.68	Pass - 2.33	Pass	Pass	No - 0.13 m/s	No*	Pass	Pass
and O16	Step 3	Pass - 0.65	Pass - 2.31	-			No*		

*The automated HEWRAT assessment results for Outfalls 'O9 and O9A' and 'O14, O15 and O16' displayed '-'. A deposit index was not calculated as the low flow velocities were too great and settlement does not accumulate.



- 3.7.20 The results for both cumulative outfalls state the bioavailability copper concentrations with the Scheme is less than the EQS, for both locations. Therefore, the Scheme with mitigation will not lead to an exceedance of EQS. The Tier 2 with M-BAT indicates that the cumulative effects of outfalls O5 and O6, O7 and O8, O9 and O9A and O14, O15 and O16 passes the sediment deposit assessment.
- 3.7.21 The Tier 2 with M-BAT assessment passed for the O5 and O6, the O7 and O8, O9 and O9A and O14, O15 and O16 cumulative assessments.

Outfalls between 100 metres and 1 kilometre

3.7.22 The cumulative assessment of outfalls between 100 metres and 1 kilometre does not consider river geometry, and therefore is run in only two stages – Tier 1 which considers dissolved copper and Tier 2 M-BAT (in case of failure at Tier 1) which considers bioavailable copper calculated with the M-BAT. The cumulative assessment for outfalls between 100 metres and 1 kilometre does not consider sediment deposit.

Tier 1

Outfall	EQ	S - Annual A Concentrat	-	Acute	e Impact	Overall result	
		Copper Zinc		Copper	Zinc		
O2, O3 and	Step 2	Fail - 4.57	Pass - 0.96	Pass	Pass	Fail	
O4	Step 3	Fail - 4.38	Pass - 0.32				
O11 and O12	Step 2	Fail - 2.91	Pass - 1.36	Pass	Pass	Fail	
Step 3		Fail - 2.69	Pass - 0.54				

3.7.23 Table 3-17 outlines the results from the Tier 1 assessment.

- 3.7.24 The results from the HEWRAT Tier 1 cumulative assessment acute impacts indicate both copper and zinc would pass the assessments. However, the results the EQS Annual Average Concentration indicated that runoff from all cumulative outfalls would fail for copper and a pass for zinc. This failure is largely due to high existing background concentrations in the catchment.
- 3.7.25 The Tier 1 assessment failed at step 3 for all cumulative EQS assessments of copper, therefore a Tier 2 M-BAT assessment was carried out.

Tier 2 M-BAT

3.7.26 A M-BAT assessment was required due to the cumulative assessments failing for the EQS annual average concentration of copper, at Tier 1 with mitigation.



- 3.7.27 The Tier 1 HEWRAT assessment assume that all dissolved copper is bioavailable. However, the dissolved copper may be above the EQS limits, causing the HEWRAT to fail.
- 3.7.28 Copper concentration was obtained from the HEWRAT assessment results for Tier 2. Dissolved organic carbon (DOC), pH and calcium have been obtained from the UK-SCAPE hydrological sensor data integration. Median values were used for DOC.
- 3.7.29 The resulting bioavailable copper concentrations, output from the M-BAT, are recorded in Table 3-18.

Table 3-18: Input parameters for the M-BAT assessment

Outfalls	Input parameters				Results
	Measured Copper Concentration (µg/l)	рН	DOC (mg/l)	Calcium (mg/l)	Bioavailable Copper Concentration (µg/l) results from M-BAT
O2, O3 and					
O4	4.57	8	6.2	89.48	0.23
O11 and O12	2.91	8.1	6.2	89.48	0.16

3.7.30 Table 3-19 outlines the results.

Table 3-19: Cumulative assessment of outfalls between 100m and 1km - Tier 2 M-BAT results

Outfall	EQS - Annual Average Concentration			Acute	Impact	Overall result	
	Copper Zinc Copper Zinc						
O2, O3 and	Step 2	Pass - 0.45	Pass - 0.96	Pass	Pass	Pass	
O4	Step 3	Pass - 0.30	Pass - 0.32				
O11 and O12 Step 2		Pass - 0.48	Pass - 1.36	Pass	Pass	Pass	
	Step 3	Pass - 0.28	Pass - 0.54				

- 3.7.31 The results for all cumulative outfall assessments state the bioavailability copper and zinc concentrations within the Scheme are less than the EQS limits for all outfalls. Therefore, the Scheme with mitigation will not lead to an exceedance of EQS.
- 3.7.32 Both the cumulative and non-cumulative assessments passed the HEWRAT with the M-BAT input criteria for soluble pollutants and sediments.



4 Spillage risk assessment

4.1 Input parameters

- 4.1.1 DMRB LA113¹ states that when considering the risk of spillages from a highway and potential pollution to the receiving environment, the following factors must be considered:
 - The calculated spillage risk return period must not be greater than 1 in 100 (1% AEP) years;
 - The calculated spillage risk return period must not be greater than 1 in 200 (0.5% AEP) years where spillage could affect protected areas for conservation, important drinking water supplies or important commercial activities; and
 - Spillage risk from existing outfalls must not be increased
 - Parameters considered in the Method D assessment include:
 - The type, location and length of road draining to the watercourse;
 - 2-way AADT flow;
 - % HGV using the road;
 - Emergency services response time (dependent on whether a site is in an urban, rural, or remote setting); and
 - Spillage factor.
- 4.1.2 The receiving watercourses the River Trent, the Old Trent Dyke and The Fleet are not sensitive watercourses since they are not within 1km of a designated site therefore the accidental spillage must be less than or equal to 1% AEP.
- 4.1.3 There are 38 active discharge consents registered on the Environment Agency's portal¹² within 1 kilometre of the study area, as of January 2023. The spillage risk assessment does not consider these, however, these have been addressed in Chapter 13 (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) of the ES Appendices **(TR010065/APP/6.3)**.
- 4.1.4 The values (and assumptions) used for each parameter as part of the Spillage Risk Assessment are described in Table 4-1 and Table 4-2:

Table 4-1: Parameters used for Spillage Risk Assessment

Input	Comment
Water body type	All outfalls to surface watercourses
Length of road draining to outfall	Measured from proposed drainage strategy drawings
Road type (A-road or motorway)	Whole Scheme is A-road

¹² Environment Agency's published data. Environmental Permitting Regulations – Discharges to Water and Groundwater [online]. Available at: <u>Environmental Permitting Regulations – Discharges to Water and Groundwater</u> (<u>data.gov.uk</u>) (Last accessed December 2023).



Input	Comment
Urban or rural site	All site designated as "urban" as worst case scenario.
Junction type	Determined from "No Junction", "Slip road", "Roundabout", "Cross road", "Side road".
Response time for emergency services	Assumed as <20 minutes due to proximity to town center and hospitals.
AADT (Two way)	Extracted from traffic modelling
Percentage of heavy goods vehicles use for each road	Extracted from traffic modelling
Spillage factor	Determined from following for urban sites:
	No Junction: 0.31
	Slip road: 0.36
	Roundabout: 5.35
	Cross road: 1.46
	Side road: 1.81
Existing and proposed	Lowest risk reduction factor of the applicable measure for each outfall
measures factor	from the following:
	Grassed Ditch/ Swale: 0.6
	Pond: 0.5
	Detention basin 0.6
	Penstock/ Valve: 0.4
	As the existing system is not assumed to be functioning as intending, no
	existing measures factor was included and the default value of 1 was used.
	The proposed measures factor was calculated using:
	Measures factor = $0.6_{swale} * 0.6_{basin} * 0.5_{pomd} * 0.4_{penstock} = 0.072$ Measures factor for O1, O9A and O15 = $0.4_{penstock}$
	Measures factor for O11 and O13 = 0.6 _{swale} * 0.4 _{penstock} =- 0.24
	Measures factor for O16 = 0.6 _{filter drain} * 0.6 _{basin} * 0.5 _{pomd} * 0.4 _{penstock} = 0.072



Table 4-2: Spillage risk assessment values

Outfall	Water body	Length of road (m)	Road Type	Site	Junction type	Response time	AADT (two way)	% HGV	Spillage factor	Existing Measures factor	Proposed Measures factor
O1	Watercourse	220	А	Urban	No junction	<20 mins	42956	12	0.31	1	0.4
O2	Watercourse	720	А	Urban	No junction	<20 mins	43434	12	0.31	1	0.072
O3	Watercourse	720	A	Urban	No junction	<20 mins	43434	12	0.31	1	0.072
04	Watercourse	390	А	Urban	No junction	<20 mins	43434	12	0.31	1	0.072
O5	Watercourse	330	А	Urban	No junction	<20 mins	43434	12	0.31	1	0.072
O6	Watercourse	380	А	Urban	No junction	<20 mins	43434	12	0.31	1	0.072
07	Watercourse	510	А	Urban	Roundabout	<20 mins	29122	12	5.35	1	0.072
O8	Watercourse	1060	А	Urban	Roundabout	<20 mins	29122	12	5.35	1	0.072
O9	Watercourse	0	A	Urban	No junction	<20 mins	41967	13	0.31	1	0.072
O9A	Watercourse	180	А	Urban	No Junction	<20 mins	41967	13	0.31	1	0.4
O10	Watercourse	960	А	Urban	No junction	<20 mins	41967	13	0.31	1	0.072
011	Watercourse	370	А	Urban	Roundabout	<20 mins	12014	12	5.35	1	0.24
012	Watercourse	1100	А	Urban	Slip road	<20 mins	29954	13	0.36	1	0.072
O13	Watercourse	0	A	Urban	No junction	<20 mins	29323	14	0.31	1	0.24
014	Watercourse	260	А	Urban	No junction	<20 mins	29954	13	0.31	1	0.072
O15	Watercourse	990	А	Urban	No junction	<20 mins	20732	11	0.31	1	0.4
O16	Watercourse	750	А	Urban	No junction	<20 mins	20732	11	0.31	1	0.072
017	Watercourse	530	А	Urban	Roundabout	<20 mins	20732	11	5.35	1	0.072



4.2 Results

4.2.1 Table 4-3 outlines the results from the spillage risk assessment.

Table 4-3: Spillage risk assessment results

Outfall	Embedded mitigation	Spillage risk %	Spillage Risk Return Period (years)	
01	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.0060%	17,318	
01	Proposed mitigation: Penstock	0.0023%	43,296	
	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.0191%	5,233	
02	Proposed mitigation: Swale, Baffles,			
	Penstock, Catchpit, Detention Basin, Pond	0.0014%	72,687	
	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.0191%	5,233	
O3	Proposed mitigation: Swale, Baffles, Penstock, Catchpit, Detention Basin, Pond	0.0014%	72,687	
01	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.0104%	9,662	
04	Proposed mitigation: Swale, Baffles,			
	Penstock, Catchpit, Detention Basin, Pond	0.0007%	134,191	
	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.0088%	11,418	
O5	Proposed mitigation: Swale, Baffles,			
	Penstock, Catchpit, Detention Basin, Pond	0.0006%	158,590	
_	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.0101%	9,916	
O6	Proposed mitigation: Swale, Baffles,			
	Penstock, Catchpit, Detention Basin, Pond	0.0007%	137,723	
-	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.1566%	639	
07	Proposed mitigation: Swale, Baffles,			
	Penstock, Catchpit, Detention Basin, Pond	0.0113%	8,868	
	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.3255%	307	
O8	Proposed mitigation: Swale, Baffles, Penstock, Catchpit, Detention Basin, Pond	0.0234%	4,267	
	Existing mitigation / No mitigation			
O9	Proposed mitigation: Swale, Baffles,	n/a - catchment does not have any		
	Penstock, Catchpit, Detention Basin, Pond	road section - on		
004	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.0050%	19,999	
O9A	Proposed mitigation: Penstock	0.0020%	49,998	
	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.0267%	3,750	
O10	Proposed mitigation: Swale, Baffles,			
	Penstock, Catchpit, Detention Basin, Pond	0.0019%	52,081	
011	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.0469%	2,133	
	Proposed mitigation: Swale, Baffles	0.0112%	8,889	
	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.0253%	3,948	
O12	Proposed mitigation: Swale, Baffles,			
	Penstock, Catchpit, Detention Basin, Pond	0.0018%	54,836	
013	Existing mitigation / No mitigation		does not have any	
013	Proposed mitigation: Swale, Baffles	road section - on	ly embankment	
	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.0052%	19,398	
O14	Proposed mitigation: Swale, Baffles,			
	Penstock, Catchpit, Detention Basin, Pond	0.0004%	269,419	
O15	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.0115%	8,699	
013	Proposed mitigation: Penstock	0.0046%	21,747	
O16	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.0087%	11,483	
0.0	Proposed mitigation: Filter drain, Penstock,	0.0006%	159,480	



	Catchpit, Detention Basin, Pond		
	Existing mitigation / No mitigation	0.1062%	942
017	Proposed mitigation: Swale, Baffles,		
	Penstock, Catchpit, Detention Basin, Pond	0.0076%	13,077

4.2.2 The Scheme passes the spillage risk assessment as all outfalls, with proposed mitigation factors applied, have a probability of a spillage risk event occurring below 1%. No additional mitigation factors are required.



5 Groundwater Assessment

- 5.1.1 Basins are formed with material, where appropriate, to impede ingress from ground water or water from land drainage interactions or to impede the infiltration of pollutants. However, where not possible or not appropriate there is a risk that groundwater will be affected by the surface runoff within the basins. Therefore, a groundwater assessment was undertaken.
- 5.1.2 A groundwater assessment was conducted using the HEWRAT Groundwater Assessment tool. Parameters are assumed to remain the same throughout the Scheme, therefore only one assessment was done.
- 5.1.3 A groundwater monitoring programme commenced in January 2023, but the available data to date does not represent baseline seasonal variability in groundwater levels. A depth to water table of less than 5 metres has been assumed.
- 5.1.4 Further assumptions made are detailed section 2.6.

5.2 Results

5.2.1	Table 5-1	outlines the	results from the	groundwater	assessment.
-------	-----------	--------------	------------------	-------------	-------------

Parameter	Source	Risk Score	Weighting Factor	Component Score	Weighted Component Score
Traffic Flow	Traffic flow	<=50,000 AADT	10	1	10
Rainfall Depth (annual average)	Rainfall depth (annual averages)	<=740mm rainfall	10	1	10
Drainage area ratio	Drainage area ratio	>=150	10	3	30
Infiltration Method	Infiltration method	"Region", shallow infiltration systems (e.g. infiltration basin)	15	2	30
Unsaturated zone	Unsaturated zone	Depth to water table <=5m	20	3	60
Flow type (incorporates flow type and effective grain size)	Flow type (Incorporates flow type an effective grain size)	Mixed fracture and intergranular flow (e.g. consolidated deposits or unconsolidated deposits of	20	2	40



Parameter	Source	Risk Score	Weighting Factor	Component Score	Weighted Component Score
		medium to coarse sand)			
Unsaturated zone clay content	Unsaturated Zone Clay Content	>=15% clay minerals	5	1	5
Organic carbon	Organic Carbon	>=15% SOM	5	1	5
Unsaturated zone soil pH	Unsaturated zone soil pH	Ph <8 to >5	5	2	10
Total Score	•	•	•	•	200
Risk Screenin	g Level				Medium

- 5.2.2 The groundwater assessment demonstrates a medium groundwater risk. The HEWRAT groundwater analysis does not consider mitigation measures embedded into the drainage design of the Scheme, such as the primary treatment swale and the material that the basins are bunded with, and therefore the pollutant load and the overall risk are likely to be overestimated by the used method.
- 5.2.3 The dry weather channel and permanent wetted areas (ponds) proposed within the attenuation area will be formed out of an impermeable liner to prevent ingress of pollutants. As the attenuation basins will be formed above seasonal peak groundwater levels (or at existing ground if at ground level) groundwater ingress should therefore not be an issue within the larger basin area. Groundwater monitoring is continuing to determine seasonal peak groundwater levels and the design will be updated in detailed design. Conservatively, groundwater has been assumed to be at ground level for design purposes.



6 Summary

- 6.1.1 The introduction of the Scheme will impact the surface water runoff quality which will in turn impact the water quality of the receiving watercourses.
- 6.1.2 The HEWRAT was used to assess the short-term risk (acute and chronic pollutant impacts) of the receiving watercourses by comparing soluble pollutants and sediment pollutants runoff.
- 6.1.3 All outfalls failed both the Tier 1 and Tier 2 HEWRAT assessment for copper. The dissolved copper measured in the receiving water courses was above the Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) limits, causing the HEWRAT to fail.
- 6.1.4 An M-BAT assessment was carried out for all outfalls. This estimated the bioavailable copper concentration under the conditions found on site, which were then compared to the EQS limits to assess compliance. The Tier 2 HEWRAT assessments were re-run for all outfalls, with the results from the M-BAT assessment. The results state that all outfalls have passed the HEWRAT assessment, for non-cumulative and cumulative assessments. Therefore, the Scheme will not lead to an exceedance of EQS or sediment accumulation with the proposed mitigation.
- 6.1.5 The results from the spillage risk assessment indicate, without consideration of the Scheme, there would be no discharge with a spillage risk more frequent than the 1% (1 in 100 year return period). This is considered acceptable, and no mitigation is required for the spillage risk. The proposed mitigation is therefore considered sufficient to not cause a significant adverse effect on the receiving watercourses.
- 6.1.6 The groundwater assessment determined there was medium risk to groundwater. The groundwater analysis does not consider mitigation measures embedded into the drainage design of the Scheme and therefore the pollutant load and the overall risk are likely to be overestimated by the used method. The dry weather channel and permanent wetted areas (ponds) proposed within the attenuation area will be formed out of an impermeable liner to prevent ingress of pollutants. As the attenuation basins will be formed above seasonal peak groundwater levels (or at existing ground if at ground level) groundwater ingress should therefore not be an issue within the larger basin area.



7 References

¹ National Highways (2023) Design Manual For Roads and Bridges LA113 Road drainage and the water environment [online]. Available at: <u>LA 113 - Road</u> <u>drainage and the water environment (standardsforhighways.co.uk)</u> (Last accessed December 2023).

² The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations (2017) His Majesty's Government [online]. Available at: <u>The Water</u> <u>Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations</u> <u>2017 (legislation.gov.uk)</u> (Last accessed December 2023).

³ National Highways (2023) LA113 DMRB Vol. 11, Section 3, Part 10 Road Drainage and the Water Environment [online]. Available at: <u>d6388f5f-2694-4986-ac46-b17b62c21727 (standardsforhighways.co.uk)</u> (Last accessed December 2023).

⁴ UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology (2023) UK-SPACE hydrological sensor data integration tool [online]. Available at:

(Last accessed December 2023).

⁵ National River Flow Archive (2018) Catchment Rainfall data [online]. Available at: ______ (Last accessed December 2023).

⁹ Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (2022). CG 501 Design of highway drainage systems [online]. Available at: <u>6355ee38-413a-4a11-989b-</u> <u>0f33af89c4ed (standardsforhighways.co.uk)</u> (Last accessed December 2023).

¹⁰ CIRIA (2015) Report C753 The SuDS Manual V6 [online]. Available at: (Last accessed December 2023).

¹¹ National River Flow Archive (2018) Catchment Rainfall data [online]. Available at:



(Last accessed December

2023).

¹² Environment Agency's published data. Environmental Permitting Regulations
 – Discharges to Water and Groundwater [online]. Available at: <u>Environmental</u>
 <u>Permitting Regulations</u> – <u>Discharges to Water and Groundwater (data.gov.uk)</u>
 (Last accessed December 2023).



Appendix A: M-Bat Results

A.1 Non-cumulative assessments



A.1.0.1 Outfall O1:

File Hame Insert Page Layout Formula Data Review View Add ins Help Projectivitie POST
Number Construction Description Number Construction Number Construction Number Construction Number Construction officer formation formation formation formation Number
Number Construction Description Number Construction Number Construction Number Construction Number Construction officer formation formation formation formation Number
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $
Laboration Part Processing Control Proceedings Control
Salukia Sa
Nasc note: A66 Revision Sector Art Control And Revision And Art Control And Ar
OS pid reference of assessment polit (n) Easing 439272 Storbing 202012 Show Detailed Results
CO 3 pri Metros at caltali acutare (in) tantos Constantes Constant
Receiving understanding understan Understanding understanding understand
[A Anosyse and Dimetel from Enterna Di [A Anosyse and Dimetel from Enterna Di [A Anosyse and Dimetel [Anosyse and Dimetel [An
Notes West carrageousy and embasisment from Families Test. Open Parameters can file
[[stage first
Step 1. State 7 Links 4007 will were stated as Officie State 200 and 1 and 1 and 200 Millions and 1 and 200 Millions and 2 and
Step J. Block Impacts Annuel On from this pinks IBM Predudent COS lines. Very Face Parame
Sinte zeri in Annuil Ca. Impermedite tood ana Statied Na) 2211 Essentiale desemble concer (up)
a der for to transes top transf quarky: Permetie ana dasing to offal (ka) [197: Bosenheide descrief ptr (pp] [15]] HLP QUOE
Base Place (BP) 188 The declarge in or white 10a spectrad size for conservation? No. 1
For disactived airc only 11 data handwas 1999-12001; 20201 19 For disactived copper only Antibet badiguand concertaints (pp) 12
For eardinent languations a determinant induction, late, pand or canad but reduces the velocity within 100m of the point of discharge? No
C Tax 1 Estimated free relation (n)
+ Tar 2 Ref vidih (n) RE Maning h (10) Sale dapa (non) (10)
Step 1 Migration (denote the haves
Treatment for Attreation for solidies. Settlement of
Endinguistic adda (V) ended Argo (n) (n) inferring (n) (Fairly status) 0 7 0
Laser Parada P <thp< td=""></thp<>

A.1.0.2 Outfall O2:

		₽ Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖽 – 🔿 🗙
File Home Insert Page Layout	Formulas Data Review View Automate Add-ins Hi	elp ProjectWise PDF-XChange			🖓 Comments 🖻 Share
Paste ↓ Cut Paste ↓ Copy ↓ ↓ ♥ format Painter ■ I ↓ ↓		Percentage v Conditional Formatting v	Format as Table ~ Comma [0] Currency	Currency [0]	m × Åv v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v
Clipboard Fs	Font S Algement S	Number 5	Styles	Cells	Editing Analysis Sensitivity
• : × ✓ fr					
Highways England	Water Risk Assessment Tool Version 28.4 June 2019 Soluble	C.C. C. C. L. L.			Cikliner/STDK07DK0+Deler-MattMatDavadit_Project/M404EV/FA7#
LGG - Annual Average Cat Carger Stop 2 8.3 Drop 3 8.05		Sediment - Directic Impact Pare Pare Referent dependence for this site is judget as: Accountariage Max Dependence for the formation of the for			
Road number Assessment type	A46 NE Area / OBF 0 number Non-currulative assessment (single outfall)	Area 7	Predict Impact		
OS grid reference of assessment point (m) OS grid reference of outfall structure (m)	Casting 47007.4 Northing 303566 Easting Northing 103566		Show Detailed Results		
Outfall number Receiving watercourse	02 List of outfalls in camulative		Save Results & Parameters		
EA receiving water Detailed River Network ID	Assessor and offician		Reset Interface		
Date of assessment Notes	09/11/2023 Version of assessment. West carriageway and embeniment from the River Trent to the Old Trent Drike.		Bocument Data Source		
			Open Parameters cer file Spillage Risk		
Step 1. Runoff Quality AAOT HIGHD and HI		Lincoln (SAA/1805mmt .	Groundwater Assessment Reset Workbook		
Enter zero in Annual Que Impermeable road area drain	0.004 Preshuraler EGS limits: ed (ha) 1.001 Elicavalizible dissolved copper (µg1)	1	ViewFixed Params		
iver for box to assess Step 1 wrolf quality only) Permeable area draining to		109 0	HELP GUDE		
Base Flow Index (DPI)	0.58 Is the discharge in or within 1 km upstream of a protecte	d site for conservation? No •	Exit Tool		
For dissolved zinc only Water hardness	Hat+>20mcGa00b1 For dissolved copper only Antilest backgrou	nd concentration (µg/l) 0.22			
For sediment impact only is there a downstream shut	are, lake, pend or canal that reduces the velocity within 100m of the point of discharge?	No			
C Tier 1 Estimated #					
* Tier 2 Bed width (r	0 117 Manning's e 0.04 Side slope (m	Am) 0.011 Long slope (m/m) 0.01			
Step 3 Mitigation	Estimated effectiveness				
	Treatment for solubles (%) miticted discharge rate (I's)	Settlement of sediments (%)			
Existing measures	D D Norealision • D				
Proposed measures Suals, beflex, description basin, per	look, pont, caldrait	100			
					-
Interface					
Ready Calculate 🛱 Accessibility: Investigate					Display Settings
"(secondary monghe					



A.1.0.3 Outfall O3:

AutoSave 🚥 👪 🧐 - 🖓 -	Copy of HEWRAT v2.0.4xism # ^R • Saving ~	,∕2 Search		and the second	Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖽 – 👩 🗙
File Home Insert Page Lay	out Formulas Data Review View Automate Add-ins	Help ProjectWise PDF-XChange			Comments 🖻 Share
Can X Cut	- 10 - A^ A = = = - ♥ - 2 Wrap Text	Percentage	Comma [0] Currency	Currency [0]	× 2▼
		Land J	Format as Percent	insert Delete Format	Sort & Find & Analyze Sensitivity
✓ ♥ Format Painter	- · ∰ - · ▲ - ▲ - 플 플 플 트 프 Merge & Center -	Formatting	Table ~	👻 v v v 🖗 Clear v	Filter ~ Select ~ Data ~
Clipboard Fa	Font E Algement E	i Number Bi	Styles	Cells	Editing Analysis Sensitivity
• : × ✓ fr					
Bighways Engl	nd Water Risk Assessment Tool Version 23.4 June 203				CKUMAITEXCEDONDIN - MAILMADUNAR_PROVIDENTATIP
	Soluble	Sediment - Direnic Impact			
Coger Coger Stop 2 8,31 Stop 3 8,25	AB of the second	Pase Defines dependente fair data size la judget au Accessifielity? <u>Tex 0.01</u> Locitor Vidata Edensive? <u>data</u> Dipublicables			
Read number Assessment type	A46 ND-curstative assessment (single outfall)	Area 7	Predict Impact		
OS grid reference of assessment point (m)	Casting 470519 Northing 353	493	Show Detailed Results		
OS grid reference of outfall structure (m) Outfall number	Casting Northing O3 List of outfields in cumulative		Save Results & Pasameters		
Receiving watercourse	Old Trent Dyke Assessment		Reset Interface		
EA receiving water Detailed River Network ID Date of essessment	Assessor and offician		Document Data Source		
Notes	East carriageway and embankment from the River Trent to Nottingham to Lincoln railway bi	lóge.	Open Parameters car file		
			Spillage Risk		
Step 1 Runoff Quality AADT HIDDON	e State of Climatic region Coller-Dry Rainfall site	Linesh (SAA7/600mm)	Groundwater Assessment		
Step 2 River Impacts			Reset Workbook Vew Fixed Params		
Annual Optimier son (n			viewrueo Parans		
ever flow box to assess		109			
Step 1 runoff quality only) Permeable area drainin Base Flow Index (DFI)	to oursel (ne) UNV Examples of standed zinc (upr) 0.55 Is the discharge in or within 1 km upstream of a pre		HELP GUDE		
For dissolved zinc only Water hardness	Hah++200msCa0001 For dissolved copper only Antiest bad	ground concentration (up/t)			
For sediment impact only is there a doverstream of	Inches, lake, pend or canal that reduces the velocity within 100m of the point of discharge?	N .			
	d river width (m)				
• Tier 2 Bed with	h (m) 2 Manning's e 0.54 Side sin	ee (m/m) 0.410 Long slope (m/m) 0.0001			
Step 3 Mitigation					
Step J. Mitigation	Estimated effectiveness Treatment for Attenuation for aplication	Settement of			
	Bristdescription solubles (%) extremation for solubles	s) setenets (%)			
Existing measures	D D Normatidos + 1	0 0			
Proposed measures Snake, balles, dearnior bas	, penalosi, post, caldipit 5.51 •	100			
< → Interface ⊕				÷ •	•
Ready Calculate 📆 Accessibility: Investigat					Display Settings 🔠 🔟 — — 🖬 — + 55%

A.1.0.4 Outfall O4:

AutoSave 🔍 🗊 📅 🥎 🗸 🖓 🗸 🗢 👘 Copy of HEWRAT v2.04.xtsm 🗚 🖌	₽ Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖬 – 🔿 🗙
File Home Insert Page Layout Formulas Data Review View Automate Add-ins Help Project	Wise PDF-XChange			Comments 🖻 Share
Car X Cut → 10 → A* A* = = = ≫ → 20 Wrap Text General		Normal Bad	Good	AutoSum X AV O
Parte La Copy V	Le.e. ee Conditional	Format as Neutral Calculation	V Jacent Dalata Format	HI V Cost D. End B. Anabara Constituity
V Format Painter	100 -K0 Formatting	" Table "		Clear - Filter - Select - Data -
Clipboard Rs Font Rs Alignment Rs Number		Styles	Cells	Editing Analysis Sensitivity
• ! × ~ fr				
Nighwyn Highwys England Water Risk Assessment Tool Vervice 28.4. Ave 201				CillionATEXETDOreDian - Matt MacDoradit_ProprovAtionES/WATP
Soluble Sedime	nt - Chronic Impact	1		-
	DPS Structure.			
Step 2 Copper 200 Sediment depend	ton for this site is judged as: Tes 0.08 Low Too Velais Mo 0 Depositor Index			
Step 3 8.05 8.00 syl	No Deposition Index			
Rad number Area / DBPO number Area 7		Predict Impact		
Assessment type Non-cumulative assessment (single outfall) OS grit reference of assessment point (in) Taking (#2545 Northing (25546)	-	Show Detailed Results		
OS grid reference of outfall structure (m) Easting Northing		Save Results & Patameters		
Outbill number Out List of outbills in cumulative Receiving watercourse Old treat Dyka ####500000				
EA receiving water Detailed River Network ID Assessor and official		Reset Interface		
Optic of assessment Op/11/2023 Version of assessment Notas West cerviageway and embanisment from the Old Trent Drixe to Notificiphem to Lincoln relivery bridge.		Document Data Source		
1998 West cervageway and embanisment from the Old Trent Dylar to Nottingham to Lincoln ratio ay bridge.		Open Parameters cer file		
		Epillage Risk		
Step 1. Runoff Quality AADT HIGGER #16000 * Climatic region Color-Dry * Rainfal size Urean SAARDOwni		Groundwater Assessment		
	-	Reset Workbook		
Annual G _{al} mer Box (RVR) 0.004 Pressurer Cus errer		VewFixed Params		
Enter zero in Annual Gu, Impermetable rood area drained (ha) Exter Sero in Annual Gu, Impermetable rood area drained (ha) Exter Sero in the assess Exter Sero in and area draining to outfail (ha) Exter Sero in and area draining to outfail (ha) Exter Sero in and area draining to outfail (ha)				
Step 1 most quality sety) Permeable ana draining to outful (ha) 0.717 Disouraliable disorded zinc (µp?) 109 Base Trou Index (DPI) 0.93 In the discharge in or within 1 km spatnesm of a protected sile for conservation 109		HELP GUDE		
For dissolved zinc only Water hardness High++200mcCaCODI For dissolved copper only Antient background concentration (a	40 0.22			
For sediment impact only Is there a downstream structure, lake, pend or canal that reduces the velocity within 100m of the point of discharge?	1			
C Tier 1 Estimated river width (m)				
Tier 2 Bed width (m) 180 Maximg's m 054 Side wiqpe (m/m) 847	Long slope (min) 0.0008			
Step 3 Mitigation Estimated effectiveness	1			
Treatment for Attenuation for soldaies - Settlement of				
Brief description matriced Sectors (%) matriced Sectors (%)				
Custory measures Proposed measures State.Lefter, Section Last, predict, port, catropt TO S S S S TO T				
< → Interface ⊕			: •	
Ready Calculate 🛱 Accessibility: Investigate				Ge Display Settings Ⅲ Ⅲ Ⅲ − − + 55%



A.1.0.5 Outfall O5:

AutoSave 🖲 🐨 📅 🥎 × 🖓 × 💭 🗢 Copy of HEWRAT v2.0.4xdsm 🗚 • Saving 🗸	P Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖽 🗕 🔿 🗙
File Home Insert Page Layout Formulas Data Review View Automate Add-ins	Help ProjectWise PDF-XChange			Comments 🖻 Share
Cat ↓ 10 ↓ A* A* Ξ Ξ ± ↔ ↓ \$\$ Wrap Text	General	Normal Bad		autosum Ary O 🕅 🕥
Parta La Copy V	昭 ~ % 9 1 :0 -00 Conditional	Format as Neutral Calculation	Check Cell	Sort & Find & Analyze Sensitivity
V romat vainter	Number 5	Table ~ Styles	Cels	Dear Y Filter Y Select Y Data Y Edding Analysis Sensibility
v l X √ fr	ST NUMBER ST	spes	1 685 1	Loting Analysis i sensitivity i A
• 1 × • <i>µ</i>				
Highways England Water Risk Assessment Tool Vervice 264 June 201				C KUNNASTERETDION/Onix - Mont MacDoneld/L Proprots/ARREV/IIAT#
Salutile	Sediment - Chronic Impact			
Control Among Control A	From Sediment dependions for this size is polyed as: Accessed along? Tex 0.04 Extension? May 0 Dependice locks			
Read number A46 HE Area / DBFO number Addessment back assessment (since outfall)	Area 7	Predict Impact		
OS prid reference of assessment point (m) Easting 478717 Northing 2	459	Show Detailed Results		
OS grid reference of outfall etnucture (m) & Easting Northing Outfall number OS Lat of outfalls in curvulative		Savo Results & Parameter		
Receiving undercourse Old trent Dyke execution		Reset Interface		
EA receiving water Detailed River Network ID Assessor and atfliation Date of assessment Version of assessment		Document Data Source		
Nets carriageway and embarisment from Notlingham to Lincoln raikway bridge to the Cild	Irent Dyke.	Open Parameters car fie		
		Spillage Risk		
Step 1 Runoff Quality AADT >10000 and 40000 • Climatic region Colder Dv • Rainfall site	Unset (SAA/RECommi	Groundwater Assessment		
		Reset Workbook		
Annual G _{an} river Box (1974) 0.000 Presentative CLOS HTME:		ViewFixed Params		
Binter zero in Annaal Qui Impermeable road ansa draited (ha) Enter Binter Sero in Annaal Qui Impermeable area draited (ha) Ext Exception (han anna) Exception (han annn				
Step 1 swordf quality unity) Permetable area draining to outfail (ha) 8.256 Biosevaliable dissolved circ (µgf) Base From Index (DFT) 9.56 In the discharge in or within 1 km spetmann of a	103 0 stected site for conservation? No v	HELP GUBE EXETON		
For disactived zinc only Water hardness Hetr+200mcCaC001 For disactived copper only Architect in		Exe Tool		
For sediment impact only Is there a downstream structure, take, pond or canal that reduces the velocity within 100m of the point of discharge?	10 0 C			
Ther 1 Estimated river width (m)				
	ope (mim) 0.007 Long slope (mim) 0.0007			
Step 3 Mitigation				
Bits for purpose Effect of the unexpose Bits for purpose Attimute to the unexpose (Reling a sensore (Papping of researce) D Description D	 Settement of 			
Interface (*)				
Ready 🛣 Accessibility: Investigate				Ge Display Settings Ⅲ Ⅲ Ⅲ − − + 55%

A.1.0.6 Outfall O6:

AutoSave 🔍 📅 🦃 - 🖓 - 🖓 -			P Search			Lena Steinberg 🥠 🖬 – 🔿 🗙
File Home Insert Page Layout	Formulas Data Review	View Automate Add-ins	Help ProjectWise PDF-XChange			Comments 🖻 Share
	↓ 10 ↓ A* A* = = =	Re - B. Wran Taxt	General y	Normal Bad	Good	Σ AutoSum \sim Arr P R
			Confilmat	Format as Neutral Calculation	Check Col Insert Delete Form	
✓ ✓ Format Painter B I U ✓		💼 🛅 🖬 Merge & Center 👻	昭 ~ % 9 100 -m Formatting ~	Table ~	Check Cell U	Clear * Filter * Select * Data *
Clipboard Fa	Fert 5	Alignment 5	Number 5	Styles	Cells	Editing Analysis Sensitivity
• 1 × √ fr						
highways Highways England	Water Risk Assessment Tool	Version 2.6.4 June 2019				C KUNKASTERETDON/Drive-Mot MacDoxaddi, Projecte/ARRED/RAT/P
	Soluble		Sediment - Diraric Impact			
Eg6 - Anneal Average Car Copper	Zine	Acute Impact	Pass			
51op 2	8.86 ogt	Copper Zine	Sediment deposition for this site is judged as:			
6.23	• #6	Pass Pass	Accumulating? Tes 0.06 Low Row Weinis Extension? No 0 Deposition Index			
Step 3						
Read number Assessment type	A46	HE Area / DBFO number	Area 7	Predict Impact		
OS grid reference of assessment point (m)	Non-cumulative assessment (single outfail) Easting 478719	Northing 2542	<u>•</u> ۵	Show Detailed Results		
OS grid reference of outfail etructure (m) Outfail number	Easting OS	Northing List of outfails in cumulative		Save Results & Pasameters		
Receiving watercourse	Old trent Dyke	assessment		Reset Interface		
EA receiving water Detailed River Network ID Date of assessment	09/11/2023	Assessor and affiliation Version of assessment		Pocument Data Source		
Netes	West carriageway and embariument from Old 1	Frent Dyke to Kelhem Road underpase.		Open Parameters cer file		
				Spillage Risk		
Step 1 Runoff Quality				Groundwater Assessment		
AAD1 PELMERES	0.000 · Climatic region	Colder Dry Rainfall site	Linosh (SAA/RECommit	Reset Workbook		
Step 2 River impacts Annual O ₄₁ river flow (m ¹ /t)	8.008	Freshuater EQS limits:		ViewFixed Params		
Enter zero in Annual Gui Impormeable road area drain ever flow box to assess		Bisavailable dissolved copper (µgR)	1			
Step 1 nmolf quality sety) Permeable area draining to		Bisavailable dissolved zinc (JgR)	103 0	HELP GUDE		
Base Flow Index (EFi)		t the discharge in or within 1 km upstream of a prob		Exit Tool		
For disacilved zinc only Water hardness	High = H000mg CaCO51	For dissolved copper only Ambient backs				
For sediment impact only is there a downstream struct	ture, take, pond or canal that reduces the velocity within ver width (m)	100m of the point of discharge?	N .			
Ther 2 Bod width (r		ing's n 004 Side slope	(mim) 838 Long slope (mim) 0.0007			
Step 3 Mitigation		E dinated effectiveness Treatment for Attenuation for solubles -				
	Brief description	Treatment for aclubles (%) Hendricted dacharge rate (Fis	Setiement of sediments (%)			
Existing measures		0 0 Nomaticion 0	0 0			
Proposed measures Teals, hefes, dearder lasin, per	MOR, JON, GRIPPE	87.5	130			
Interface						
					1	□ Display Settings
Ready Calculate 😨 Accessibility: Investigate						Lag Linspeay Settings III III + 55%



A.1.0.7 Outfall O7:

		₽ Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖬 – 🔿 🗙
File Home Insert Page Layout Formulas Data	Review View Automate Add-ins Help Pro	jectWise PDF-XChange			Comments 🖻 Share
10 ∨ A* A*	= = = ₩ - Ø Wrap Text	~	Normal Bad	Good	^{Sum} ~ Ay O 🔯 🕅
	三三三三三三三三三 三三三三三三三三三三 Menge & Center ~ 昭~ %	+2 .9 Conditional	Format as Neutral Calculation	Insert Delete Format	Sort & Find & Analyze Sensitivity
Gebeard 5 Feet 5			Table ~ Styles	Ces Ces	r Filter Select Data C
	Augumens (S) Nor	Der 191	sques	i Ces i	coung i waaysis i sensavey i A
• I × ✓ fr					
Highways England Water Risk Assessment To	M Version 2.6.4 June 2019				C AUSERS/TERETED/OveDrive - Mot MacDonald/, Projects/ARIHE/URA7#
Soluble		liment - Dhranic Impact			
Copper Zisc	Acute Impact	Pass			
Stop 2 8.38 8.35	ogi Copper Zine Sediment de	position for this site is judged as:			
4.25 4.22	ogt Pass Pass Accountation Extrassion?	97 Tes 0.05 Low low Velosis No 0 Deposition Index			
Step 3					
Read number A460 Addessment bate Non-currulative assessment	HE Area / DBFO number Area 7		Predict Impact		
OS grid reference of assessment point (m) Easting (79361	Nerthing 254508	-	Show Detailed Results		
CS grid reference of outfait eincture (m) Easting Outfail number O7	Liat of outfails in cumulative		Save Results & Pasameters		
Receiving watercourse Tributary of the River Tree	e assessment		Reset Interface		
EA receiving water Ostalled River Network ID Date of assessment 09/11/2023	Assessor and attilation Version of assessment		Pocument Data Source		
	embankment from Kelhem Road underpass to Cettle Market Roundsbout and So	utheast quadrant of roundabout.	Open Parameters cer file		
			Collage Rink		
			Groundwater Assessment		
Step 1 Runoff Quality AADT HIDDO and +80.000 +	Climatic region Colder Drv Rainfall site Unoch (SAAR50	inni ·	Reset Workbook		
Step 2. River Impacts Annual Quertier Texe (milt)	8.007 Freeshwater EQS limits:	1	View Fixed Params		
(Enter zero in Annual Que Impormeable road area drained (ha)	1.00 Disavailable dissolved copper (µg1) 1				
siver flow box to assess Step 1 surveil quality celly. Permeable area draining to cutfall (ha)	1.707 Bicavailable dissolved zinc (µgf) 10.0		HELP GUDE		
Base Flow Index (871)	5.55 Is the discharge in or within 1 km upstream of a protected sile for cores	rvation? No a	Exit Tool		
For dissolved zinc only Water hardness High + 200mg CaCOb1	For dissolved copper only Ambient background concentration	n (upi) 0.22			
For sediment impact only Is there a downstream structure, take, pond or canal that reduc					
C Tier 1 Estimated river width (m)	2.22				
Tier 2 Bed width (m)	2.22 Manning's a 0.04 Side slope (nvin) 8.679	Long slope (m/m) 0.0001			
Step 3 Mitigation	Estimated effodiveness				
8 fet des gription	Treatment for Attenuation for solubles - Settlement of antidates (%) resplicited disclarge rate (Fix) and ments (5				
Existing measures					
Proposed measures Doals, balles, detertion basin, pendodi, pont, cathrpit	87.5 8.65 8 120				
< → Interface ⊕				i e	•
Ready Calculate 🛱 Accessibility: Investigate					🕼 Display Settings 🏢 🔟 — — 🖡 - — + 55%

A.1.0.8 Outfall O8:

	AutoSave 🔍 🖬 🦃 - 🖓 - 🤤	Copy of HEWRAI	Tv2.0.4.xtsm # ^R ❤	P Search			Lena Steinberg 📢 🖽 – 🔿	×
	File Home Insert Page Layout	Formulas Data Review View	Automate Add-ins Help	ProjectWise PDF-XChange				ire
	Cut Cut	- 10 - A* A* = = - ≫··	22 Wrap Text Gene	al v	Normal Bad	Good	Σ AutoSum \sim A_{∇} O \square	
	Paste La Copy V			0/ e 60 to Conditional	Format as Neutral Calculation	Cherck Coll	senat Sort & Find & Analyze Sensitivity	
			The Merge & Center V M	70 7 10 -40 Formatting ~	Table ~	· · · ·	✓ Ø Clear Y Filter Y Select Y Data Y	
	Clipbeard Fa	Fort 5 Ali	lignment 5	Number 5	Styles	Cells	Editing Analysis Sensitivity	^
	highways Highways England V		nion 2.6.4 June 2019				C 4JournSTEREIDDiviDium-Met MacDoxiddL/ProjectsA40eE5/80	ae 🔺
	FBS - Annual Average Date		AutoInsut	Sediment - Chronic Impact				
				Pass				
	Step 2			ment deposition for this site is judged an:				
	5 m 1	6.22 vpl	Cate	asiee? No OxpositionIndex				
	Read number Assessment type		Area / DBFO number	Ares 7				
	OS grid reference of assessment point (m)	Easting 679303			Show Detailed Results			
	Outfal number	08 Lat	t of outfails in cumulative		Save Results & Parameters			
		Tributery of the River Trent asso			Reset Interface			
	Date of assessment	09/11/2023 Ver	rsion of assessment		Document Data Source			
Image: The stand of the st	Notes	Northwest carriageway and embankment from Kelham/R embankment up to East Coast Mainline railway bridge, o	Read underpass to Cattle Market Roundabout, carriageway up to River Trent	Roundabout and carriageway and	Open Parameters cer file			
					Spillage Flisk			
Number	Step 1 Runoff Quality		1		Groundwater Assessment			
				awayawa •				
	Amus d _{at} over the (min)				ViewFixed Params			
					Exercise			
	For sediment instart only							
	= Tier 2 Bed width (n)	2.22 Manning's n 0.04	Side slope (mits)	8.679 Long slope (mim) 0.0001				
	Step 3 Mitigation							
			ment for differentian for subdies . Set	ienert of				
		Briefdestription		nenta (%)				
- A hterface (2)	Existing measures Proposed measures Exals, hefter, description lastin, pand	0 808, sold, sality2						
interface is interface in the second seco								
interface is interface in the second seco								
interface is interface in the second seco								
interface is interface in the second seco								
interface is interface in the second seco								
interface is interface in the second seco								
interface is interface in the second seco								
	() Interface (1		
Ready Calculate 💢 Accessibility: Investigate	Ready Calculate 😨 Accessibility: Investigate						Ga Display Settings Ⅲ Ⅲ Ⅲ − − + +	



A.1.0.9 Outfall O9:

AutoSave 💷 🖬 🦻 - 🖓 - 📼		P Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖽 🗕 🙍 🗙
File Home Insert Page Layout	Formulas Data Review View Automate Add-ins H	lelp ProjectWise PDF-XChange			다 Comments 년 Share
X Cut	✓ 10 ✓ A* A* = = = + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +		=	AutoSum ~ Aγ Q	
	田、 & 、 A、 王王王 田 田 Merge & Center 、	100 - % 9 +0 .00 Conditional	Format as	Insert Delete Format Sort & Find & Oter * Sort & Find &	
 Second Painter 	Fort 5 Alignment 5	Number 5	Shies	Cells Editing	Data - Analysis Sensibility
• 1 × √ h					
highways Highways England	Nater Risk Assessment Tool Vervice 2.6.4 June 2019				C ALISERNETERETERIORNETINE -Most MacDonalds[_ProjectsA404EV/FA7#
Ellip - Annual Average Con	Soluble Acute Impact	Sediment - Diranic Impact			
6.22 Step 2	Zine 0.00 spit Copper Zine	Pas			
8.02	Pass Pass	Sediment deposition for this site is judged as: Accumulating? No 0.14 Low lion Velmis Extension? No - Opposition Index			
Step 3					
Read number Assessment type	A46 HE Area / DBFO number Non-cumulative assessment (single outfall)	Ares 7	Predict Impact		
OS grid reference of assessment point (m)	Easting 400144 Northing 255191		Show Detailed Results		
CS grid reference of outfall structure (m) Outfall number	Easting Northing OS Use of outfails in cumulative		Save Results & Pasameters		
Receiving watercourse	River Trent assessment		Reset Interface		
EA receiving water Detailed River Network ID Date of assessment	Assessor and affiliation		Bocument Data Source		
Date of assessment Notes	05/11/2023 Version of assessment Embankment from East Coast Mainline railway bridge to the River Trent.				
			Open Parameters cer file		
			Spillage Risk		
Step 1 Runoff Quality AADT HIG00 and 40	000 • Climatic region CriterOv • Rainful site	Linok (SAARSOme)	Groundwater Assessment		
			Reset Workbook Vew Fixed Params		
Step Z Nover impacts Annual Q ₁₁ river flow (m ¹ /h) (Enter zero in Annual Q ₁₁ Impermeable road area drain		1	ViewPixed Parans		
dinter Sero in Annual Cu. Impomentine road area dram even flow hos to assess Step 1 sandt quality only) Permeable area draining to o		103	HELP GUDE		
Base Flow Index (I/F)	150 Is the discharge in or within 1 km upstream of a protect		Exit Tool		
For dissolved zinc only Water hardness	Hoh = 200mc CaCOBI	and concentration (apl)			
	rrs, lake, pond or canal that reduces the velocity within 100m of the point of discharge?	N			
C Tiar 1 Estimated riv					
* Tier 2 Bed width (n	0 #7.59 Manning's a 0009 Side slope (nim) 1802 Long slope (mim) 0.0001			
Step.3 Mitigation	E dimated effectiveness				
	Treatment for Attenuation for solubles - autubles (%) readicted dactarge rate (Fix)	Settlement of audimenta (%)			
Existing measures		9 10			
Proposed measures Doals, balles, detertion basin, per		100			
					-
< → Interface ⊕				i (•
Ready Calculate 🛱 Accessibility: Investigate				La c	Display Settings 🔠 🔟 🖳 — 📕 — + 55%

A.1.0.10 Outfall O9A:

AutoSave 🔍 🖬 🦻 - 🖓 - 🔍 =		g V Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖬 🗕 🔿 🗙
File Home Insert Page Layout	Formulas Data Review View Automat	e Add-ins Help ProjectWise PDF-XChang	2		Comments 🖻 Share
Ratte Copy → Gebeerd 5	↓ 10 A* A' = =		I Format as Table	Insert Delete Format	AutoSam ~ Ar AntoSam ~ Ant
	Fort Isl Alignment	Ist Number Ist	Styles	I Cels I	Loting Analysis Sensitivity
• × ✓ fr					
highways England	Water Risk Assessment Tool Vervice 2.84 Area 2 Soluble				C KUNERSTERETE DevDew - Mot MacDosadd _ ProjectsA404 EV/FA74*
LSB - Annual American Car Copper Size 2 Bong 3	Andria Dec Ber Copper Pass Pass	Zine Fast Past Sedinast deputition the tite it page 4 ac Accessed for the tite it page 4 ac Accesse			
Read number Assessment type	A46 [Ht Avea / DBFO n Non-cumulative assessment (single outfail)	maar Area 7	Predict Impact		
OS grid reference of assessment point (m) OS grid reference of outfall structure (m)	Easting 400134	Northing 2553.30	Show Detailed Results		
Outfail number	ORA List of outfails in o		Save Results & Parameter		
Receiving wetercourse EA receiving water Dataled River Network ID	River Trent essessment Assessor and attile	Feb.	Reset Interface		
Date of assessment	09/11/2023 Version of assesse	eit	Document Data Source		
Netes	Dridge deck of netheriock viaduat		Open Parameters cer file Spillage Risk Groundwater Assessment		
Step 1. Runoff Quality AADT >10000 and 45		Rainfall site Unote (SAVR500mm) .	Reset Workbook		
Step 2 Nover Impacts Annual Q ₁₁ river flow (m ¹ /h) (Enter zero in Annual Q ₁₁ Impermeable road area drain	1.340 Preshwater DOS limits: ned (ha) 0.210 Disevalable disselv	nd copper (µgR)	ViewFixed Params		
over four box to assess Step 1 surgition (guilty orly) Permeable area draining to			HELP GUDE		
Base Flow Index (EFI)		1 km upstream of a protected sile for conservation? No	Exertoni		
For disactived zinc only Water hardness	Hah = >300mc CaC081 For dissolved coppe	only Ambient background concentration (apl)			
For sediment impact only is there a downstream struct	ture, take, pond or canal that reduces the velocity within 100m of the point of disch	nga? 10 0			
Tier 1 Estimated ri Tier 2 Bed width (n		Side slope (mim) 01.802 Long slope (mim) 0.0001			
	6) In the Manager a cours	Side scope (none) 11.002 Long scope (none) 0.0001			
Step 3. Mtigation Easing measures Proposed measures	Briefdestriation	emeter diversioners tuning for diversioners tuning declarge ratie (1x) wetters weters weters weters wet			
< → Interface ⊕					
Ready 🙀 Accessibility: Investigate					🕞 Display Settings 🌐 🗉 🖳 — — 🖡 — — — + 55%



A.1.0.11 Outfall O10:

		₽ Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖬 – 🗿 🗙
File Home Insert Page Layout Formulas Data	Review View Automate Add-ins Hel	p ProjectWise PDF-XChange			Comments 🖻 Share
10 √ A* A*	≡ = = 🖗 - 🛛 🕸 Wrap Text	~		\land \blacksquare \blacksquare \blacksquare \square \square \square AutoSum \sim A_{∇} \bigcirc	
	프 프 프 프 프 B Merge & Center ~ 태	8 ~ % 9 + 8 .00 Conditional	Format as		
Gioboard E Feet E	Alignment 5	Number 5	Styles	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Data v valysis Sensitivity A
$\cdot \mid \times \checkmark \not h$				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Highways England Water Risk Assessment Tool	Version 2.6.4 Auto 2019				CAUMASTERCIDIONOMIA-Most MacDonalds_ProjectsA40HEV/TATP
Soluble E00 - Annual Average Concentration	Auste Inpact	Sediment - Diranic Impact			
Copper Zine		Alex. DIS Strustere.			
5109.2 0.34 0.53	of Copper Zinc ,	Sediment deposition for this site is judged as:			
0.26 0.37	- Pass Pass 1	Accumulating? Tes 0.04 Low low Velosis Extension? No 0 Deposition Index			
Step 3					
Raad number A46	HE Area / DBFO number	Area 7	Predict Impact		
Assessment type Non-currulative assessment (air OS grid reference of assessment point (in) Easting 400473	ngie outfail) Nerthing 256028	-	Show Detailed Results		
OS grid reference of outfall enveture (m) Easting	Northing		Save Results & Parameters		
Outfall number 010 Receiving watercourse Tributary of the River Trent	List of outfails in cumulative essessment		Reset interface		
EA receiving water Detailed River Network ID	Assessor and affiliation				
Date of assessment 05/11/2023 Notes East carriegoway and embersion	Version of assessment sent from the River Trent to Alexander Avenue.		Bocument Data Source		
			Open Parameters cer file		
			Spillage Flisk		
Step 1 Runoff Quality AAOT HIDDE and HIDDE and HIDDE	Smalle major Color Dry + Rainfall site	extr (SAAR50mm)	Groundwater Assessment		
			Reset Workbook		
	Freshuater EQS limits:		ViewFixed Params		
	CON Disavailable disselved copper (µgR) Risavailable disselved rise (µgR)	1			
	Bioavailable dissolved zinc (µg/l) 151 Is the discharge in or vithin 1 km upstream of a protected or	103 0 site for conservation? No • 0	HELP GUDE		
For dissolved zinc only Water hardness High = 1000mg CaCObi	For dissolved copper only Ambient background		Exertool		
For sediment impact only is there a downstream structure, lake, pond or canal that reduces the		144 .			
C Tier 1 Estimated river width (m)					
+ Tier 2 Bed with (m)	1.6 Manning's n 004 Side slope (min	i) 8258 Long slope (mim) 0.0001			
Step 3 Mitigation	E dimated effectiveness				
	Treatment for Attenuation for solubles -	Setienent of edmenta (%)			
Briefdestription					
Existing measures Proposed measures Disals Juffes, deprint lasis, pendicit, port, catholic	0 5 Nomaticion • 5 0				
					-
< → Interface ④					>
Ready Calculate 🛱 Accessibility: Investigate				L g Display	Settings 🔠 🔟 — — 🖬 — — + 55%

A.1.0.12 Outfall O11:

AutoSave 💷 🖬 🦻 - C - 📼		₽ Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖬 🗕 🔿 🗙
File Home Insert Page Layou	: Formulas Data Review View Automate Add	-ins Help ProjectWise PDF-XChange			다 Comments 년 Share
Paste Copy - B I U -	□ 10 □ A* A* = = . 2: Wrap Text □ □ △ △ = = = .	Formatting		Check Cell Unsert Delete Format	AutoSum ~ Žrv Polari Fil ~ Sort & Field & Analyze 'Clear ~ Filter ~ Select ~ Data
Clipboard Fa	Fort E Alignment	5 Number 5	Styles	Cells	Editing Analysis Sensitivity A
• : × √ fr					
highways Highways England	Water Risk Assessment Tool Vervice 2.6.4 June 2019				C KUNKASTERCITUON/Daw - Mot MacDox#dl_ProjectAR0HEV/FATP
LSB - Anneal Aneropy Co Copyer Surp 2 8.20 Borp 3 8.97	All of the second secon	Sectionerd - Ocranic Impact Pairs Factored Repetition 2 for the table of an Accounting			
Read number Assessment type	A46 [HE Area / DBFO number Non-cumulative assessment (single outfall)	Ares 7	Predict Impact		
OS grid reference of assessment point (m) OS grid reference of outfail structure (m)	Easting 43109-4 Northing Easting Northing	256196	Show Detailed Results		
Outfall number	O11 Lat of outbills in cumulative		Save Results & Pasameters		
Receiving watercourse EA receiving water Detailed River Network ID	Slough Dyke execution Assessor and affliction		Reset Interface		
Date of assessment	09/11/2023 Version of assessment		Bocument Data Source		
Notes	Gip road and sip road roundabout by fyrover.		Open Parameters car file Spillage Risk Groundwater Assessment		
Step 1 Runoff Quality AADT HODD and H		Unob (SAARSOnn)	Reset Workbook		
Annual G _{at} river too (reve)	8.003 Preshwater EQS limits:		ViewFixed Params		
(Enter zero in Annual Que Impormeable road area drai eiver flow box. to assess Stato 1 smolf quality cety) Permeable area draining to		0 1 0 103 0			
Step 1 suroff quality only) Permeable area draining to Base Flow Index (BFI)	the discharge in or within 1 km upstream		HELP GUDE Exit Tool		
For dissolved zinc only Water hardness	Hah = >000mc CaCObi Por dissolved copper only Am	Sient background concentration (apli)	EXELOU		
For sediment impact only is there a downstream struct	tare, take, pond or canal that reduces the velocity within 100m of the point of discharge?	10 .			
O Tier 1 Estimated r	ver width (m)				
* Tier 2 Bed width (1.45 Manning's a 0.03	Side slope (mim) 8909 Long slope (mim) 0.0018			
Step 3 Mitigation	E dimated effec	·····			
Existing measures Proposed measures Protocol, analo, table, cathol	Treatment for differentian for				
					J
Interface					•
Ready Calculate 🛱 Accessibility: Investigate					GDisplay Settings III III
interior and an					- + 20.0



A.1.0.13 Outfall O13:

AutoSave 💿 🐻 🦻 - 🖓 - 🤤 =		,₽ Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖽 – 🔿 🗙
	rmulas Data Review View Automate Add-ins Hel	p ProjectWise PDF-XChange			다 Comments 년 Share
Paste Corry ~ Paste Copy ~ B I U ~ E	10 → A^ A' = = = + + + 2 Wrap Text	eneral v	Normal Bad	Good	AutoSum ~ Ar O
Paste Copy ~			Format as Neutral Calculation	Insert Delete Format	Fill Y Sort & Find & Analyze Sensitivity
The second secon		Formatting ~	Table ~		Clear Y Filter Y Select Y Data Y
Clipboard 5 Font	5 Algoment 5	Number 5	Styles	Cells	Editing Analysis Sensitivity
• 1 × √ fr					
highways England Water R	isk Assessment Tool Version 28.4. June 2019				CKINERATEXCEDIONEDIan - Matt Madowake_Project/MillelEV/MATP
	Soluble	Sediment - Dironic Impact			-
ESS - Annual Average Concentration Copper	Zine	Pare			
Stop 2		Sediment deposition for this site is polyed as: Assemblation? No. 0.12 Location Vehicle			
51rp 3	•••	Accumulating? Mo 0.12 Low low Vet nos Estensive? No . Deposition Index			
Read number A45	ME Area / DBPO number	Jeen 7	Predict Impact		
	umulative assessment (single outfall)	-	Show Detailed Results		
OS grid reference of outfail structure (m) Easting					
Outfall number 012 Receiving watercourse Siloug	List of outfulls in cumulative		Save Results & Parameters		
EA receiving water Detailed River Network ID	h Dyka Assessor and official		Reset Interface		
	2023 Version of assessment		Document Data Source		
Notes Southe	trn skp roads and A46 flyover until A1.		Open Parameters cer file		
			Spillage Rink		
Step 1 Runoff Quality			Groundwater Assessment		
AADT PROMINENDED	Climatic region ColterOny Rainfall site	resh GAAR60mmi	Reset Workbook		
Step 2 River Impacts Annual O _{st} river flow (m/k)	0.000 Freshwater EQS limits:		ViewFixed Params		
(Enter zero in Annual Q _{in} Impermeable road area drained (ha) ever flow box to assess	3.311 Elicavailable dissolved capper (µgR)	1			
Step 1 seriell quality only) Permeable area draining to outfall (his Base Flow Index (DP1)	Bioavailable dissolved zinc (µg/l) Bit the discharge in or within 1 km upstheam of a protected	100 0 site for conservation? No •	HELP GUIDE		
	20ns CaCOII For dissolved copper only Ambient background		Exit Tool		
For sediment impact only Is there a downstream structure, lake,	perief or canal that reduces the velocity within 100m of the point of discharge?	N			
Ther 1 Estimated river width	m) [0]				
Tier 2 Bed width (m)	0.8 Manning's n 0.00 Side slope (m/r	e) 1249 Long slope (m/m) 0.001			
Step 3 Mitigation	Estimated effectiveness				
	Treatment for solubles (%) metricled discharge rate (Fis)	Settement of address of the settement of			
Existing measures Proposed measures State, beflex, detertion basin, persibulit, port	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
< → Interface ⊕				: •	
Ready Calculate 😨 Accessibility: Investigate					🙀 Display Settings 🌐 🕮 🖳 — 📕 + 55%

A.1.0.14 Outfall O13:

AutoSave 🖲 🕼 🖓 - 🖓 - 🗢 🛛 HEWIKAT v2.04xdsm 🛩	₽ Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖬 – 🔿 🗙
File Home Insert Page Layout Formulas Data Review View Automate Add-ins Help	ProjectWise PDF-XChange			P Comments 🖻 Share
A Cut Image: Second Training Points Discongram B I J = Image: Second Training B I J = Image: Second Training		Normal Bad	Good	
Partie De Copy * B I U * E * & A * E E E E E E E E Merge & Center * EE *	9/ 9 +2 .9 Conditional	Format as Neutral Calculation	Insert Delete Format	Sort & Find & Analyze Sensitivity
	70 9 30 -30 Formatting *	Table ~ Styles	Cels Cels	Clear * Filter * Select * Data *
	Number Isl	sques	i Ceis i	toting Anarysis sensitivity A
highways Highways England Water Risk Assessment Tool Version 28.4 June 2019				CiliariATEXCEDOrdDare -MattMacDaradeLProproxA804EV#A14
Soluble Anne Anne Ingent	Sediment - Chronic Impact			
Copper Zier 10 Copper Zier 10 Copper Zier 10 Copper Zier	Pass and deposition for this site is judged as milating? Ma 0.37 Leading Video's			
Step 3	natating? Mis 0.37 Low Row Vid ruls Size? Ma Deposition Index			
Read number A46 ME Area / DPO number A4 Addessment type Nen-cumulative assessment (single cutital)	rea 7	Predict Impact		
OS prid reference of assessment point (m) Easing 481310 Northing 355565		Show Detailed Results		
OS grid refurence of outfall diructure (m) Easting Northing Outfall number 0.13		Save Results & Pasameters		
Receiving watercourse AP4 Drain watercourse		Reset Interface		
EA receiving water Detailed River Network ID Assessor and officiation Date of assessment		Bocument Data Source		
Date of assessment 00/11/2023 Version of assessment Patos Southern embeniment from A1 to Friendly Former Roundabout alig road.				
		Open Parameters cer file		
		Spillage Risk		
Step 1. Runoff Guality AA0T H0200 end e0000 Climate region Color-Dry Rainfal ate United	AARtitionet	Groundwater Assessment		
		Reset Workbook VewFixed Params		
AMUR Optimer Son (IPVS) 0.000 Pressure CUS INVEC		wiewriteo Params		
	0			
Step 1 mmdf qualty only Permeable area draking to outfall (hs) 0.11 Disovaluble disource (upF) Base Flow Index (DFI) 0.35 Is the discharge in or within 1 km upstream of a protected site for		HELP GUDE		
For dissolved zinc only Water hardness High + 200m CaCOM + For dissolved copper only Antiaest background conce				
For sediment impact only Is there a downstream structure, lake, pond or canal that reduces the velocity within 100m of the point of discharge?	• •			
C Tier 1 Estimated river width (m) 104				
Tier 2 Bel with (m) 10 Maxing's e 10 Side slope (mm)	1572 Long slope (m/m) 0.000			
Step 3 Mitigation				
Treatment for Actenuation for solubles - Settle	ment of			
	ma (s)			
Existing measures Proposed measures Proposed measures Proposed measures Protock analytication D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D	10			
< → Interface ⊕			1	
Ready Calculate 🛱 Accessibility: Investigate				🕼 Display Settings 🔠 🔟



A.1.0.15 Outfall O14:

AutoSave 💿 📓 🖓 - 🖓 - 🖬 📕	EWIRAT v2.0.4xlsm 🗸	,∕2 Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖭 – 💿 🗙
File Home Insert Page Layout Formulas Data Review	View Automate Add-ins Help ProjectWise	PDF-XChange			Comments 🖻 Share
	参 × 熱 Wrap Text General	Normal	Bad Good	E AutoSum ~ Åγ	
Paste Copy - R. Z. H. a. C. a. A. a. E. E. E.	西 西 岡 Merge & Center ~ 昭 ~ % 9 133		Calculation Check Cell	Insert Delete Format	Find & Analyze Sensitivity
- Se rormat Painter		Formatting ~ Table ~		Clear ° Filter S	
Clipbeard Fs Fort Fs	Algement 5 Number	5 91	es	Cells Editing	Analysis Sensitivity
<u>A</u>					
highways England Water Risk Assessment Tool	Version 2.0.4 June 2019				C KLINE NOTE REITORN Drive - Mort MacDonald L, Project MADE EV/TATE
Soluble EBS - Annual Average Concentration	Acute Impact	renic Impact			
C (D) C (D) <th< th=""><th>Copper Zite Pass Pass Factored Factored States Education? No. Education? No.</th><th>das untra ta produje d ani. RED - Cour Sine Velenita - Dependite Index</th><th></th><th></th><th></th></th<>	Copper Zite Pass Pass Factored Factored States Education? No. Education? No.	das untra ta produje d ani. RED - Cour Sine Velenita - Dependite Index			
Read number A45 Assessment hop Non-runnietius assessment (simile outfall)	ht Area / Obh O number Area 7	Predict Impact			
OS grid reference of assessment point (m) Casting 481515	Northing 356119	Show Detailed Results			
OS grid reference of outfall structure (m) Easting Outfall number OD14	Northing List of outfills in currenting	Save Results & Parameters			
Receiving valencourse The Float	assassing re-	Beart Interface			
EA receiving water Detailed River Network ID Date of assessment 09/11/2023	Assessor and effliction Version of assessment	Document Data Source			
Notes Carriageway and nohtern embankment from -					
		Open Parameters car file			
		Spillage Risk			
Step 1. Runoff Quality AAD1 H12000 and +02000 Climatic region	Colder Dry Rainstall site Lincole (SAARt00mm)	Groundwater Assessment			
Char 2 West Installe		Reset Workbook			
Annual General Const	Preshvater EQS limits:	ViewFixed Parame			
(Enter zero in Annual G _{att} impormeable road area drained (ha) 0.00 ever flow box. Its assess	Bioavailable dissolved copper (µg1)				
Skep 1 nanofi quality eery) Pornetable area dhaining to outfail (ha) 9.00 Base Plow Index (BPI) 9.55	Bioanallable dissolved zin: (µg/l) Bioanallable dissolved zin: (µg/l) Bio discharge in or within 1 km upstream of a protected site for conservation?	No • • Exit Tool			
For disactived zinc only Water hardness High++200mg Ca0001 +	For dissolved copper only Archient background concentration (upl)	0.10			
For sediment impact only Is There a downstream structure, lake, pend or canal that reduces the velocity within	100m of the point of discharge?				
C Tier 1 Estimated river width (m)					
* Tier 2 Bed width (m) 1.68 Man	ting's a 0.03 Side slope (mitre) 0.333 Long all	ipa (m/m) 0.005			
Step 3 Mitigation	E stimuted effectiveness				
	Treatment for Attenuation for solution - Settlement of				
Brief description	solubles (%) invahicted discharge rate (Fix) sediments (%)				
Existing measures Proposed measures Seals. taffes. detricionanis, pendink, pend pathol	0 0 Normatician 0 0 0				
					-
< → Interface ⊕					•
Ready Calculate 🛱 Accessibility: Investigate				La Display Setting	s Ⅲ Ⅲ Ⅲ − — I → — + 55%

A.1.0.16 Outfall O15:

AutoSave 💽 🐨 📅 🤧 - 🖓 - 📼		₽ Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖭 – 🔿 🗙
File Home Insert Page Layout Form	ulas Data Review View Automate Add-ins Help Projec	tWise PDF-XChange			Comments 🖻 Share
To X Cut	× A [*] A [×] = = = № × 2 2 Wrap Text	E BER F	Normal Rad	Good ^ State X	utoSum ~ Av 🔎 💽 🚳
	▲ ▲ ▲ = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =	(+,0,.00 Conditional For	-324	About one insert Delete Format	Sort & Firel & Analyze Sensitivity
 Promat Painter 		Formatting ~ Tal	sble ~	· · · · · · ·	lear * Filter * Select * Data *
Clipbeard Fa Fort	5 Algement 5 Number		Styles	Cells	Editing Analysis Sensitivity A
<i>A</i> ∨ × !					
Nighways England Water Risk					C 41 HP # 012 R210 Ov Dive - Mot MacDonald L, Poperty ARD EV/TATP
195 - Annual Aserage Concentration	Soluble Section	int - Chronis Impact			
Cupper Cu	Zee Vin Copper Zee Default formation formation of the comparison o	Pass tass for this site is polgod as: No. 0.13 Low Rev Molais No Oxpenite Index			
Read number A45	ME Area / DBFO number Jarea 7 Jarea 7		Predict Impact		
OS grid reference of assessment point (m) Easting	481519 Northing 358118		Show Detailed Results		
OS grid reference of outfail structure (n) Easting Outfail number O15	Softing List of outfulls in carrylative		Save Results & Parameter		
Receiving watercourse The Float	assassmant .		Reset Interface		
EA receiving water Detailed River Network 10 Date of assessment 09/11/200	Assessor and attliation 23 Version of assessment		Document Data Source		
	ay from triendy farmer roundabout to wirthorpe roundabout		Open Parameters car file		
			Spillage Risk		
Step 1. Runoff Quality AADT >1000 and +01000	Climatic region ColderDry Raistal site Lincol: SAAR500mm		Groundwater Assessment Benet Workbook		
Step 2. River Impacts Annual Quertiere free (m/m)	0.000 Presbuater EQS limits:		VewFixed Parame		
Enter zero in Annual Q., Impermeable road area drained (ha)	0.00 Freshwater EQS limits 3.101 Bioaxailable dissolved copper (upl) 1	-			
river flow box. Is assess Step 1 minoff quality only. Permeable area draining to outfall (ha)	Elicavailable dissolved zinc (upl)		HELP CUDE		
Base Flow Index (BFI)	538 Is the discharge in or within 1 km upstream of a protected site for conservat	en? No •	Exit Tool		
For disactived zinc only Water hardness Hub++200	Tor dissolved copper only Avaient background concentration (a	p0 0.10			
For sediment impact only is there a downstream structure, lake, per-	d or canal that reduces the velocity within 100m of the point of discharge?				
C Tier 1 Estimated river width (m)					
Tier 2 Bed width (m)	1.88 Manning's e 0.03 Side slope (nxhn) 6.333	Long slope (m/m) 0.005			
Step 3 Mitigation	Estimated effectiveness	7			
	Treatment for Attenuation for solutions - Settlement of				
Bieldesz	uun				
Existing measures Proposed measures Premetok	0 0 No matchin 0 0 0 0				
					-
interface ⊕				i e	
Ready 🛱 Accessibility: Investigate					🕞 Display Settings 🌐 🗉 🖳



A.1.0.17 Outfall O16:

AutoSave 💿 🖬 🤣 - 🖓 - 🖷		₽ Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖽 – 🔿 🗙
	Data Review View Automate Add-ins Help	ProjectWise PDF-XChange			다 Comments 년 Share
Patter Dictory ~ B I U ~ D ~ A	C A [*] = = = ♥ × ₿ Wrap Text	al v H	Normal Bad	Good A SH SK III 2	AutoSum ~ Av
Paste Copy -	A · 프 프 프 프 프 프 프 프 프 프 프 프 프 프 프 프 프 프	O/ a 6-0 .00 Conditional For	rmat as Neutral Calculation	insert Delete Format	Fill Sort & Find & Analyze Sensitivity
- Permanentinan		70 7 100 -X0 Formatting ~ To	able *		Clear * Filter * Select * Data *
Clipboard IS Font	5 Algement 5	Number 5	Styles	Cells	Editing Analysis Sensitivity
• ! × √ fr					
Highways Highways England Water Risk Assessm	sent Tool Version 2.8.4 June 2019				CistoriaTEXEEDGreEker-MatHacDoxe8LPropriationEv#AtP
Salub		Sediment - Chronic Impact			-
COS - Annual Average Concentration Copper Zine	Acute Impact	Pare			
Step 2	syl Copper Zine Sed	ment deposition for this site is judged as:			
4.28 4.54	Tan Tan Ann	melating? Als E.D Low Row Veloats ssize? Als - Deposition Index			
Step 3					
Road number A45	HE Area/DBFO number	irea 7	Predict Impact		
Assessment type Non-cumulative ass	esament (single outfal)	-	Show Detailed Results		
 OS grid reference of outfail structure (m) Easting 	1518 Narthing 356121 Narthing				
Cutal number 016 Receiving watercourse The Fleet	List of outbills in cumulative		Save Results & Parameters		
Receiving water Detailed River Network ID	Assessor and officiation		Reset Interface		
Date of assessment 09/11/2023	Version of assessment		Document Data Source		
Notes North eastern lane fi	rom Friendly Farmer Roundabout silp road to Winthorpe Roundabout.		Open Parameters car file		
			Spillage Risk		
			Groundwater Assessment		
Step 1 Runoff Quality AAOT HID 200 and +50.000	Climatic region Colde Dry Rainfall site Lincole	SAARSOmei .	Reset Workbook		
Step 2. River Impacts Annual Qu. door Four (milts)	0.002 Freehauter EOS limits:		Vew Fixed Parama		
(Exter zero in Annual Q ₁₁ Impermeable road area drained (ha)		1 0			
siver flow box to assess siver flow box to assess Skep 1 wrodf quality only Permeable area draining to outfall (ha)		109 0	HILP CUDE		
Base Flow Index (BFI)	0.55 In the discharge in or within 1 km upstream of a protected site 1				
			Exit Tool		
For disactived zinc only Water handness High + >200mg Ca00b1	For dissolved copper only Antiiest background con				
		Ne			
C Tier 1 Estimated river width (m)	1.65				
Tier 2 Bed width (m)	1.08 Manning's n.0.00 Side slope (m/m)	0.333 Long slope (m/m) 0.005			
Step 3 Mitigation	Estimated effectiveness				
	Treatment for Attenuation for aplubles . Sett	ement of			
Brisfdescription		eris (%)			
Existing measures Proposed measures Filer dain, detertion basin, persitod, port, celcipit	0 0 No realization + 0 0 40 5 - 100	2			
Contrast measures					
Interface				1.04	•
				: 4	•
Ready Calculate 😨 Accessibility: Investigate					🕼 Display Settings 🌐 🔟 — — 🖬 + 55%

A.1.0.18 Outfall O17:

AutoSave 💽 🖬 🦃 - 🖓 -		P Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖽 – 👩 🗙
File Home Insert Page La	yout Formulas Data Review View Automate	Add-ins Help ProjectWise PDF-XChange			다 Comments 년 Share
Parta	10 √ A [*] A [*] = = = ≫ √ 救 Wrap	ext. General -	Normal Bad	Good	27 P 🕅 🖻
Paste Copy ~	1 · 田 · 소 · 스 · 프 프 프 프 프 프 페 Merge	Control I REP . D/ . 6-0 .00 Conditional	Format as Neutral Calculation	Check Coll insert Delete Format	Sort & Find & Analyze Sensitivity
✓ ∜ Format Painter B I j	Font 5 Alignment	5 Number 5	Table * Styles	Cels Edit	Filter - Select - Data - na Analysis Sensitivity -
		ISI NUTDER ISI	3085	i Cers i Eder	ng Analysis Sensthirty
• ! × √ fi					
highways Eng	Jand Water Risk Assessment Tool Version 23.4 June 2019				CKINHASTEXEEDINGDise-Matt MacDonald/_ProprovAsteES/FA1#
	Soluble	Sediment - Chronic Impact			
EGS - Annual Avera Copper	e Concentration Acute Impact	Part -			
Seep 2 8.00 Seep 3 8.00	100 (y) 100	Zine Technist dependent of the starts is polyed an Accountaining? <u>No. 6.11</u> Lowing Wints Extensive? <u>No</u> Dependention			
Reed number	A46 HE Area/OBFO numb	Aceo 7	Predict Impact		
Assessment type OS grid reference of assessment point (m)	Non-currelative assessment (single outfall) Easting (45226 Non	Ving 2566.07	Show Detailed Results		
OS grid reference of outfall structure (m)	Lasing Mazze No				
Outfall number	O 17 List of outbills in came	tive	Save Results & Parameter		
Receiving watercourse EA receiving water Detailed River Network ID	Tributary of The Fleet Assessment Assessment		Reset Interface		
Cate of assessment	09/11/2023 Version of assessment		Document Data Source		
Notes	Wethorpe Roundabout		Open Parameters cer file		
			Scillage Risk		
Step 1 Runoff Quality AADT >10300	and 40000 Climatic region ColterDry P	antal ste Urech (SAARSOmmi •	Groundwater Assessment Reset Workbook		
Step 2 River Impacts			Vew Fixed Params		
Annum U _{st} mier sou (ViewPixed Parans		
Enter zero in Annual Q _{an} Impermeable road are river flow box to assess					
 Step 1 runoff quality only) Permeable area drain Base Flow Index (DFI) 			HELP GUDE		
For disactived zinc only Water hardness		Ambiest background concentration (up/)	Exit Tool		
	structure, lake, pend or canal that redaces the velocity within 100m of the point of discharge				
	aled river width (m)				
• Tier 2 Bel v	idh (n) 034 Manning's e 0.01	Side slope (m/m) 0.784 Long slope (m/m) 0.0018			
Step 3 Mitigation			1		
		ed effectueress ation for solubies - Settlement of			
	Briefdescription solubles (%) matrice	discharge rate (Fs) sedererts (%)			
Existing measures Proposed measures Stain.tefle.flar.doi.t.do	B O Nu real sertion basin, penalode, cathlyit, pond E7 5 S	en • 0 0			
←→ Interface ⊕					
Ready Calculate 🛱 Accessibility: Investige	te			Lag Disple	sy Settings 🌐 🔟 — — 🖬 — + 55%



A.2 Cumulative assessments

A.2.1 Cumulative assessments within 100 metres



A.2.1.1 Outfalls O5 and O6:

AutoSave 💿 📓 🏳 - Cl - 💌		,₽ Search			Lena Steinberg 👰 📼 – 🛷 🗙
File Home Insert Page Layout Formulas Di	ata Review View Automate Add-ins	Help ProjectWise PDF-XChange			🖓 Comments 🛛 Share
A. Cut	A [×] = = = № - ∰ Wrap Text	General	Normal Bad	Good	
Darto Copy -	-> = = = = = = = ⊕ Merge & Center ->	F722 - 0/ € €30 .00 Conditional	Format as Neutral Calculation	Phone Continue Insert Delete Format	Sort & Find & Analyze Sensitivity
	Alignment		Table ~ Styles	Clear *	Filter × Select × Data × Editing Analysis Sensitivity
	isi Augument ii	Number 191	styles	i Cees i	Editing Analysis Sensitivity A
• i × √ fr					
Highways England Water Risk Assessmen					CriterosTERORDeBrier -MontMacConadt, ProprovideBreDATP
EQS - Annual Average Consentration	Acute Impact	Sediment - Chronic Impact			
Copper 2ms Drep 2 8.28 6.25 Orap 3 8.28 8.28	eff Copper Zins eff Pase Pase	Pase Sodianet depositions for this site in judged an Accumulating? Yes 8.86 Lowlow Yid min Entender			-
Rod number A46 Assessment type Cumulative assessment	III. Area / DBFO number It including sediments (outfails within 100m)	Acea 7	Predict Impact		
OS grid reference of assessment point (m) Easting	Northing	-	Show Detailed Results		
OS grid reference of outfall structure (m) Easting Outfail number	List of outbils in cumulative (c)	06	Save Results & Parameter		
Receiving wellercourse Old Trent Dyke EA receiving weller Detailed River Network ID	Assessment Assessment		Reset Interface		
Date of assessment 09/11/2023	Version of assessment		Document Data Source		
Notes Viest carriageway and	embankment from Nottingham to Lincoln railway bridge to Kelham R	aad underpass.	Open Parameters cav file		
			Spillage Risk		
Step 1 Ranoff Quality ALDT >10000 and +00000 -	- Climatic region Critier Dry - Raintal são	Littedt (SAAR500mm)	Groundwater Assessment		
The T Black Income		-	Reset Workbook		
Amual G ₁₀ (Ver flow (IV/6)	6.000 Freshwater EQS limits		View Fixed Parama		
(Enter zero in Annual Q _a) Impermeable rand area drained (ha) river flow box is assess Size 1 numb numb coh Permeable area draining to outfal (ha)	Bieanaliable disserved copper (µgf) Disenaliable disserved zinc (µgf)	1			
Step 1 sunolf quality only) Permeable area draining to outfait (ha) Date Flow Index (DFI)	C 448 Disconsibilitie dissolved zinc (µgit) D 10 In the discharge is or within 1 km wontmarm of a pro-	ected sile for conservation?	HELP GUDE		
For dissolved zinc only Water hardness High = 200mp CaCObi	For dissolved copper only Ambient back		Ealt Tool		
For sediment impact only is there a downstream shucture, take, pond or canal that					
Tier 1 Estimated river width (m)	101				
* Tier 2 Bed width (m)	401 Massing's n 024 Side slop	e (mite) 0.37 Long slope (mite) 0.0007			
Step 3 Mitigation					
	E stimuted effectiveness Treatment for Attenuation for solutions	Settement of			
Briefdesorption	solubles (%) restricted discharge rate (1	s) sedments (5i)			
Existing measures Proposed measures Divales, bellin, basin, purel, cashpil, perseck	0 0 No maticition + 1 87.5 7 4	9 0			
() Interface ()					
Ready 🛣 Accessibility: investigate					Display Settings III III
meany BC arresonary mesnyate				4	Colorish and the C - + 22.0

A.2.1.2 Outfalls O7 and O8:

AutoSave 🖲 🐨 📓 🥍 × 🖓 × 🖷		,₽ Search			Lena Steinberg 🤹 📼 🗕 🔿 🗙
File Home Insert Page Layout Formulas Data	Review View Automate Add-ins Help Proje	ctWise PDF-XChange			🖓 Comments 🖻 Share
10 × A* A*	= = = ₽× ♣ Wrap Text General		Normal Bad	Good ^	Z AutoSum A A A
Paste Lig copy *	프 프 프 프 프 B Merge & Center ~ B ~ % 5	6-0_00 Conditional I	Format as Neutral Calculation	Check Coll - Insert Delete Forma	Fill * Sort & Find & Analyze Sensitivity
- V Politika Namer		Formatting ~	Table *		Clear * Filter * Select * Data *
Clipboard 15 Font 15	Alignment 🕤 Numbe		Styles	Cells	Editing Analysis Sensitivity A
Highways England Water Risk Assessment To:					C 4.1.4 TO FEEDHID WORK - MOT Mar Doc #41, Proprovide PATP
EQS - Annual Average Concentration	Sedim	ent - Chronic Impact			
Copper Zea Urg 2 8.50 8.30 Urg 3 8.30 8.30	up1 Pass Plase Accountering?	Press pairs for this site is pedged as: Yes 6.85 No 0 Departue has			
Road number A46 Assessment trop	HE Area / D0FO number Area 7 ading sediments (outfails within 100m)		Predict Impact		
OS grid reference of assessment point (m) Easting OS grid reference of outfall structure (m) Easting	Northing Northing		Show Detailed Results		
Outfal number	List of outbills in oursulative 07 08		Save Results & Parameter		
Receiving watercourse Tributary of the River Tree EA receiving water Detailed River Nativols ID	Assessment Assessment		Reset Interface		
Date of assessment 09/11/2023	Version of assessment		Document Data Source		
Tiples Carriageway and embanisme to East Coast Mainline railwo	nt from Kelham Road underpase to Cattle Market Roundabout, Roundabout and ce sy bridge.	rriageway and embankment up	Open Parameters ow file		
			Spillage Risk		
Step 1 Ranoff Quality ALDT 11000 and r00000 +	Climatic region ColderDry - Raintal ste Unoth GAURDONY	• •	Groundwater Assessment		
Cher S. Blackberger			Reset Workbook		
(Enter yours in Annual Q _{in} there had area drained (ha)	0.00 Freehwater EQS limits: 1.00 Eleanstable deserved copper (up/l) 1	-	VIEW TEES PARAME		
(ver few box to assess Step 1 mont guilty only) Permeable area draining to cutfal (ha)	Intern Decanatized dasalved copper (upt) 1 1019 Dicensibile dasalved zinc (upT) 103		HELP GUIDE		
Dane Flow Index (DFI)	0.00 Is the discharge in or within 1 km upstream of a protected sile for conserva		EatTool		
For dissolved zinc only Water hardness High == 200mp CaCOD/	For dissolved copper only Ambient background concentration	igf) 022			
For sediment impact only Is there a downstream structure, take, post or caral that reduc	es the velocity within 100m of the point of discharge?	0			
C Tier 1 Estimated river width (m)	2.22				
* Tier 2 Bed width (w)	222 Masning's n 014 Side slope (netro) 050	Long slope (min) 8.0001			
Step 3 Mitigation	Estimated effectioness				
Rviet description	Treatment for Attenuation for solubles - Settlement of availables (%) respirated declarate rate ((s.) sediments (%)	1			
Exercise Exercise Exercises Exercise					
Proposed measures Duries, taffels, tasis, pord, cattlpit, paraticit	173 11.50 x 100				
←→ Interface ④				: I	
Ready 🛱 Accessibility: investigate					□ Display Settings



A.2.1.3 Outfalls O9 and O9A:

AutoSave 💌 🖬 🦃 - 🖓 - 🖉		,P Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖬 – 👩 🗙
	Data Review View Automate Add-ins Help	ProjectWise PDF-XChange			🖓 Comments 🖻 Share
Paste Di Copy ~ B I <u>U</u> ~ <u>Di copy</u> ~	A [×] = = = ≫ × ₿ Wrap Text	al v	Normal Bad	Good · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	∑ AutoSam × Ay ♀ IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII
Paste Da Copy ~	▲ ~ 프 프 프 프 프 프 Marge & Center ~ K	Or a 1 4-0 .00 Conditional	Format as Neutral Calculation	Ghock Coll Insert Delete Format	Sort & Find & Analyze Sensitivity
				· · · ·	Clear * Filter * Select * Data *
Clipboard Fa Fort	S Alignment S	Number 15	Styles	Cells	Editing Analysis Sensibility A
at >> × ↓					
Highways England Water Risk Assessm					C+Low of TERUPED ov Dove - Non ModDowed (Projecto/ARX/PXPATP
EQS - Annual Average Concentration	e Acute Import	Sediment - Chronic Impact			
Copper Zea Copp 2 8.22 8.99 Orep 2 0.22 8.99	upt Capper Zine Sine upt Pass Pass Can Can	Person Invest departitions for this site is judged as: unsubsting? <u>Ho. 0.16</u> Low for Vid mits unsupp? <u>Ho. Constitution</u>			
Road number A46 Assessment type Currulative assessm	HE Area / DDFO number tent including sediments (outfails within 100m)	Area 7	Predict Impact		
OS grid reference of assessment point (m) Easting	Kerbing	2	Show Detailed Results		
OS grid reference of outfall structure (m) Easting Outfall number	List of outfolies in cumulative 01	094	Save Results & Parameter		
Receiving watercourse River Trent	assessment		Reset Interface		
EA receiving water Detailed River Network ID Date of essenance it 09/11/2023	Assessor and affiliation Vitration of assessment		Document Date Source		
	ast Coast Mainine railway bridge to the River Trent and bridge dock		Open Parameters cav file		
			Spillage Risk		
Step 1 Russoff Quality AADT =============	Climatic region ColterDry Raintall site Uncel	SAARSDones -	Groundwater Assessment		
Step 2 River Impacts			Reset Workbook		
(Enter parts in Annual Q ₄₄ Inspection Annual Q ₄₄ river flow (th/its) (Enter parts in Annual Q ₄₄ Inspectmentile road area drained (ha)	1.540 Freshvater EQS limits 8iganalable disselved copper (ugl)		View Fixed Parama		
(criser bets in Admain Gas) Impermeable road area drained (na) river flow box to assess Step 1 mord graatity only Permeable area draining to outfail (ha)		1 0			
Base Flow index (SFI)	2.50 Is the discharge in or within 1 km upstream of a protected site 1		HELP GUDE		
For dissolved pinc only Water hardness Mat = >200ms C+CC01	For dissolved copper only Ambient background con		Exit Teol		
For sediment impact only is there a downsheam structure, lake, pond or canal th C Tier 1 Estimated iver width (m)	at reduces the velocity within 100m of the point of discharge?	No 💌 🗇			
= Tier 2 Bed width (m)		18 Long slope (mint) 0.0011			
Step 3 Mitigation	E alimated effectiveness				
Brief description	Treatment for Attenuation for solubles - Sett solubles (%) restricted discharge rate (Vs) setter	ieneit of nerts (%)			
Existing measures		115			
Proposed measures Duries, ballis, basis, pord, cettrol, peraboli	01 0.72 • 90.41				
interface				1	•
				1	
Ready 🛱 Accessibility: Investigate					Display Settings III III + 53%

A.2.1.4 Outfalls O14, O15 and O16:

AutoSave 📧 🖬 🦻 v 🖓 v 🔹	HEWRAT v2.0.4.dsm V	₽ Search			Lena Steinberg 🤬 🖽 – 🔿 🗙
File Home Insert Page Layout For	mulas Data Review View Automate Add-ins I	lelp ProjectWise PDF-XChange			🖓 Comments 🖻 Share
Paste Db Copy ∨ V ≪ Format Painter Clipboard 5 Fort	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	General Conditional Formating * Table	Normal Bad Neutral Calculation Styles	Good Insert Delete Format	∑ Andršovi ~ Ž V O li Fili ~ Sori & Find & Oran ~ Filter ~ Select ~ Edding Analysis Sensibility
± × √ £					
Mighways England Water Rin					CriterolTES2000reDive-NonMacCoset_ProjecoMileEvPATP
Figs: Asset Area of the cape Cases statute Gage Sigs: Units: Sigs: Baset controls: Asset Research type: Controls: Research type: Controls: Sigs: Controls: Sigs: Controls: Sigs: Controls: Sigs: Controls: Sigs: Controls:	Anno competition of the section of t		Postici Impact Show 2 related Reads		
Receiving watercourse The File EA receiving water Detailed River Network ID	Assessment Assessment		Reset Interface		
	2023 United of assessment away from filendly farmer roundabout to withforpe roundabout		Document Data Source Ipen Parameters car file Spillage Risk roundwater Assessment		
Step 1 Ranoff Quality AADT HIG200 and HIG200 and HIG200	Climatic region Color/Dry Raintal sto	Uttoh (SAARtS)Ond	Reset Workbook		
Chier zero in Annual Que International Control (Control (Contro)(Control (Control (Control (Control (Contro)(Control			Vew Fixed Parama HELP GUDE Exit Tool		
○ Tier 1 Estimated iver width (m + Tjer 2 Bed width (m)		No Construction (nom) (0.005)			
(Step 2. Mogetine (Carlog Parameter Support Consume Support Co	0 D Noresticton • D	Internet of address to a second secon			
→ Interface ⊕				: 4	
Ready Calculate 📆 Accessibility: Investigate					Display Settings



A.2.2 Cumulative assessments between 100 metres and 1 kilometre

A.2.2.1 Outfalls O2, O3 and O4

AutoSave 💿 🖬 🥬 🤆 🔹		,₽ Search			Lena Steinberg 🥷	⊞ - ø ×
File Home Insert Page Layout	Formulas Data Review View Automate Add-ins	Help ProjectWise PDF-XChange				Comments 🖻 Share
A X Cut	- 10 - A* A* = = = ≫ - 8 Wrap Text	General	Normal Bad	Good	Σ AutoSum × Aγ Ω	
			Format as Neutral Calculation	Insert Delete Format		
✓ ∜ Format Painter B I U ✓	⊞ ~ ▲ ~ ▲ ~ 프 프 프 Ξ Ξ Ξ Β Merge & Center ~	W ・ S ・ S ・ Formatting *	Table *		Clear * Filter * Select * Data	
Clipboard Fa	Fost 5 Alignment 6	Number G	Styles	Cells	Editing Analysis	Sensitivity ^
• 1 × √ fx						
highways England	Water Risk Assessment Tool Version 22.4 June 2019 Soluble	Sediment - Chronic Impact			C-UNIC STEED HOUSE	Ive Mon MacConald (Projecto/MikeEvPATP
EQS - Assual Average Co		Sidnini - Chante Inpatri				
Capper 0.45 Step 2	0.96 upt Copper Zine	Sediment deposition for this site is judged as:				
0.20	AND	Accenditing? Low for Videniz Extensive? Describer inde				
Step 2	······································					
Read number	A46 HE Area/DDFO number	Area 7	Predict Impact			
Assessment type OS grid reference of assessment point (m)	Cumulative assessment excluding sediments (outfails between 100m and 1km apart) Easting Northing	-	Show Detailed Results			
OS grid reference of outfall structure (m)	Easting Kerthing		Save Results & Parameter			
Outfall number Receiving watercourse	Did Trent Duke assessment	03 04	Manufacture and a subject of the			
EA receiving watercounse EA receiving water Detailed River Network ID	Assessor and affliation		Reset Interface			
Date of assessment	09/11/2023 Version of assessment		Document Data Source			
fiples	Carriageway and embanisment from the River Trent to Nottingham to Lincoln railway bridge		Open Parameters cav file			
			Scillage Risk			
			Groundwater Assessment			
Step 1 Ranoff Quality AADT >10,000 are rd	000 - Climatic region Colter Dry - Raintail elle	Linzik (SAARSIOnni)	Reset Workbook			
Step 2. River Impacts Annual Que river flow (mi/s)	0.004 Freshvater EQS limits	1	View Fixed Pacama			
(Enter paro in Annual Que Impermeable road area drain		5				
river flow box to assess Step 1 suroff quality only) Permeable area draining to		109 0	HELPGIDE			
Ease Flow Index (BFI)	0.5k Is the discharge in or within 1 km upstream of a pro	iected sile for conservation? No •	Exit Teol			
For dissolved zinc only Water hardness	For dissolved copper only Antient back	pround concentration (µg/t)				
	are, lake, pond or canal that reduces the velocity within 100m of the point of discharge?	le v D				
© Tier 1 Estimated #						
# Tier 2 Bed width (#	n) 38.35 Manning's n 6323 Side slag	e (m/m)				
Step 3 Mitigation	E stimuted effectiveness					
	Tradinal by differentia by addition	Settement of				
	Brief description solubles (%) restricted discharge rate (V	s) sedments (%)				
Existing measures	0 No maticitan •	0 0				
Proposed measures Durine, ballin, basis, post, cathy	675 52 •	10.4				
Interface				1.4		
Ready 🛱 Accessibility: Investigate					🕞 Display Settings 🔠 🔟	
nearly WC Ancessment; investigate					warman and the second s	+ 55%

A.2.2.2 Outfalls O11 and O12:

AutoSave 💿 🐻 🦻 < 🤆 = 🛛 👪	WRAT v2.0.4.afsm • Saving 🛩	₽ Search				Lena Steinberg 🥳) 📼 😑	σ×
File Home Insert Page Layout Formulas Data Review	v View Automate Add-ins Help ProjectW	ise PDF-XChange					Comments	🖻 Share
Paste \bigcirc Copy \checkmark \checkmark \checkmark Format Painter \blacksquare $I \sqcup \lor \boxdot \lor \bigtriangleup \lor \land \land \lor$ $\blacksquare \equiv \equiv$		Conditional Formatting ~	Table *	Good ~ ulation Check Cel 👳	Insert Delete Format	The period of the	Sensitivity	
Clipboard Fa Font S	Alignment 5 Number		Styles		Cells	Editing Analysis	Sensitivity	^
<i>i</i> t ∨ × ! •								
Fighways England Water Risk Assessment Tool	Version 2.1.4 June 2019					CriteworkTER290xDr	eDrive - More MacDon ald L Projects	
OS grid referince of assessment port (in) Easting OS grid referince of culful diruture (in) Easting Octor surfact Octor surfact Octor surfact Octor surfact Octor runnit Octor runnit Octor runnit Octor runnit Octor runnit Octor runnit	Annibusy T Cogetti 200 Tasiani 2010 Davide Cogetti C	Oranic Impact Internet Impact Internet Internet Oraportion Indee Oraportion Indee Oraportion Indee	Predict Inspect Show Technical Results Save Results & Durarisate Result Information					
Step 2. Rever Impacts Annual O ₁₁ (hor flow (11/h)) 0.000 (Chine zwo in Annual O ₁₁) Impermeable road area drained (ha) 0.100 (Fair Early loss) Same drained (ha) 0.100 Stop 1 and road way only) Permeable read drained to stoff (ha) 0.100	Vermen al framework		Document Data Source Open Parameters car Kie Spilling Rick Groundweiter Assessment Reset Workbook View Fasel Parama HELP GUBD					
For descrived dots only With humbless March 10000 CCG31 For descrived dots only Is then a down/twan disclare, bin, you'd reach the velocity In the Contraction for with you Is the contraction for with you In the Contraction for with you Is the contraction for with you In the Contraction for with you Is the contraction for with you Step 3. Milliopticite Is the contraction for with you	uillin 100m of the point of discharge?	ang silapa (naha)	ExtTool					
Endersproce								
←→ Interface ④					1			
Ready 🕱 Accessibility: Investigate						Display Settings 🔠 🔟		