

## 26.1 INTRODUCTION

26.1.1 The broad principles of the methodology that have been applied in undertaking the EIA have been set out in *Chapter 2* of the *ES*. *Chapter 2* sets out the proposed temporal, spatial and technical scope of the EIA which applies in the same manner to *Volume 2*. The assessment of environmental impacts of the Compensation Site has followed the same approach to identify, evaluate and mitigate for environmental impacts.

26.1.2 Specific details on the assessment process for individual topics are given in the relevant topic chapters. For the majority of topics, the environmental assessment process does not differ between the AMEP and the Compensation Site. Exceptions to this occur where the nature of the impacts are particularly different between the two sites, therefore necessitating an alternative assessment process specific to the Compensation Site. Where the assessment process differs, this is made clear in the relevant chapter.

## 26.2 BASIS OF THE ASSESSMENT

### *Overview*

26.2.1 The design of the Compensation Site has been developed in conjunction with the AMEP and therefore this element of the Project will be considered under the same legislation, namely the 2009 EIA Regulations as they apply to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (“NSIPs”).

26.2.2 The environmental impacts of the proposed Compensation Site have been assessed in the same manner as for the AMEP, under each relevant environmental topic (e.g. water quality, commercial fisheries, traffic, socio-economics) by comparing baseline environmental conditions (i.e. the situation without the proposed development) with the conditions that would prevail once the Compensation Site is in place and fully functional.

### *Assessment Process*

26.2.3 The assessment of the Compensation Site has been based on specific locations, size and design of the sites. The design of the sites has been driven by the requirement to avoid existing designated nature conservation sites and to focus on sites which are suitable for creation of the required habitat. In comparison to the AMEP where a certain

degree of flexibility of design is required (eg design and siting), the characteristics of the Compensation Site have been developed to define the locations and sizes in order to facilitate the assessment of environmental impacts. As the EIA developed there has been the potential for parameters to change as a consequence of modifications to the AMEP. In this case an assessment has been made to determine if the required changes would lead to significantly greater impacts and as a result would require further investigation prior to construction and implementation.

## 26.3 *DEFINING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS*

26.3.1 The assessment of significant effects of the Compensation Site has followed the same format as for the AMEP, as detailed in *Section 2.3*. Significant effects are defined through a specific framework for each environmental topic considered. The criteria used to judge significance for both the AMEP and the Compensation Site are explained as part of the assessment methodology for each environmental topic in *Volume 1* (see the relevant sections in *Chapters 7 to 24*).

## 26.4 *MITIGATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS*

26.4.1 As for the AMEP, measures to avoid, reduce and if necessary mitigate environmental impacts have been built into the design of the Compensation Site. Residual effects have been classified as non-significant or still significant (albeit reduced), as appropriate, in the same manner as for the AMEP (detailed in *Section 2.4*).

## 26.5 *SCOPE OF THE ASSESSMENT*

### *Technical Scope*

26.5.1 The technical scope of this ES and the range of topics relating to the Compensation Site are set out in *Table 2.1*.

### *Spatial Scope*

26.5.2 The spatial scope of the EIA of the Compensation Site aligns with that set out in *Chapter 2*.

### *Temporal Scope*

#### *Overview*

26.5.3 The temporal scope of the assessment of the Compensation Site has used the same terms to refer to the anticipated duration of effects (i.e. short-term, medium-term and long-term).

### *Construction Phase*

- 26.5.4 The construction phase of the Compensation Site is anticipated to be undertaken over two spring/summer periods, with work likely to take place from March to October. The exact working periods will be determined in consultation with Natural England.

### *Operational Phase*

- 26.5.5 The Cherry Cobb Sands site will become operational immediately following breaching of the existing embankment, although the site will continue to develop and change as intertidal habitat evolves naturally (see *Chapter 28* for further details on the likely evolution of the Cherry Cobb Sands site).
- 26.5.6 The Old Little Humber Farm site will be considered operational once the grass cover has established.

### *Decommissioning Phase*

- 26.5.7 It is not intended for the Cherry Cobb Sands site to be decommissioned as it will become part of a naturally functioning coastline. Once created and functional, it is anticipated that the intertidal habitats will be incorporated into existing designated nature conservation sites, extending the Humber SAC, SPA and Ramsar site as well as the local designations that currently cover the intertidal habitats offshore of Cherry Cobb Sands. The point at which these sites are deemed to be suitable for inclusion into the designated nature conservation sites will be determined by Natural England and will be informed by post-construction monitoring.
- 26.5.8 Old Little Humber Farm will remain as wet grassland for as long as required by Natural England to ensure that sufficient functional compensation habitat is provided. When Natural England agree as a result of monitoring that the wet grassland area is no longer required as compensation habitat, the land at Old Little Humber Farm will be returned to arable use.

### *Cumulative Impacts*

- 26.5.9 The potential for cumulative impacts from other schemes in the vicinity of the Compensation Site have been assessed as part of the EIA. *Volume 2* concentrates on those schemes which could have cumulative impacts in association with the Compensation Site, and each technical

assessment chapter (*Chapters 31 to 43*) includes an assessment of potential cumulative impacts upon the relevant environmental topic.

### ***Consideration of Alternatives***

- 26.5.10 In line with the 2009 EIA Regulations, the main alternatives which have been considered are outlined in the ES, together with the principal reasons for selecting the chosen design. *Chapter 30* describes the alternative sites which have the potential to meet the requirements for compensatory habitat. This is supported by *Annexes 30.1 and 30.2*, which present the findings of the high level assessment and options appraisal that were undertaken. An assessment of the alternative locations for, and numbers of, embankment breaches, as well as a review of alternative ground levels, are summarised in *Chapter 32* and detailed in *Annex 32.3*.

### ***Consultation***

- 26.5.11 Throughout the EIA process Able has consulted with key stakeholders regarding the Compensation Site; including consultation with Government bodies on the design of the site, and public consultation through the Scoping Report (*Annex 2.1*) and Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR). A Consultation Report has been produced detailing the public consultation exercise that was undertaken for the Project.