A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Scheme TR010036

6.3 Environmental Statement Appendix 4.2 Scoping Opinion Schedule of Comments and Responses

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)
Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009
July 2018

Volume 6.0

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Scheme

Development Consent Order 201[X]

6.3 Environmental Statement
Appendix 4.2 Scoping Opinion Schedule of Comments and Responses

---

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(a)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR010036
Application Document Reference:	6.3
Author:	A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Scheme Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	July 2018	Application Issue

Table of Contents

1 Scoping Opinion Schedule of Comments and Responses

1.1.1 In November 2017 a Scoping Opinion was sought from the Planning Inspectorate. An Environmental Scoping Report was submitted to PINS by Highways England under Regulation 10 of the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017. It set out the proposed scope of works and methods to be applied in carrying out the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and the proposed structure of the Environmental Statement (ES).

1.1.2 A Scoping Opinion was received from The Planning Inspectorate in January 2018. Further information is contained within Section 4.1 of Chapter 4 Environmental Assessment Methodology, Volume 6.1.

1.1.3 **Error! Reference source not found.** contains all the comments received in t he Scoping Opinion, the action to be undertaken following the comments, and the subsequent outcome of these actions (how they have been addressed or incorporated in the ES).

Table 1.1: Scoping Opinion comments, actions and outcomes

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
1.0 Introduction				
1.2 The Planning Inspectorate's Consultation				
1.2.3	PINS	The ES submitted by the Applicant should demonstrate consideration of the points raised by the consultation bodies. It is recommended that a table is provided in the ES summarising the scoping responses from the consultation bodies and how they are, or are not, addressed in the ES.	Table to be provided as a technical appendix to the ES summarising how the scoping opinion responses have (or have not been) addressed.	A table of the scoping opinion comments and responses is provided in Appendix 4.2 of Volume 6.3.
2.2 The Planning Inspectorate's Comments				
Description of the Proposed Development				
2.3.1	PINS	Paragraph 2.5.2 of the Scoping Report states that the maximum parameters (size and scale) of the Proposed Development are currently not known. The ES should contain full details of the maximum parameters applicable to the design of the Proposed Development, together with any limits of deviation. This should be shown on supporting plans.	Maximum parameters and limits of deviation to be included within Chapter 2 of the ES, and presented on supporting plans.	The limits of deviation are detailed in paragraphs 2.5.193 - 2.5.197 of Section 2.5 of Chapter 2 The Scheme, Volume 6.1. The lateral limits of deviation are also shown on the ***Works Plans (TR010036/APP/2.3)***.
2.3.2	PINS	The Scoping Report states that additional features include drainage, landscaping, environmental mitigation, gantries, signage and utility diversions. No further details have been provided in the Scoping Report. The description of the Proposed Development in the ES should also include the number of and dimensions for the various components applicable to the Proposed Development.	The description of the proposed development to include these additional features.	A description of the proposed development detailing these features is contained within Section 2.5 of Chapter 2 The Scheme, Volume 6.1.
2.3.3	PINS	The Scoping Report makes reference to the need for construction compounds as part of the Proposed Development but no further details are provided. The ES should be clear in providing specific information regarding the number, size and location of the construction compounds and access arrangements. These should also be depicted on plans to provide further clarity for the reader.	Details of the construction compounds required will be included in Chapter 2 of the ES. Compound locations will be depicted on plans which will support Chapter 2 of the ES.	Details of the construction compounds is contained within paragraphs 2.5.198 - 2.5.219 in Section 2.5, Chapter 2 The Scheme, Volume 6.1. The locations are shown on Figure 2.14 of Volume 6.2, and are also shown on the ***Works Plans (TR010036/APP/2.3)***.
2.3.4	PINS	The Scoping Report states that new lighting may be required during the construction and operational phases. It is identified in paragraph 8.8.3 of the Scoping Report that lighting columns are proposed at key junctions and that they will be kept to a minimum height. The ES should explain the need for lighting during construction and operation and the impacts associated with lighting proposals should be assessed in the ES with evidence of how this has been taken into account in relevant aspect chapters.	Details of lighting requirements during both construction and operation to be included within Chapter 2 of the ES. Lighting proposals will be assessed for the relevant discipline chapters.	The need for and a description of the lighting requirements during construction are detailed within paragraphs 2.5.227 to 2.5 22 and lighting requirements during operation are detailed in paragraphs 2.5.126 to 2.5.127, Chapter 2 The Scheme, Volume 6.1. The impacts associated with lighting are assessed in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage, Chapter 7 Landscape, and Chapter 8 Biodiversity, of Volume 6.1.
2.3.5	PINS	Appendix B of the Scoping Report identifies areas of proposed permanent and temporary land take, as well areas to be used for proposed ecological mitigation. There is very limited information in the Scoping Report as to what the land take would be used for, though it does state that approximately 400,000m2 of third party land would be required permanently. The ES should include a description of areas of permanent land take, including justification of why they are needed. The ES should also identify temporary land take areas and explain how long the land would be required. Land required for ecological mitigation should be clearly identified including how these areas will be used.	Details of permanent and temporary land take to be included within Chapter 2 of the ES.	Areas of permanent and temporary land are detailed within section 2.5 of Chapter 2 The Scheme, Volume 6.1. This includes a detailed description of the permanent scheme, as well as details of temporary land take required such as areas of land needed for compounds, haul routes, and material storage areas. Land required for ecological mitigation is also detailed within Chapter 2 The Scheme, Volume 6.1.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
2.3.6	PINS	A number of access routes for Non-motorised Users (NMU) are shown on Appendix B to the Scoping Report, Environmental Constraints Plan and several are located within the redline boundary. However there is limited information provided in the Scoping Report as to what will happen to these access routes during construction and operation. Paragraph 13.8.2 of the Scoping Report states that a NMU strategy has been produced which includes the locations for diversions for NMU. The ES should describe the diversions which will be in place during construction and explain how long the diversions would be in place. Details should also be included for any permanent diversions. These should be illustrated on supporting plans.	Ensure a description of the NMU diversions during construction and operation is provided, and accompanied by supporting plans.	As stated in Section 12.8 of Chapter 12, Volume 6.1, details regarding the phasing of NMU facility closures and diversions are not known. However, a number of permanent diversions would be required as shown in Figure 12.7, Volume 6.2, which would mitigate for permanent effects to NMUs. These measures are also described in section 12.9 of Chapter 12 Volume 6.1 and are considered as part of the assessment of likely significant effects in Section 12.10. The assessment has assumed a worst case scenario that all footpath closures would be in place for the full duration of the construction period.
2.3.7	PINS	The Scoping Report omits a detailed description of the nature and quantity of materials used and waste generated as they will be included in the later design process. The ES should include these details as part of the Proposed Development and include justification of any key assumptions made.	The ES to use a bill of quantities (or similar) and outline the types and quantities of materials required, and where information is available the types and quantities of waste likely to be generated, within the Materials chapter. Where information on the type and quantities of waste is not available, assumptions will be made and outlined in the assumptions/limitations section.	Quantities of materials required for the construction of the scheme have been calculated based on the description of the scheme (as outlined in Paragraph 10.5.1) and have been outlined in Table 10.13; assumptions regarding calculations have been referenced in Paragraph 10.5.1. Waste likely to be generated has been estimated and outlined in Table 10.15; assumptions associated with these have been outlined in Paragraph 10.10.9 and Section 10.5.
2.3.8	PINS	Diversions and a road closure are highlighted throughout the Scoping Report as being required for the Proposed Development. The ES should contain a full explanation of road closures and diversions including whether they are permanent or temporary.	An Outline Traffic Management Plan to be produced by the contractor, and appended to the ES.	An outline Traffic Management Plan which details road closures and traffic diversions during construction has been produced by the Contractor and is contained in Annex B.5 of the ***Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7).***
2.3.9	PINS	The Scoping Report notes that there is a need to demolish one farm building to enable the Proposed Development. No further details are provided in the Scoping Report. The ES should provide further details and clearly identify the location of the structure on a supporting plan.	Provide additional details on the proposed demolition required as part of the scheme.	Details on the proposed demolition required as part of the scheme, and cross reference to a figure showing the location of this, is contained within paragraph 2.6.3 of Chapter 2 The Scheme, Volume 6.1.
2.3.10	PINS	Construction of the Proposed Development is anticipated to last five years. The ES should provide details regarding proposed working hours, including for weekends and bank holidays.	Paragraph 6.7.1 states that the anticipated construction duration is 2.5 years. The proposed working hours to be detailed as part of the construction strategy, to be included within the ES.	Details regarding proposed construction programme are contained within Table 2.2, and details of hours of working, including for weekends and bank holidays, are provided in paragraphs 2.6.8 to 2.6.9 of Chapter 2 The Scheme, Volume 6.1.
Alternatives				
2.3.12	PINS	The Inspectorate would expect to see a discrete section in the ES that provides details of the alternatives considered and the reasoning for the selection of the chosen option(s), including a comparison of the environmental effects.	Include details on the alternatives and a description of the preferred route selection.	Details of alternatives considered, including a comparison of the environmental effects, are provided within Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives, Volume 6.1.
Flexibility				
2.3.14	PINS	The Applicant should make every attempt to narrow the range of options and explain clearly in the ES which elements of the Proposed Development have yet to be finalised and provide the reasons. At the time of application, any Proposed Development parameters should not be so wide-ranging as to represent effectively different developments. The development parameters will need to be consistently and clearly defined in the draft DCO (dDCO) and in the accompanying ES. It is a matter for the Applicant, in preparing an ES, to consider whether it is possible to robustly assess a range of impacts resulting from a large number of undecided parameters. The description of the Proposed Development in the ES must not be so wide that it is insufficiently certain to comply with the requirements of Regulation 14 of the EIA Regulations.	Ensure development parameters are consistently and clearly defined in the draft DCO and ES.	Undecided parameters have been described in Section 2.5 of Chapter 2 The Scheme, and are consistent with those outlined in the draft DCO. The environmentally worst case has been presented within the discipline-specific topic chapters (Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 6.1).

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
2.3.16	PINS	The Scoping Report omits details relevant to the design of the Proposed Development including the anticipated size and scale of specific components eg gantries, lighting, and environmental mitigation proposals. The ES should include a detailed description of the Proposed Development including its individual components any uncertainties or assumptions regarding the design should be appropriately addressed perhaps through suitable use of design parameters.	Provide a detailed description of the scheme including the anticipated size and scale of specific components. Ensure the limits of deviation are also detailed and supported by plans.	A description of the proposed development detailing these features is contained within Section 2.5 of Chapter 2 The Scheme, Volume 6.1. The limits of deviation are detailed in paragraphs 2.5.193 - 2.5.197 of Section 2.5 of Chapter 2 The Scheme, Volume 6.1. The lateral limits of deviation are also shown on the ***Works Plans (TR010036/APP/2.3)***.
3.0 EIA APPROACH				
3.1 Introduction				
3.1.2	PINS	Aspects/matters are not scoped out unless specifically addressed and justified by the Applicant, and confirmed as being scoped out by the Inspectorate. The ES should be based on the Scoping Opinion in so far as the Proposed Development remains materially the same as the Proposed Development described in the Applicant's Scoping Report. The Inspectorate has set out in this Opinion where it has/has not agreed to scope out certain aspects or matters on the basis of the information available at this time. The Inspectorate is content that this should not prevent the Applicant from subsequently agreeing with the relevant consultees to scope such aspects/matters out of the ES, where further evidence has been provided to justify this approach. However, in order to demonstrate that the aspects/matters have been appropriately addressed, the ES should explain the reasoning for scoping them out and justify the approach taken.	Ensure reasoning is provided for scoping out topics, and justify the approach taken, within the ES. A concise summary report for Road Drainage and Water Environment to be provided, explaining reasons for scoping out this topic.	The Assessment Methodology section of each of the ES chapters (Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 6.1) provides an overview of the scope of the assessment as detailed in the EIA Scoping Report, and is also clear on any areas where the Scoping Opinion has not been followed. Where any additional aspects have subsequently been scoped out, these have also been detailed within the Assessment Methodology section. The reasoning for scoping out the topic of Road Drainage and the Water Environment is provided within Appendix 4.3 of Volume 6.3.
3.1.3	PINS	Where relevant, the ES should provide reference to how the delivery of measures proposed to prevent/minimise adverse effects is secured through DCO requirements (or other suitably robust methods) and whether relevant consultees agree on the adequacy of the measures proposed.	Details relating to how mitigation measures will be secured through the DCO requirements to be included, likely to be in the form of the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, to be included within the Outline Environmental Management Plan.	An ***Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7)*** has been prepared to support the DCO submission. Within the Outline Environmental Management Plan, Table 3.1 contains the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which details all of the mitigation requirements. The Outline Environmental Management Plan was issued to the Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England for review and comment, and any amendments required have been included. The ***Consents and Agreements Position Statement (document reference TR010036/APP/3.3)*** has also been produced that details the consents needed as part of the scheme.
3.1.4	PINS	The Inspectorate notes the concern expressed by Somerset County Council (SCC) that the traffic model may not be a sufficiently detailed model to understand local re-routing impacts such as those arising from reducing the number of access points to the A303. It is essential that the assessment of likely significant effects is undertaken on the basis of robust and reliable information. The Applicant should ensure that the model used to inform the assessments is sufficient for this purpose. The Applicant should make effort to agree this approach with relevant stakeholders including SCC. Impacts from local re-routing during construction and operation should be identified and assessed in the ES.	The traffic model approach has been discussed with Somerset County Council and the model has been enhanced in the local area so that it can forecast local traffic impacts as well as strategic impacts. Technical Working Group meetings to be held with local authorities to share information on local impacts and to discuss possible mitigation measures. Where appropriate, these measures might be implemented in advance to assist traffic management measures that will be required during construction.	A meeting was held with Somerset County Council and consultants WSP (who reviewed the traffic model on behalf of Somerset County Council) on 5 June 2018 to explain the model set up, specially local enhancements incorporated into the South West Regional Traffic Model (SWRTM). It was agreed that most of the information necessary for the review is available from the ***Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (TR010036/APP/7.6)***. Any additional information requested has been provided. WSP to produce a report highlighting outcome of the review. A cross reference to the ***Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (TR010036/APP/7.6)*** is provided within paragraph 4.3.4 of Chapter 4 Environmental Assessment Methodology, Volume 6.1. Several Technical Working Group meetings were held with local authorities to share information on local impacts and to discuss possible mitigation measures. Where appropriate, these measures might be implemented in advance to assist traffic management measures that will be required during construction.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
3.3 Scope of Assessment				
General				
3.3.1	PINS	The Inspectorate recommends that in order to assist the decision-making process, the Applicant uses tables: • to demonstrate how the assessment has taken account of this Opinion; • to identify and collate the residual effects after mitigation for each aspect, including the relevant interrelationships and cumulative effects; • to set out the proposed mitigation and/or monitoring measures including cross-reference to the means of securing such measures (eg a dDCO requirement); • to describe any remedial measures that are identified as being necessary following monitoring; and • to identify where details are contained in the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) report (where relevant), such as descriptions of European sites and their locations, together with any mitigation or compensation measures, are to be found in the ES.	Tables to be used as part of the ES to aid clarity wherever possible.	A table in Appendix 4.3 Scoping Opinion Comments and Responses, Volume 6.3, has been provided which demonstrates how the assessment has taken account of the Scoping Opinion. Residual effects are tabulated within Chapter 15 Summary, Volume 6.1. The combined and cumulative effects are tabulated within Chapter 14 Combined and Cumulative Effects, Volume 6.1. The proposed mitigation measures and any monitoring requirements are tabulated within Table 3.1 of the ***Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7)***. Monitoring requirements are also tabulated within Chapter 15 Summary, Volume 6.1.
3.3.2	PINS	The ES should include details of difficulties (for example technical deficiencies or lack of knowledge) encountered compiling the required information and the main uncertainties involved.	To be detailed in the assumptions and limitations section within each environmental discipline chapter.	The Assumptions and Limitations section of each chapter (Chapters 4 to 14 of Volume 6.1) details any difficulties encountered.
3.3.3	PINS	The Inspectorate considers that where a DCO application includes works described as 'associated development', that could themselves be defined as an improvement of a highway, the Applicant should ensure that the ES accompanying that application distinguishes between; effects that primarily derive from the integral works which form the proposed (or part of the proposed) NSIP and those that primarily derive from the works described as associated development, for example through a suitably compiled summary table. This will have the benefit of giving greater confidence to the Inspectorate that what is proposed is not in fact an additional NSIP defined in accordance with s22 of the PA2008.	Clearly define what elements of the proposed development are integral to the NSIP and which is 'associated development' under the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) or is an ancillary matter.	Section 2.5 of Chapter 2 in Volume 6.1 provides details regarding both the integral works and the associated development associated with the scheme.
Baseline Scenario				
3.3.4	PINS	The ES should include a description of the baseline scenario with and without implementation of the development as far as natural changes from the baseline scenario can be assessed with reasonable effort on the basis of the availability of environmental information and scientific knowledge.	A description of the baseline scenario at the time of writing to be included within each of the environmental discipline chapters. A description of the future baseline without the scheme taking into consideration its likely evolution due to natural changes to be included within the upfront chapters of the ES. This will take account of readily available information such as the Local Development Framework and climate change scenario data over an appropriate timescale (to be justified).	A description of the baseline scenario at the time of writing is included within the 'Baseline Conditions' section of each of the discipline-specific chapters (Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 6.1). The future baseline scenario is considered within Section 2.4 of Chapter 2 The Scheme, Volume 6.1.
Forecasting Methods of Evidence				
3.3.5	PINS	The ES should contain the timescales upon which the surveys which underpin the technical assessments have been based. For clarity, this information should be provided either in the introductory chapters of the ES (with confirmation that these timescales apply to all chapters), or in each aspect chapter.	Timings of surveys to be included within the baseline section of each environmental discipline chapter.	Timings of surveys have been included within the 'Baseline Conditions' section of each of the discipline-specific chapters (Chapters 5 to 14, Volume 6.1).

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
3.3.6	PINS	The Inspectorate expects the ES to include a chapter setting out the overarching methodology for the EIA, which clearly states which effects are 'significant' and 'non-significant' for the purposes of the EIA. Any departure from that methodology should be described in individual aspect assessment chapters.	Ensure a chapter is included in the ES which sets out the overarching EIA methodology.	Chapter 4 Environmental Assessment Methodology sets out the overarching methodology for the EIA. Section 4.4 Significance Criteria specifically states which effects are 'significant' and non-significant' for the purposes of the EIA, and outlines any departures from the methodology.
3.3.7	PINS	The ES should include details of difficulties (for example technical deficiencies or lack of knowledge) encountered compiling the required information and the main uncertainties involved.	Main assumptions and limitations associated with the EIA to be included in one of the upfront chapters of the ES. Discipline-specific assumptions and limitations to be detailed within each of the discipline-specific chapters of the ES.	Section 4.3 of Chapter 4 Environmental Assessment Methodology details the general assessment assumptions and limitations. Assumptions and limitations have also been described on a topic by topic basis, within Chapters 5 to 14 of Volume 6.1.
		Residues or Emissions		
3.3.8		The EIA Regulations require an estimate, by type and quantity, of expected residues and emissions. Specific reference should be made to water, air, soil and subsoil pollution, noise, vibration, light, heat, radiation and quantities and types of waste produced during the construction and operation phases, where relevant. This information should be provided in a clear and consistent fashion and may be integrated into the relevant aspect assessments.	To be included within the discipline-specific chapters of air quality, noise and vibration, geology and soils, landscape, materials, and road drainage and the water environment. Heat and radiation effects have been scoped out of the ES.	Included within the 'Baseline Conditions' section of Chapter 5 Air Quality, Chapter 7 Landscape, Chapter 9 Geology and Soils, Chapter 10 Material Assets and Waste, Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration, Chapter 12 People and Communities (Volume 6.1), and Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and Water Environment Assessment Summary (Volume 6.3).
3.3.9	PINS	Commentary to be provided only if there is an issue or omission in relation to water, air, soil and subsoil pollution, noise, vibration, light, heat, radiation and quantities and types of waste produced during the construction and operation phases or GHG. Specific areas to consider include impact on soil, farming production and field drainage.		
		Mitigation		
3.3.10	PINS	Any mitigation relied upon for the purposes of the assessment should be explained in detail within the ES. The likely efficacy of the mitigation proposed should be explained with reference to residual effects. The ES should also address how any mitigation proposed is secured, ideally with reference to specific DCO requirements or other legally binding agreements.	Mitigation and the specific DCO requirements to secure this mitigation to be included in the mitigation section of each of the environmental discipline chapters of the ES.	The 'Mitigation' section of each of the discipline-specific chapters (Chapters 5 to 14) of the ES describes all the mitigation measures required as part of the scheme. These are also included within Table 3.1 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, within the Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7).
		Vulnerability of the development to risks of major accidents and / or disasters		
3.3.11	PINS	The ES should include a description of the potential vulnerability of the Proposed Development to risks of major accidents and/or disasters, including vulnerability to climate change, which are relevant to the Proposed Development. Relevant information available and obtained through risk assessments pursuant to European Union legislation such as Directive 2012/18/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council or Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom or relevant assessments carried out pursuant to national legislation may be used for this purpose provided that the requirements of this Directive are met. Where appropriate, this description should include measures envisaged to prevent or mitigate the significant adverse effects of such events on the environment and details of the preparedness for and proposed response to such emergencies.	Include an assessment of major accidents and disasters within the ES. In considering the elements of vulnerability, professional judgement will be applied to develop project specific definitions of major events. Major events, both man-made and naturally occurring, will be identified and any potential effects and likely mitigation measures will be included as part of the assessment. The conclusions of this assessment will be included as a technical appendix to the ES.	The assessment of major accidents and disasters is included within Appendix 4.8 of Volume 6.3.
3.3.12	PINS	Paragraphs 5.1.7-5.1.9 of the Scoping Report explain the Applicant's proposed approach to the assessment of impacts associated with major accidents and/or disasters. The scope of the assessment will cover vulnerability of the Proposed Development to risks of major accidents and/or disasters and any consequential impacts on the environment. Rather than being considered as a separate chapter in the ES, the Applicant proposes to assess these impacts within each relevant aspect area of the ES.	An assessment of major accidents and disasters to be included as part of the ES.	The assessment of major accidents and disasters is included within Appendix 4.8 of Volume 6.3.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Transboundary effects				
3.3.13	PINS	Schedule 4 Part 5 of the EIA Regulations requires a description of the likely significant transboundary effects to be provided in an ES. The Inspectorate notes that the Applicant has not indicated in the Scoping Report whether the Proposed Development is likely to have significant impacts on another European Economic Area (EEA) State.	Ensure a description of the likely significant transboundary effects is provided in the ES.	Transboundary effects and the reasoning for scoping these out are detailed within paragraphs 4.1.15 to 4.1.17, Section 4.1 of Chapter 4, Volume 6.1.
3.3.15	PINS	The Inspectorate considers that where Regulation 32 applies, this is likely to have implications for the examination of a DCO application. The Inspectorate recommends that the ES should identify whether the Proposed Development has the potential for significant transboundary impacts and if so, what these are and which EEA States would be affected.	Ensure a description of the likely significant transboundary effects is provided in the ES.	Transboundary effects and the reasoning for scoping these out are detailed within paragraphs 4.1.15 to 4.1.17, Section 4.1 of Chapter 4, Volume 6.1.
A reference list				
3.3.16	PINS	A reference list detailing the sources used for the descriptions and assessments must be included in the ES.	All sources used within the ES to be included as footnotes.	The sources used within the ES are included as footnotes.
3.4 Confidential Information				
3.4.1	PINS	In some circumstances it will be appropriate for information to be kept confidential. In particular, this may relate to information about the presence and locations of rare or sensitive species such as badgers, rare birds and plants where disturbance, damage, persecution or commercial exploitation may result from publication of the information. Where documents are intended to remain confidential the Applicant should provide these as separate paper and electronic documents with their confidential nature clearly indicated in the title, and watermarked as such on each page. The information should not be incorporated within other documents that are intended for publication or which the Inspectorate would be required to disclose under the Environmental Information Regulations 2014.	Any documents that are intended to remain confidential to be clearly marked and not included as part of the information to be made accessible to the public.	The Confidential Badger Report has been clearly marked as being confidential and has not been made available to the public.
4.0 ASPECT BASED SCOPING TABLES				
4.1 Air Quality				
ID 2	PINS	*Scope of assessment* - No reference is made to the need for PM2.5 to be considered as a specific pollutant within the assessment. The Inspectorate considers that the ES should include an assessment of impacts associated with increased PM2.5 resulting from the Proposed Development. In determining significance the assessment should take into account performance against relevant target/limit values.	Information as to why PM2.5 has been scoped out to be included in the air quality ES chapter.	No significant effects are anticipated for PM2.5 (and therefore the need to assess PM2.5 has been scoped out the assessment) as: • the results of the PM10 assessment (Appendix 5.4, Volume 6.3) show that predicted concentrations of PM10 are well below the equivalent strategy objectives and Target Values set for PM2.5 (annual men concentration of 25µg/m3). • PM2.5 is constituent part of PM10 which means vehicles emission factors for PM2.5 are lower than those for PM10. • projected background concentrations in the area are well below the objective and target values and lower than those for PM10 (Chapter 5, section 5.7 of ES). Therefore, the outcome of an assessment of PM2.5 would not be significant and therefore the need to assess PM2.5. This has subsequently been scoped out the assessment.
ID 3	PINS	*Study area* - The ES should include a plan or figure to depict the extent of the ARN and identify the sensitive receptors; both human and ecological which may be impacted by the Proposed Development.	A figure to be included within the ES of the ARN and nearby sensitive receptors.	Figure 5.2 shows the Local ARN, 5.5 shows the Regional ARN, and Figure 5.4 shows the air quality receptors (both air quality and ecological) considered within Chapter 5 Air Quality, Volume 6.1.
ID 4	PINS	*Baseline* - The Scoping Report identifies that diffusion tube monitoring has taken place over 6 months at 16 locations along roads near the Proposed Development. The dates of these surveys, together with the locations and justification of why the locations were selected should be included within the ES.	Additional information related to the monitoring survey undertaken to be included in the ES.	Appendix 5.2 Monitoring Survey (Volume 6.3) has been produced to provide additional details on the diffusion tube monitoring undertaken.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
ID 5	PINS	*Baseline* - The Scoping Report identifies that there are approximately 200 residential properties within 200m of the Proposed Development. It is not clear whether this includes the properties within 200m of the redline boundary or within 200m of the ARN. The ES should clearly set out the type and quantity of receptors identified within 200m of the ARN.	The 200 residential properties refers to the within 200m of the red line boundary. Information on the type and quantity of receptors within 200m of the ARN to be included in the ES.	The number of properties within 200m of the redline boundary have been identified in section 5.6 of Chapter 5 Air Quality (Volume6.1) and the number of receptors within 200m of the ARN is presented in section 5.6.
ID 6	PINS	*Effects on ecological receptors* - The ES should clearly identify those designated sites which may be impacted by changes in air quality, identifying those sites where the critical loads may be exceeded. The need to consider other sensitive nature conservation sites should be established through consultation with the relevant statutory consultees.	Information on designated sites likely to be affected by changes in air quality to be included within the ES. Undertake consultation with Natural England to determine the need assess any other sensitive conservation sites.	NOx concentrations at the one designated site within 200m of the ARN are well below the EU limit value of 30µg/m3 (10µg/m3 in the opening year) and result in an imperceptible change of NOx (less than 0.4µg/m3). Therefore, the scheme is not expected to result in significant effects at designated sites so, in accordance with IAN 174/13 an assessment of critical loads is not required. Consultation with Natural England has not highlighted the need assess any other sensitive conservation sites. This is detailed within the Consultation section of Section 5.4 Assessment Methodology of Chapter 5 Air Quality, Volume 6.1
ID 7	PINS	*Construction compounds* - The Scoping Report states that once the locations of the construction compounds are known, then the potential impacts will be reassessed as part of the ES in relation to any nearby designated sites. The ES should also assess whether the location of the construction compounds may have any impacts on human health and wellbeing.	The dust impacts on nearby sensitive receptors associated with the location of the construction compounds to be assessed in accordance with DMRB (HA 207/07).	The red line boundary has been updated to include the locations of the construction compounds (Figure 5.1, Volume 6.2), which has been used to undertake an assessment construction dust in accordance with DMRB (HA 207/07). No designated sites are located within 200m of the construction compounds (section 5.6 of chapter 5, volume 6.1).
ID 8	PINS	*Assessment of impacts* - The Scoping Report states that potential concentrations of NOx will be assessed in relation to designated sites. If it is concluded that there may be a significant impact, a briefing note would be prepared by the ecologist for the Proposed Development and submitted to Natural England (NE) in accordance with IAN 174/13. In the event that this occurs, details should be included within the ES together with details of mitigation measures proposed to reduce significant impacts.	If a potential significant impact is predicted at a designated site, a briefing note would be prepared by the ecologist and details of this note and proposed mitigation would be included within the ES.	Only 1 designated site which is sensitive to air quality is located within 200m of the ARN (Figure 5.4, paragraph 5.4.40-5.4.41 of chapter 5, volume 6.1). Predicted concentrations of NOx have been assessed at this site (Appendix 5.4, Volume 6.3). In accordance with IAN 174/13, the scheme is not expected to have a significant impact, as the change in annual mean NOx concentration between the DM and DS scenario is imperceptible and the DS concentration is 10µg/m3 and is therefore below the critical level of 30µg/m3 (paragraph 5.10.30-5.10.32). Therefore, in accordance with IAN 174/13 a briefing note is not required.
4.2 Cultural Heritage				
ID 2	PINS	*Study area* - The assessment will be based upon a 1km study area. DMRB HA208/07 does not specify particular distances for study areas. The Applicant should justify the study area(s) adopted for the Proposed Development; the study area should be established having regard to the extent of likely impacts. The study area should be agreed with Historic England.	The study area and reasons for selection to be detailed within the Cultural Heritage ES chapter.	The reasons for the selection of the study area used in the assessment is contained within Section 6.5 Study Area in Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage, Volume 6.1.
ID 3	PINS	*Intrusive and non-intrusive investigations* - The Scoping Report has not specified the need for intrusive and non-intrusive archaeological surveys. Any such need will be informed by the desk study and site walkover assessment. The Applicant should discuss and agree the need for intrusive or non-intrusive survey work with the South West Heritage Trust and relevant local authority officers.	Details of surveys to be included as part of the Cultural Heritage ES chapter. Heritage stakeholders to be engaged with through the Environmental Technical Working Group.	Geophysics and trial trench specifications have been agreed with Historic England and SWHT. Non-intrusive and intrusive surveys are being undertaken on the basis of these specifications. It has been agreed with both Historic England and SWHT that this work will be undertaken during the DCO process and results reported as other environmental information. This agreement is reported in Section 2.6 Consultation of the Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment, Volume 6.3.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
ID 4	PINS	*Non designated built heritage assets* - The extent of non-designated heritage assets along the Proposed Development has not yet been determined or examined. The Applicant should discuss if there are relevant non designated heritage assets that should be assessed with the South West Heritage Trust and relevant local authority officers as appropriate. The discussions should be informed following completion of the desk study and site walkover assessment.	Details of the assets to be included as part of the ES. Heritage stakeholders to be engaged with through the Environmental Technical Working Group.	Any non-designated heritage assets to be scoped in to the assessment were discussed with the heritage consultees as part of the Environmental Technical Working Group. Those assets scoped in to the assessment are contained within Section 6.7 'Baseline Conditions' of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage (Volume 6.1) and a full list of the assets are included within Appendix 6.1 Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment, Volume 6.3.
ID 5	PINS	*Geophysical survey* - It is unclear what is meant regarding the consultation undertaken in August 2017 with Historic England and the South West Heritage Trust regarding the geophysical survey. This should be clarified within the ES.	Details of this consultation to be included as part of the ES.	This consultation was to agree a scope and specification for the non-intrusive geophysics survey with Historic England and SWHT. Details of the results of this consultation can be found in Section 2.6 of the Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment, Volume 6.3.
ID 6	PINS	*Mitigation* - The Scoping Report explains that preservation of archaeological remains in situ would be explored during the design process and best practice measures to limit impacts on heritage assets would be employed during construction through the implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). The Applicant should show that they have discussed and agreed these approaches with the South West Heritage Trust and officers from relevant local authorities.	Heritage stakeholders to be engaged with through the Environmental Technical Working Group.	Consultation with heritage consultees has been ongoing throughout the process. This is reflected in section 2.6 of the Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment, Volume 6.3. Heritage consultees were also issued the ***Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7)*** for review and comment.
		4.3 Landscape and Visual		
ID 2	PINS	*Study area* - The Scoping Report states that the study area is 1km from the limits of the Proposed Development. However, this boundary is not clearly defined in the Scoping Report making it uncertain what the actual extent of the study area is. The Inspectorate assumes that 1km from the scheme means 1km from the redline boundary indicated in Appendix B of the Scoping Report but this should be clearly presented in the ES. DMRB HA208/07 does not specify particular distances for study areas. The Applicant should seek to agree with relevant consultees and justify the study area(s) adopted for the assessment in their ES.	The study area for the LVIA to be included on supporting drawings. Consultation will be undertaken with the SSDC Landscape Architect to agree study area and key views.	The study area is now clearly defined in section 7.6 of Chapter 7 Landscape of Volume 6.1 and supported with figures and explanation to justify where the study area has been extended beyond 1km. Consultation with South Somerset District Council was undertaken during the Environmental Technical Working Group where the study area and viewpoints were agreed (see meeting minutes contained in Appendix 4.9 of Volume 6.3).
ID 3	PINS	*Night time lighting* - If night time lighting is required during construction or operation, the visual impact on residential receptors should be assessed, including use of night-time photomontages where appropriate.	Night time lighting will be assessed as part of the LVIA and if required additional photomontages will be produced to support the assessment of night time lighting.	Lighting during construction and operation has been considered in the assessment (see section 7.11 'Assessment of likely significant effects' of Chapter 7 Landscape, Volume 6.1) however, however it was not deemed necessary to undertake a separate lighting assessment with photomontages. This is because lighting during operation will replace an existing lighting scheme and is considered to be less intrusive than the existing lighting.
ID 4	PINS	*View point selection* - The Inspectorate welcomes the Applicant's commitment to consult with relevant local planning authorities to discuss and agree the final selection of representative viewpoints for inclusion in the ES.	Consultation will be undertaken with SSDC Landscape Architect to agree key views, as part of the Environmental Technical Working Group.	View point locations were discussed with the environmental Technical Working Group which included South Somerset District Council (meeting minutes contained within Appendix 4.9 of Volume 6.3) and the representative viewpoint locations were agreed for the use in Chapter 7 Landscape, Volume 6.1).
ID 5	PINS	*Impact from construction and operation* - The Inspectorate is aware that the raised section of road west of Camel Hill will be particularly prominent and may result in visual impacts. The ES should assess these impacts and the Applicant is referred to comments from Queen Camel Parish Council (PC) and West Camel PC in this regard.	These impacts will be considered as part of the LVIA and mitigated accordingly.	The impacts of the raised section of the road have been assessed in detail in particular with regards to the visual impacts. The scheme has been designed to include a false cutting / bund and native shrub and tree planting along this section of the road to reduce visual impacts of traffic and signage.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
ID 6	PINS	*Lighting columns* - The ES should ensure that the location and anticipated height of new lighting columns is included within the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.	Details of the lighting and vertical engineering infrastructure will be detailed within the upfront chapters of the ES and references within the LVIA.	Details regarding lighting columns are provided within section 2.5 of Chapter 2 The Scheme, Volume 6.1, and Chapter 7 Landscape of Volume 6.1 provides cross references back to this section where appropriate.
4.4 Geology and Soils				
ID 2	PINS	*Study area* - The study area for hydrogeology and hydrology lacks clarity as the Scoping Report states that a 'wider area is considered to be appropriate' but provides no definition of what this might be. The Applicant should provide a definition of 'wider area' within the ES, ensuring that it appropriately reflects the anticipated extent of potential impacts.	Study area to be well defined within the Geology and Soils chapter of the ES.	Section 9.6 'Study Area' of Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Volume 6.1) defines 'wider area'.
ID 3	PINS	*Study area* - The Inspectorate notes that the study area for geology and soils does not include the whole Local Geological Site (LGS) and Local Wildlife Site (LWS) areas. The Applicant should avoid using an arbitrary figure for the study area within the ES, and utilise a justifiable study area that encompasses the extent of the anticipated impact.	Study area to be well defined within the Geology and Soils chapter of the ES.	Section 9.6 'Study Area' of Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Volume 6.1) defines 'wider area'.
ID 4	PINS	*Baseline* - Table 9.1 of the Scoping Report refers to the chainage but no plan or figure has been provided. If chainage is used as a point of reference in the ES then a plan or figure should be provided with chainage appropriately labelled to support the reader.	Plan with chainage clearly labelled to be included to support the ES.	Chainage appropriately labelled has been added to Sheets 1 and 2 of Figure 9.1, Volume 6.2. These figures directy support Chapter 9 Geology and Soils, Volume 6.1.
ID 5	PINS	*Design, mitigation, and enhancement measures* - The Applicant states that a CEMP, Materials Management Plan (MMP), Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) and a Soil Management Plan (SMP) will be utilised to provide mitigation during construction. These management plans should include specific and sufficient detail to ensure efficacy and be in included within the ES.	An Outline Environmental Management Plan to be produced which contains the following supporting outline management plans: Outline Soils Management Plan, Outline Materials management Plan and Outline Site Waste Management Plan.	An ***Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7)*** has been prepared to support the DCO submission. Within the Outline Environmental Management Plan, an Outline Site Waste Management Plan is contained within Annex B.1, an Outline Materials Management Plan is contained within Annex B.2, and an Outline Soils Management Plan is contained within Annex B.3. These Outline documents detail the minimum measures that would be included within each of the supplementary plans.
ID 6	PINS	*Methodology* - The Scoping Report states that the DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Part 11, the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and the Environmental Protection Regulations 1991 will be utilised when undertaking the assessment of Geology and Soils. However, there is no specific detail as to the methodology for the assessment. The ES should outline the methodology and detail how the assessment of geology and soils will be undertaken.	Ensure methodology is included within the Geology and Soils chapter of the ES.	The assessment methodology is contained within Section 9.4 of Chapter 9 Geology and Soils, Volume 6.1.
4.5 Biodiversity				
ID 2	PINS	*Study area* - A distance of 2km may not be appropriate for water dependent SSSI's downstream of the Proposed Development. The Applicant should seek to agree the study area for water dependant SSSIs with the Environment Agency (EA), such as Wet Moor SSSI.	To be agreed with the EA following review of HAWRAT and Water Framework Directive.	Study area has been extended to incorporate water dependant SSSIs downstream of the works. The WFD Screening and Scoping Assessment (Appendix 4.5, Volume 6.3) has identified a 'zone of influence' for the scheme to include any waterbodies within a 1km radius of the scheme, but to also include downstream / hydraulically connected waterbodies within a 10km radius of the scheme. The River Cary, Cam and Yeo (and the associated water dependant areas) are therefore all scoped in as part of the WFD Screening and Scoping assessment. This has been agreed with the Environment Agency (see Appendix A of Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and Water Environment Assessment Summary, Volume 6.3).
ID 3	PINS	*Surveys* - The Scoping Report states that surveys have been carried out for protected and notable species, including barn owls. Barn owl surveys are not reported in Appendix C of the Scoping Report. The ES should contain the results of all surveys, including for barn owls.	The Biodiversity chapter of the ES to contain details of the barn owl survey results.	Section 8.7 'Baseline conditions' of Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Volume 6.1) summarises the results of the protected species surveys, including those for barn owls. The full results are detailed within Appendix 8.5 Barn Owl Technical Report, Volume 6.3.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
ID 4	PINS	*Consultation* - The Inspectorate welcomes the Applicant's commitment to consult with NE and the relevant local planning authorities to discuss and agree an ecological mitigation strategy. The final strategy should be sufficiently detailed to ensure efficacy and details of how it would be secured in the DCO.	The Biodiversity chapter of the ES to detail consultation that has taken place with Natural England.	The consultation that has taken place with Natural England as part of the Environmental Technical Working Group is detailed within Section 8.4 'Assessment Methodology'. The ecological mitigation strategy is shown in Figure 2.8 Environmental Masterplan, Volume 6.3, and mitigation measures are detailed in Table 3.1 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments contained within the ***OEMP (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7)***.
ID 5	PINS	*Impacts on bats* - The impact of the lighting design and use of lighting during construction; on protected species (eg bats) and the potential to cause severance to flight paths should also be considered. The full impact of the Proposed Development on foraging bats should be assessed.	Impact of lighting on protected species to be assessed as part of the Biodiversity chapter of the ES.	The impact of lighting on protected species is assessed within Chapter 8 Biodiversity, Volume 6.1. Effects on protected species are documented within section 8.10 'Assessment of likely significant effects', with lighting impacts on bats for example detailed in paragraph 8.10.29 (construction lighting) and paragraph 8.10.60 (operational lighting). Further consideration is given within the protected species technical reports (Appendices 8.2 to 8.13, Volume 6.3).
ID 6	PINS	*Ecological mitigation areas* - Appendix B of the Scoping Report identifies 5 land parcels to be used for ecological mitigation. The Scoping Report states this may include receptor areas for species such as reptiles or newts or for habitat creation. The ES should contain details of each ecological mitigation area together with details regarding its size, and what it would be used for. The Applicant should consult relevant stakeholders regarding the development of ecological mitigation areas. In particularly the County Ecologist and the Forestry Commission (FC), should be consulted to ensure that opportunities to maximise the performance of these areas are realised. The Applicant should assess the residual loss of priority habitat or habitat supporting priority species and decide whether this should be addressed via the creation of compensatory areas or provision of financial compensation.	Ecological mitigation areas have been identified and details will be included within the Biodiversity chapter of the ES. Forestry Commission and County Ecologist to be contacted as part of the Environmental Technical Working Group. Habitat loss to be fully assessed and mitigated/compensated where needed to ensure no net loss of habitat and create habitats of higher biodiversity value.	Details of the receptor sites are contained within Section 8.9 'Design, mitigation and enhancement measures'. These areas have been discussed with Natural England as part of the Environmental Technical Working Group. Both the Forestry Commission and the County Ecologist were invited but we unable to attend the meetings. Suitable mitigation measures to ensure no net loss and to create habitats of higher biodiversity value have been incorporated into the design (as detailed in paragraph 8.9.3) and assessed within Chapter 8 Biodiversity, Volume 6.1.
ID 7	PINS	*Surveys* - The Scoping Report refers to a breeding bird survey which was undertaken in August 2017. Appendix C of the Scoping Report refers to an overwintering bird survey. It is not clear if both have been undertaken. To avoid confusion, surveys should be reported accurately in the ES.	Ensure full details of surveys are included within the Biodiversity chapter of the ES.	Section 8.7 'Baseline conditions' of Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Volume 6.1) summarises the results of the protected species surveys, including those for breeding birds (paragraphs 8.7.27 to 8.7.30). The full results are detailed within Appendix 8.6 Breeding Bird Technical Report, Volume 6.3.
ID 8	PINS	*Surveys* - The Scoping Report refers to National vegetation classification survey and hedgerow surveys but the findings of these are not documented in the Scoping Report. The ES should report the findings of all surveys and take the results into account in the assessments.	Ensure full details of surveys are included within the Biodiversity chapter of the ES.	Section 8.7 'Baseline conditions' of Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Volume 6.1) summarises the results of the habitat surveys, including those for NVC and hedgerow (paragraphs 8.7.10 and 8.7.11). The full results are detailed within Appendix 8.2 NVC Technical Report and Appendix 8.3 Hedgerow Technical Report, Volume 6.3.
		4.6 Materials		
ID 3	PINS	*Impacts of depleting materials* - The Scoping Report lacks evidence that an assessment of the effects the Proposed Development will have on the materials listed in 11.7.2. An assessment of the potential effects that the Proposed Development will have on the market for these materials should be included within the ES.	Highways England to provide guidance on the assessment methodology for materials.	The assessment methodology has been outlined within the chapter and the significance of effect criteria for material assets is based upon the reduction or alteration in material availability at the regional, national and international scale, as well as drawing the re-use of aggregate or use of recycled aggregate (see Table 10.1). The significance of effect criteria for waste is based upon the reduction or alteration in the regional or national capacity of waste infrastructure and whether the waste would require disposal outside of the region (see Table 10.1).

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
ID 4	PINS	*Study area* - The study area for the assessment of waste lacks sufficient justification. The Applicant should ensure that the study area is determined by the extent of potential impacts and not by an arbitrary geographical boundary.	The study area description to be updated to ensure the study area is determined by the extent of potential impacts.	The assessment methodology has been outlined within the chapter and the significance of effect criteria for material assets is based upon the reduction or alteration in material availability at the regional, national and international scale, as well as drawing the re-use of aggregate or use of recycled aggregate (see Table 10.1). The significance of effect criteria for waste is based upon the reduction or alteration in the regional or national capacity of waste infrastructure and whether the waste would require disposal outside of the region (see Table 10.1). The study area has been updated and now constitutes two geographically different study areas: 1. The first study area is based on the area of completed works within the redline boundary of the scheme. Within this area, construction materials will be consumed (used, reused and recycled) and waste will be generated. 2. The second study area focuses on the county of Somerset, within which: - suitable waste infrastructure that could accept arisings and or waste generated by the project - feasible sources and availability of construction materials typically required for motorway and all-purpose trunk road projects. This is outlined in Section 10.6.
ID 5	PINS	*Baseline* - No reference has been made to utilising a future baseline. A future baseline forecasting the availability of resources and waste infrastructure should be included within the ES.	A future baseline to be outlined and used. This will be informed by previous forecasting done by South Somerset District Council and Somerset County Council in their minerals and waste plans.	Reference to the future reserves of aggregates in Somerset has been outlined in Table 10.4, and to the future capacity of landfill in Paragraph 10.7.17. Chapter 2 of the ES also provides an overview of the future baseline for each topic considered in the ES.
ID 6	PINS	*Design and mitigation* - The Scoping Report references the usage of a CEMP, SWMP and MMP to provide mitigation measures. The Applicant should ensure that these documents are cross referred to the ES and secured through the DCO in sufficient detail to ensure efficacy.	An Outline Environmental Management Plan to be included as part of the ES. The Contractor to produce a SWMP and MMP (prior to construction).	An Outline EMP, Outline SWMP and Outline MMP have been produced as part of the DCO and have been cross referenced to in the ES.
ID 7	PINS	*Proposed level and scope of assessment* - The Scoping Report lacks any discussion of the removal/ treatment of hazardous waste arisings or the availability of hazardous waste treatment infrastructure. The Applicant should include an assessment of the treatment/ removal of hazardous waste within the ES.	The ES to assess the removal and/or treatment of this hazardous waste, if hazardous waste is likely to be generated by the scheme.	The material assets and waste chapter of the ES has discussed the potential for hazardous waste arisings from the sources of contamination identified in the area. The baseline Section 10.7 has identified the capacity of hazardous waste infrastructure in the region and the assessment in Section 10.10 has discussed the generation and subsequent removal of hazardous waste.
ID 8	PINS	*Proposed level and scope of assessment* - The Scoping Report references paragraph 11.7.9 which should state that 'there would be minimal requirements for waste during operation of the Proposed Scheme' but no paragraph with this reference is within the Scoping Report.	Noted. Any such statements to be made clear in the ES.	Not applicable.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
		4.7 Noise and Vibration		
ID 2	PINS	*Study area* - The Scoping Report states the study area will follow DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Part 7 which sets out a study area of 1km from the works for operational noise. For construction, this study area 'may be extended to assess effects from construction traffic on the existing road network'. The Scoping Report does not explain how receptors will be determined and there is no clear evidence as to how the locations of sensitive receptors and extent of likely impacts have been taken into account in determining the study area. The ES should clearly explain the methodology adopted for the assessment along with the method used to identify the receptors and study areas, ensuring that a robust assessment is carried out. The Applicant should seek to obtain agreement of the methodology with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) as stated in DMRB.	Receptors to be determined through a combination of site walkover, desktop study, OS mapping, consultation with the LPA and other environmental specialists for designated areas, heritage buildings etc. The study area extents are determined by application of DMRB guidance and are based upon noise changes on the existing and proposed road network. The above aspects be made clear in the ES chapter.	Receptors have been identified primarily through the use of OS AddressBase data, as well as site visits and consultation with the Local Planning Authority Environmental Health Officer through the Environmental Technical Working Group. Paragraph 11.6.2 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.1) details how HD213/11 has informed the study area extents. Paragraph 11.6.1 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.1) describes the study area for construction noise and justifies this and paragraph 11.6.2 Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.1) describes the study area for operational noise and how this aligns with DMRB. Paragraph 11.4 38 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.1) discusses the consultation with the local planning authority.
ID 3	PINS	*Study area* - The Scoping Report states that 'the extent of the assessment will be limited to areas where total noise (calculated construction noise plus baseline noise) exceeds the baseline noise levels.' The Scoping Report does not set out how this will be assessed.	The baseline to be determined through survey and calculations. This is to be made clear in the Noise and Vibration chapter of the ES.	The baseline has been outlined in Section 11.7 'Baseline conditions' of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration, Volume 6.3. Appendix 11.1 Baseline Noise Survey of Volume 6.3 also provides further details.
ID 4	PINS	*Baseline* - The Scoping Report does not list any noise monitoring undertaken by the LPA in its sources for the desk study. The ES should set out whether such information exists and whether it has been taken into account.	Information to be taken into account of as part of the Noise and Vibration chapter of the ES.	No information was available from the LPA. The baseline has therefore been informed by the baseline noise surveys undertaken in 2018 as described in Section 11.7 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration, Volume 6.3.
ID 5	PINS	*Assumptions* - The paragraph discusses noise surveys; however, the Scoping Report does not detail the methodology applied to undertaking these surveys. The ES should clearly set out what surveys are being undertaken, the location, the duration, the weather conditions and the time of year.	Survey details to be included within the noise and vibration chapter of the ES.	Full survey details are contained within Appendix 11.1 Baseline Noise Survey of Volume 6.3.
ID 6	PINS	*Mitigation* - The Inspectorate would expect to see mitigation such as acoustic bunds assessed fully within the ES and appropriate cross reference to other aspects in the ES such as the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.	Mitigation to be assessed fully within the noise and vibration chapter of the ES.	Mitigation measures are detailed within section 11.9 'Design, mitigation and enhancement measures' of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration, Volume 6.1, and are also detailed within the ***Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7).***
ID 7	PINS	*Working hours* - The Scoping Report explains that the working hours and noise levels will be agreed by the contractor and secured through the CEMP. The assessment in the ES should explain the working hours applied to the assessment and how these are secured through the DCO.	Noted. Details of working hours to be described in the assessment.	Details of working hours are contained within Chapter 2 The Scheme of Volume 6.1. Mitigation measures are detailed within section 11.9 'Design, mitigation and enhancement measures' and are further included within the ***Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7).***
ID 8	PINS	*Methodology* - The noise assessment is required and should include assessment of impacts to sensitive ecological receptors as well as human. NE should be consulted to agree which ecological receptors should be assessed in this regard.	Consultation with Natural England to be undertaken as part of the Environmental Technical Working Group to understand if any ecological receptors should be included within the noise and vibration assessment.	This consultation has been detailed in paragraph 11.4.10 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration, Volume 6.1.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
ID 9	PINS	*CEMP* - The Scoping Report states that mitigation measures will be secured through the CEMP. This should also be detailed in the ES and secured through the DCO.	Mitigation to be detailed as part of the noise and vibration chapter of the ES, as well as included within the Outline Environmental Management Plan.	Mitigation measures are detailed within section 11.9 'Design, mitigation and enhancement measures' of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration, Volume 6.1, and are also detailed within the ***Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7).***
ID 10	PINS	*Methodology* - The Scoping Report does not set out the methodology for operational vibration assessment. The ES should clearly set out such a methodology.	The methodology to be in accordance with DMRB and set out in Noise and Vibration chapter of the ES, if applicable.	The assessment of operational vibration has been scoped out of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration, Volume 6.1.
ID 11	PINS	*Methodology* - The ES should be explicit where the overarching methodology (Chapter 5 of the Scoping Report) is relied upon and when a aspect specific methodology is to be utilised.	The ES to provide an overarching EIA methodology section in Chapter 4 and discipline-specific methodologies to be provided in the preceding chapters.	Chapter 4 Environmental Assessment Methodology (Volume 6.1) sets out the overarching methodology for the EIA. Section 11.4 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.1) details the specific methodology used for the assessment.
ID 12	PINS	*Potential noise and vibration effects* - The ES should explain and justify the levels noted for LOAEL and SOAEL in Table 12.1.	Noted. To be set out in the Noise and Vibration chapter of the ES.	Paragraph 11.4.1 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.1) justifies where the LOAEL and SOAEL values (as outlined in Table 11.5) have been informed by.
ID 13	PINS	*Methodology* - The Scoping Report states that human health will be addressed under section 12.11.1 however this paragraph in the Scoping Report does not address the assessment of impacts on human health. The ES should provide accurate cross referencing within and between the chapters to ensure a comprehensive assessment.	Human health and wellbeing to be assessed qualitatively as part of the Noise and Vibration chapter of the ES.	Human health and wellbeing has been assessed qualitatively as part of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration. Volume 6.1.
4.8 People and Communities				
ID 1	PINS	*Development land during construction* - The Inspectorate notes that there is no land identified as an allocated development site in the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028). However the Inspectorate notes the potential for development to come forward which is not on allocated land which should be included in a cumulative impact assessment. As such, the Inspectorate does not agree that this matter can be scoped out.	The potential for further development to be included within the baseline, and to then be further considered within the Combined and Cumulative Effects chapter of the ES.	Land allocated for development has been established with South Somerset District Council, who confirmed that no land has been allocated within the study area. This has therefore not been assessed within Chapter 12 People and Communities, Volume 6.1. The developments agreed with South Somerset District Council have been included within Chapter 14 Combined and Cumulative Effects, Volume 6.1.
ID 2	PINS	*Development land during operation* - The Inspectorate notes that there is no land identified as an allocated development site in the South Somerset Local Plan (2006-2028). However the Inspectorate notes the potential for development to come forward which is not on allocated land which should be included in a cumulative impact assessment. As such, the Inspectorate does not agree that this matter can be scoped out.	The potential for further development to be included within the baseline, and to then be further considered within the Combined and Cumulative Effects chapter of the ES.	Effects on development land during operation have been assessed within Chapter 12 People and Communities, Volume 6.1 (see section 12.10). With regards to development land, improved journey times and reduced levels of congestion would improve access to possible future developments in the local area. This includes supporting the delivery of the target of at least 141 homes and 1.02 hectares of employment land in Ilchester between 2006 and 2028. As there are currently only limited future plans in the LIA, this effect is considered to be Slight Beneficial, and therefore not significant.
ID 5	PINS	*Study area* - The Scoping Report states that the study area has been defined through use of professional judgement. The Inspectorate considers this should be extended to take into account impacts on settlements such as Queen Camel.	Queen Camel to be included as part of the baseline within the People and Communities chapter of the ES, and effects assessed if required.	Queen Camel has been considered within the baseline section of Chapter 12 People and Communities, Volume 6.1 as appropriate.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
ID 6	PINS	*Identification of receptors* - The Applicant should ensure they have identified all community land and community facilities which may experience impacts from the Proposed Development. West Camel Parish Council in their response, highlight community facilities which have not been recorded in the Scoping Report. Such facilities should be included in the assessment to ensure a robust assessment.	All community facilities within the study area to be detailed as part of the baseline within the People and Communities chapter of the ES.	All community facilities within the study area have been detailed as part of the baseline (Section 12.7 of Chapter 12, Volume 6.1) within the People and Communities chapter of the ES. Where relevant, community facilities just outside of the study area have also been referred to in the chapter.
ID 7	PINS	*Mitigation and enhancement* - The Inspectorate notes the potential for adverse traffic impacts arising from the Proposed Development, the nature of which cannot be specifically identified at this stage. However, mitigation should be explained in the ES and secured in the DCO once any local impacts are identified.	To be detailed within the mitigation section of the People and Communities chapter of the ES.	Section 12.9 of Chapter 12, Volume 6.1 details the measures that would be put in place during construction to minimise adverse effects with regard to traffic. These can also be seen in the Traffic Management Plan in Appendix 12.2, Volume 6.3.
ID 8	PINS	*Methodology* - The Scoping Report refers to various receptors which are to be identified 'in the area' or 'in the immediate area' of the Proposed Development. This introduces ambiguity to the assessment as there is no defined, set study area. The ES should clearly set out the parameters for the assessment and justify how these parameters ensure all potentially affected receptors are included in the assessment. Further descriptions of the study area are included in the Scoping Report chapter however these are varied and vague. The Inspectorate expects all study areas to be explained and justified in the ES to ensure a robust assessment with all potential receptors included in the study area.	Study area to be clearly defined within the People and Communities chapter of the ES.	Study areas have been clearly identified for the People and Communities sub-topics within section 12.4 Chapter 12, Volume 6.1. The study areas have been defined through professional judgement, based on the type and scale of the scheme and the context of the surrounding area, and are considered wide enough to identify potentially significant effects for individual receptors.
ID 9	PINS	*Potential impact* - The Inspectorate recognises that this aspect includes a number of distinct matters requiring a selective methodology for each. It is therefore essential that the ES clearly explain the methodology for each assessment including the definition of significance. The use of summary tables will be important to improve coherence for the reader and to understand the overall significance of effects.	A methodology to be included as part of the People and Communities chapter of the ES.	The methodology for the People and Communities Chapter is detailed in Section 12.7 of Chapter 12 People and Communities, Volume 6.1, with additional detail provided in Appendix 12.4, Volume 6.3. These provide definitions of significance for each sub-topic. A summary table has been provided in Chapter 15 which details all the significant effects anticipated for People and Communities.
ID 10	PINS	*Methodology* - Reference is made to an Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey. The Inspectorate notes the comments made by NE and their reference to Technical Information Note TIN049 - Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land. The Applicant should seek to agree the approach to the assessment of ALC with NE and as relevant make appropriate use of available technical information.	The approach to ALC surveys to take into consideration Natural England's technical note. Approach to be confirmed with Natural England.	Chapter 12 People and Communities (Volume 6.1) has made use of the available information obtained via a desk study, and has also been informed by agricultural questionnaires (see section 12.7 of Chapter 12 People and Communities, Volume 6.1). Details are also included within Appendix 12.4 Agricultural Impact Assessment Baseline Report, Volume 6.3.
4.9 Road Drainage and the Water Environment				
ID 1	PINS	The Inspectorate does not agree that this matter can be scoped out of the ES due to the potential for significant effects to impact LWS due to their close proximity to the Proposed Development.	The assessment of effects for LWS to be covered within the biodiversity chapter of the ES.	An assessment of impacts to LWSs has been undertaken (see Appendix 4.5 Water Framework Directive Screening and Scoping Report, Volume 6.3) and agreed with the Environment Agency that there would be no likely significant effects (see Appendix A of Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and Water Environment Assessment Summary).
ID 2	PINS	*Impacts on Sparkford Wood, Babcary Meadows, East Polden Grassland and Wet Moor SSSIs* - The Proposed Development is located within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) for several SSSIs. The Inspectorate is concerned that significant environmental effects have the potential to damage these nationally important sites and therefore, the Inspectorate does not agree that this matter can be scoped out. A full assessment of how the Proposed Development may affect the water environment of these sites should be included within ES.	To be agreed with the EA following review of HAWRAT and Water Framework Directive.	The scheme could only effect water dependant SSSIs. The potential effects on water-dependant SSSI (Wetmoor and King's Sedgemoor SSSI) have been assessed as part of Appendix 4.5 Water Framework Directive Screening and Scoping Report (Volume 6.3) which has confirmed that no effects are anticipated.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
ID 3	PINS	*Impact on Camel Hill Quarry and Sparkford Refuse Tip* - The Applicant states that the 'works would not affect the Camel Hill Quarry' and that the Sparkford Refuse Tip is not 'hydraulically linked' to the Proposed Development and therefore these sites will not be assessed. The Inspectorate considers that there is absence of an impact pathway for significant effects and they are unlikely to occur. Accordingly this matter can be scoped out of the ES. However, the justification to the scope of the assessment for this matter should be further supported by the inclusion of relevant plans/figures in the ES.	Water constraints plan to be provided to support Chapter 13 Road Drainage and Water Environment.	Appendix A of Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and the Water Environment Assessment Summary (Volume 6.3) includes the location of these landfills.
ID 4	PINS	*Study area* - The Scoping Report does not provide sufficient justification as to why a 1km study area has been used. The study area in the ES should be based on the extent of the likely impact and include a robust justification in support of the chosen study area.	The study area to be justified in the Road Drainage and Water Environment chapter of the ES.	Study area has been extended to incorporate water dependant SSSIs downstream of the works. The WFD Screening and Scoping Assessment (Appendix 4.5, Volume 6.3) has identified a 'zone of influence' for the scheme to include any waterbodies within a 1km radius of the scheme, but to also include downstream / hydraulically connected waterbodies within a 10km radius of the scheme. The River Cary, Cam and Yeo (and the associated water dependant areas) are therefore all scoped in as part of the WFD Screening and Scoping assessment. This has been agreed with the Environment Agency (see Appendix A of Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and Water Environment Assessment Summary, Volume 6.3).
ID 5	PINS	*Study area* - The Scoping Report does not define how or when the study area will be 'extended'. The ES should clearly explain the approach to extending the study area and justify the basis on which, this decision is reached.	The study area to be justified in the Road Drainage and Water Environment chapter of the ES.	As above.
ID 6	PINS	*Baseline* - The Applicants attention is drawn to comments received from West Camel Parish Council regarding the discharge of surface water from the existing A303 to the east of Plowage Lane causing a 'significant source of surface water flood for the village'. An assessment of the possible mitigation measures to prevent this flooding should be included within the ES.	A Flood Risk Assessment to be produced to support the ES.	A Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 4.6, Volume 6.3) has been produced.
ID 7	PINS	*Design, mitigation and enhancement* - The Scoping Report lacks sufficient detail of the proposed mitigation measures that are to be including within the CEMP and the Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Within the ES, the mitigation measures should be set out in as much detail as possible. Furthermore, the CEMP and SuDS should be included within the ES to ensure that the proposed mitigation measures will be implemented into the Proposed Development.	An Outline Environmental Management Plan to be produced which will include details of the mitigation measures required.	All of the mitigation measures required during construction and operation associated with the topic of Road Drainage and the Water Environment are detailed in Section 1.6 of Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and the Water Environment Assessment Summary, Volume 6.3. The mitigation measures are secured within Table 3.1 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments in the ***OEMP (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7).***
ID 8	PINS	*Assessment of impacts on fish* - The Scoping Report states that there is a risk of impact on water chemistry and sediment within the adjacent water bodies which will indirectly adversely impact fish populations. The Applicant should monitor water quality and acquire fishery data to ensure that the fish populations are not impacted by the change in water quality caused by the Proposed Development.	Water quality to be assessed as part of the HAWRAT assessment. Any requirements to monitor fish populations will be considered following the production of the HAWRAT, in consultation with the Environment Agency.	The HAWRAT (Appendix 4.4, Volume 6.3) has been reviewed by the Environment Agency, who are in agreement with the conclusions (see Appendix A of Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and the Water Environment).
ID 9	PINS	*Private water supplies* - The ES should assess the impacts on private water supplies within 500m of the Proposed Development during construction and operation.	The Road Drainage and Water Environment topic to consider private water supplies under the topic of licenced abstractions.	Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and Water Environment Assessment Summary details the licenced abstractions in paragraph 1.4.22.
4.10 Climate				
ID 2	PINS	*Study area* - The Scoping Report lacks a concise and justified study area. The Applicant should utilise a study area that is based on the extent of the likely impacts and agreed with the relevant consultees.	The study area to be further justified within the Climate chapter of the ES.	The study area is justified within Section 13.6 of Chapter 13 Climate, Volume 6.1.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
4.11 Combined and Cumulative Effects				
ID 2	PINS	*Landscape* - Table 16.1 identifies a 1km Zone of Visual Impact; however the Landscape Assessment will take into account receptors outside of this 1km limit. The assessment should be undertaken based on the extent of the likely impacts and their potential to act cumulatively with other impacts.	The zones of influence in the combined and cumulative effects to match with those study areas used in the individual environmental discipline chapters.	Table 14.5 of Chapter 14 Combined and Cumulative Effects (Volume 6.1) considers the Zones of Influence assessed within each of the discipline-specific topics (Chapters 5 to 13 of Volume 6.1).
5.0 INFORMATION SOURCES				
5.0.2	PINS	Applicants are also advised to review the list of information required to be submitted within an application for Development as set out in The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedures) Regulations 2009 (as amended).	This information to be reviewed prior to the DCO submission.	Information set out in The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedures) Regulations 2009 (as amended) has been included within the application.
APPENDIX 2 RESPONDENTS TO CONSULTATION AND COPIES OF REPLIES				
Environment Agency				
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	10.2.1 - A distance of 2 km may not be appropriate for water dependant SSSIs downstream of the proposed works. The River Cary feeds into designated sites and therefore, the potential would exist for a negative impact on such sites. Accordingly, these must be scoped in until it can be determined there would be little/no impact.	To be agreed with the EA following review of HAWRAT and Water Framework Directive.	Study area has been extended to incorporate water dependant SSSIs downstream of the works. The WFD Screening and Scoping Assessment (Appendix 4.5, Volume 6.3) has identified a 'zone of influence' for the scheme to include any waterbodies within a 1km radius of the scheme, but to also include downstream / hydraulically connected waterbodies within a 10km radius of the scheme. The River Cary, Cam and Yeo (and the associated water dependant areas) are therefore all scoped in as part of the WFD Screening and Scoping assessment. This has been agreed with the Environment Agency (see Appendix A of Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and Water Environment Assessment Summary, Volume 6.3).
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	10.3.2 - As stated above, water dependant designated sites downstream of water bodies, which may be impacted by the proposed works, must be scoped in until it can be determined there is little/no impact.	Approach to be agreed with the Environment Agency during Environmental Technical Working Groups. HAWRAT and WFD to be sent to the Environment Agency for review and comment.	Water designated sites that are within 10km downstream of the scheme / have a hydraulic connection have been scoped in as part of the WFD Screening and Scoping Report (Appendix 4.5, Volume 6.3). The WFD Screening and Scoping assessment concluded that although there is a potential impact pathway present between the scheme and water dependent sites, the comprehensive drainage treatment (SuDs) installed as part of the scheme would prevent contaminated routine run off from reaching the sites in such quantities that could cause adverse impacts to occur. Much of the current routine runoff from the existing A303 carriageway is unattenuated and untreated, and therefore poses a high contamination risk to the surrounding area. The scheme is considered to provide an opportunity to improve the current status quo with regards to routine runoff, as reported within the WFD Screening and Scoping Report. This has been agreed with the Environment Agency (see Appendix A of Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and Water Environment Assessment Summary, Volume 6.3).
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	10.3.2 - The Agency must advise that Wet Moor, which is at risk of deterioration due to eutrophication, should be scoped in at this stage. A programme of work is currently being progressed to reduce phosphate input to the system. The potential impacts of petrochemical runoff into the adjacent waterbody must be considered for both WFD and designated site risks.	Approach to be agreed with the Environment Agency during Environmental Technical Working Groups. HAWRAT and WFD to be sent to the Environment Agency for review and comment.	Wet Moor has been scoped in to the WFD Screening and Scoping Report (Appendix 4.5, Volume 6.3) and assessed accordingly. This has been agreed with the Environment Agency (see Appendix A of Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and Water Environment Assessment Summary), Volume 6.3.
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	10.3.8 - Notable species known to be in the vicinity of the proposed works include European otters, which should be scoped into the survey package at this stage.	Otter survey results to be detailed as part of the Biodiversity chapter of the ES.	The otter survey results are summarised within Section 8.7 'Baseline Conditions' and are detailed in full within Appendix 8.10 Water Vole and Otter Technical Report, Volume 6.3.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	10.4.1 - Where phase 1 surveys are not possible, a precautionary approach must be taken i.e. assume presence.	To be detailed in the assumptions and limitations section of the Biodiversity chapter of the ES.	Paragraph 8.5.3 within Section 8.5 'Assumptions and Limitations' of Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Volume 6.1) details this assumption.
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	10.6.2 - As a standard, the expectation for tree/hedgerow loss is like for like (or improved) replacement at a 3:1 ratio. For freshwater habitat loss the expectation is like for like (or improved) replacement at a 2:1 ratio.	To be discussed and agreed with Natural England and the Environment Agency.	The strategy 'no net loss' has been discussed with Natural England who are in agreement that a 3:1 replacement of hedgerows is not feasible. However, a gain in woodland and trees and shrubs categories is anticipated. There would be no freshwater habitat lost as part of scheme design. This has been agreed with the Environment Agency.
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	14.12.1 - There does not appear to be any information on the potential risk or impacts on fish populations within the adjacent water bodies. There is a risk of impact on water chemistry and sediments as a result of the proposed works, which would have a direct impact on fishery populations.	Potential impacts to fish to be addressed within the Biodiversity chapter of the ES. In addition, assessment of impacts on fish to be covered within the WFD assessment.	The effects of the scheme on fish populations have been considered as part of Chapter 8 Biodiversity, Volume 6.1. The biodiversity assessment concludes that the scheme is not anticipated to pose a risk to fish habitats / populations (see Section 8.7) of Chapter 8 Biodiversity, Volume 6.1).
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	14.12.1 - The River Yeo is a known salmonid waterbody and therefore an assessment should be undertaken to ensure compliance with the Salmon and Freshwater Fishery Act (1975) and the Water Framework Directive. It may be necessary to undertake monitoring of the fish population to determine the sensitivity of the species present to changes in sediment and water chemistry.	Approach to be agreed with the Environment Agency during Environmental Technical Working Groups. HAWRAT and WFD to be sent to the Environment Agency for review and comment.	The effects of the scheme on fish populations have been considered as part of Chapter 8 Biodiversity, Volume 6.1. The biodiversity assessment concludes that the scheme is not anticipated to pose a risk to fish habitats / populations (see Section 8.7 of Chapter 8 Biodiversity, Volume 6.1).
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	14.12.1 - As a minimum, available fisheries data should be collated and gap analysis undertaken to determine whether additional monitoring is required.	Approach to be agreed with the Environment Agency during Environmental Technical Working Groups. HAWRAT and WFD to be sent to the Environment Agency for review and comment.	The effects of the scheme on fish populations have been considered as part of Chapter 8 Biodiversity, Volume 6.1. The biodiversity assessment concludes that the scheme is not anticipated to pose a risk to fish habitats / populations (see Section 8.7 of Chapter 8 Biodiversity, Volume 6.1).
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	14.12.1 - For information, the Agency would prefer the WFD scoping report to be included at this stage. There appears to be sufficient evidence to inform the scoping report, which would then inform the need for a full WFD assessment. This assessment would be informed by additional information pertaining to ground/surface water linkages to WFD water bodies and anticipated sediment and water chemistry impacts.	A Water Framework Directive Scoping Report to be produced and submitted to the EA for review prior to DCO submission.	A WFD Screening and Scoping report (Appendix 4.5, Volume 6.3) has now been completed and issued to the Environment Agency. The assessment concludes that a full, detailed WFD impact assessment would not be required as the potential impact pathways present a very low risk to WFD status and objectives of the River Cary, Cam and Yeo. This has been agreed with the Environment Agency (see Appendix A of Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and Water Environment Assessment Summary, Volume 6.3).
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	The Agency would welcome the opportunity to review the forthcoming Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) at the earliest opportunity.	Flood Risk Assessment to be issued to the Environment Agency for review and comment.	The Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 4.6, Volume 6.3) was issued to the Environment Agency for comment. The Environment Agency did not have any comments on this document. This has been agreed with the Environment Agency (see Appendix A of Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and Water Environment Assessment Summary, Volume 6.3).
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	For information, the FRA should include a link to the Government's current climate change allowance guidance (see hereunder): https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances	Flood Risk Assessment to include allowance for climate change.	This has been included within section 6.2 of the Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 4.6, Volume 6.3).
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	The IDB and LLFA should be consulted in respect of specific aspects of road drainage attenuation and pollution control.	Ensure consultation with IDB and LLFA.	The consultation with the IDB and LLFA has been undertaken as part of the Drainage Technical Working Group. Consultation is detailed within Chapter 2 of the Drainage Strategy Report (Appendix 4.7, Volume 6.1).

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	The Agency is unable to concur with the proposal to scope out any aspects of 'Road Drainage and the Water Environment' from the Environmental Statement.	To be agreed with the EA following review of HAWRAT and Water Framework Directive.	Three detailed assessments (Appendix 4.5 WFD Screening and Scoping Report, Appendix 4.4 HAWRAT report and Appendix 5.6 Flood Risk Assessment, Volume 6.3) have since been produced following receipt of the Scoping Opinion. These detailed assessments have concluded the scheme would have negligible impacts on the water environment (with potential for some benefits / opportunities). Further detailed assessment of the RDWE as part of the Environmental Statement would likely conclude the same negligible effects, and therefore in the interests of proportionate EIA, the 3 detailed assessments and a supporting RDWE technical appendix which sign posts to these documents have been produced. This has been agreed with the Environment Agency (see Appendix A of Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and Water Environment Assessment Summary, Volume 6.3).
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	Private water supplies (including deregulated supplies) may exist in proximity to the area of the proposed works. Accordingly, risks to these features from both construction and operational phases should be assessed utilising information from a water features survey. It is recommended the survey area should extend at least 500m on either side of the centre line of the proposed scheme. Baseline monitoring may be required prior to development.	The Road Drainage and Water Environment topic considers private water supplies under the topic of licenced abstractions.	This has been considered within section 1.4 'Baseline conditions' of Appendix 4.3 Road Drainage and the Water Environment Assessment Summary, Volume 6.3.
Appendix 2	Environment Agency	Again, reference should be made to the Government's current climate change allowance guidance, as detailed above.	Reference to be made to the Government's current climate change allowance.	This has been included within Section 2.5 of the Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 4.6, Volume 6.3).
Dorset County Council				
Appendix 2	Dorset County Council	Thank you for the consultation, however, the length of highway does not appear to pa ss through the county boundary, as such we have no comment to make, but would refer the plannin g inspectorate to our colleagues at Somerset County Council for any Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) related comment.	No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Dorset County Council	The scoping report considers all ecological receptors which we would consider to be relevant and associated with the scheme.	No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Dorset County Council	We are pleased to see that lack of information on bat use within the zone of impact h as been identified as a factor. We are aware that bat populations in North Dorset are oft en under recorded and it is likely that this is the case along this section of the A303. Surveys to identify which species may be impacts, and the impact of the scheme on bat foraging corridors will be needed to evaluate the full impact of the scheme on these species.	Surveys include a full suite of bat surveys which consider bat foraging corridors, commuting routes, and roosts. Surveys to be detailed within the Biodiversity chapter of the ES.	The survey results for bat species are summarised within Section 8.7 'Baseline Conditions' of chapter 8 Biodiversity, Volume 6.1. The full bat survey results and analysis of these is presented within Appendix 8.4 Bat Technical Report, Volume 6.3.
Appendix 2	Dorset County Council	The scoping report should also make reference to the need for an assessment of the residual loss of priority habitat or habitat supporting priority species, to help decide whether this should be addressed via the creation of compensatory areas or provision of financial compensation.	Figures for habitat loss and replacement to be detailed within the Biodiversity chapter of the ES. A strategy of no net loss or better will be detailed within the ES.	The figures for habitat loss and replacement are detailed within Tables 8.9 and 8.10 of Chapter 8 Biodiversity, Volume 6.1.
		ESP Utilities Group		
Appendix 2	ESP Utilities Group	I can confirm that ESP Gas Group Ltd has no gas or electricity apparatus in the vicinity of this site address and will not be affected by your proposed works.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	ESP Utilities Group	ESP are continually laying new gas and electricity networks and this notification is valid for 90 days from the date of this letter. If your proposed works start after this period of time, please re-submit your enquiry.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	ESP Utilities Group	Please be advised that any enquiries for ESP Connections Ltd, formerly known as British Gas Connections Ltd, should be sent directly to us at the address shown above or alternatively you can email us at: PlantResponses@espipelines.com	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
		Forestry Commission		
Appendix 2	Forestry Commission	Ancient Woodlands and Veteran Trees* are acknowledged as an irreplaceable habitat and a part of our natural heritage. Mixed broadleaved woodland, wood-pasture and parkland are also regarded as principally important for the purpose of conserving biodiversity. Therefore, the chosen option should ideally avoid the loss of these important habitats. (*Note: Ancient Woodlands includes Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW) and Plantations (including conifers) on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS).	Agreed. No further action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Forestry Commission	A scheme that fragments any woodland, particularly an Ancient Woodland, will not only result in significant loss, but will also decrease the ecological and environmental value and its resilience to climate change.	Agreed. No further action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Forestry Commission	We note that the selected option has been chosen as the one which will cause least damage to ancient woodland habitats and that this is in line with Natural England advice. We note that the selected option will still have some impact on nearby woodlands.	Agreed. No further action required. Any impact on woodland would be mitigated.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Forestry Commission	This response highlights matters which should be resolved as part of the pre-application process. We believe that these issues should be addressed by Highways England and the Examining Authority as part of the Environmental Statement.	Agreed. To be addressed as part of the ES, as per the above comments.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Forestry Commission	Ancient Woodlands and veteran trees must be included in all future habitat and species surveys in relation to this scheme and the size and nature of the impact quantified.	Impacts to ancient woodland and veteran trees for the scheme to be included as part of the Biodiversity chapter of the ES.	Impacts to ancient woodland and veteran trees have been considered within Chapter 8 Biodiversity, Volume 6.1. One veteran tree would be removed to facilitate construction of the scheme, as detailed in Section 8.10 'Assessment of Likely Significant Effects'. No surveys to monitor ancient woodland or veteran trees are planned post-construction.
Appendix 2	Forestry Commission	All woodland is a priority habitat and so we would request that all woodland should be included in surveys and the impact on all woodland habitats should be quantified. We would encourage this to take into account likely impacts related to tree health issues, especially ash dieback, since this will affect future woodland and tree cover in the area.	Both the National Vegetation Classification (NVC) survey and arboricultural surveys assessed woodland. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Forestry Commission	We would also encourage an assessment of hedgerows and in-field trees affected by the scheme.	An arboricultural survey has taken place and hedgerows have been assessed as part of the Phase 1 survey. Results to be documented within Chapter 8 Biodiversity of Volume 6.1 and the associated technical appendices.	Section 8.7 'Baseline conditions' of Chapter 8 Biodiversity (Volume 6.1) summarises the results of the protected species surveys, including those for barn owls. The full results are detailed within Appendix 8.3 Hedgerow Technical Report, Volume 6.3. An assessment of in-field trees was undertaken as part of the arboricultural report, details of which are documented within Appendix 7.1 Arboricultural Constraints Report, Volume 6.3.
Appendix 2	Forestry Commission	All European Protected Species should be included in surveys and impacts on populations assessed, as well as the impacts on designated sites in the vicinity.	Phase 2 surveys have been undertaken and results tol be detailed within the ES.	Phase 2 protected species surveys have been undertaken for the scheme, results of which are summarised in section 10.7 'Baseline Conditions' and full details contained within the protected species technical reports (Appendices 8.2 to 8.13, Volume 6.3).
Appendix 2	Forestry Commission	Impacts on watercourses should be assessed to consider whether this will affect ancient woodland flora downstream	A HAWRAT assessment to be undertaken to support the ES.	A HAWRAT assessment (Appendix 4.4, Volume 6.3) has been produced. No impacts to ancient woodland flora downstream are anticipated.
Appendix 2	Forestry Commission	We draw attention to the fact that where significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided or mitigated, as a last resort, appropriate compensation measures should be sought.	Agree. Measures to be detailed within Chapter 8 Biodiversity of Volume 6.1.	Any compensation measures are detailed within section 10.9 'Design, mitigation and enhancement measures' of Chapter 8 Biodiversity, Volume 6.1.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	Forestry Commission	We would welcome mitigation works that result in an increase in woodland, hedgerow and field tree cover in this area, without impacting on other valuable habitats, especially where this improves natural flood management or water quality. We would also support mitigation work that reduces the impact of some non-native species, such as rhododendron, or tree health issues, such as the likely significant impact of ash dieback.	Details of the mitigation strategy, which includes an increase in woodland and trees/shrubs, to be included within the Biodiversity chapter of the ES.	The mitigation strategy is detailed in paragraphs 8.93 to 8.9.5 of section 8.9 'Design, mitigation and enhancement measures' and depicted in Figure 2.8 Environmental Masterplan of Volume 6.2.
Appendix 2	Forestry Commission	We would encourage you to ensure that productive forestry is also considered and that access to any woodlands affected is maintained or improved to ensure that they can be managed efficiently and sustainably after the development takes place.	Replanting in other areas to replace woodland loss at Hazlegrove to be developed and detailed within the ES.	The mitigation strategy is detailed in paragraphs 8.93 to 8.9.5 of section 8.9 'Design, mitigation and enhancement measures' and depicted in Figure 2.8 Environmental Masterplan of Volume 6.2.
Appendix 2	Forestry Commission	For the loss of any woodland, the Forestry Commission would ask: 1. To explore with you how this loss could be further reduced. 2. How best to target the creation of new woodland to compensate for the loss of trees and woodlands.	Consider as part of the iterative design process. The mitigation strategy to be detailed within the Biodiversity chapter of the ES.	A net gain of woodland habitat has been incorporated into scheme. The mitigation strategy is detailed in paragraphs 8.9.3 to 8.9.5 of section 8.9 'Design, mitigation and enhancement measures' and depicted in Figure 2.8 Environmental Masterplan of Volume 6.2.
Health and Safety Executive (HSE)				
Appendix 2	HSE	With reference to the *Proposed Draft Red Line Boundary and Scheme Elements* in drawings contained in document *A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling, Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report HE551507-MMSJV-EGN-000-RP-LP-0014, November 2017, Version: P13, Highways England*: There are currently no Major Hazard Installations in the vicinity of the proposed scheme. There are currently no Major Accident Hazard Pipeline (s) (MAHP) in the vicinity of the proposed scheme.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	HSE	Although there are currently no Major Hazard Installations or Major Accident Hazard Pipeline(s) (MAHP) in the vicinity of the proposed scheme, should a Hazardous Substances Consent [The Planning (hazardous substances) (England) 2015 Regulations (as amended)] be granted prior to the determination of the present application, and/or HSE receives a notification under the Pipeline Safety Regulations 1996 then HSE reserves the right to revise its advice.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	HSE	The presence of hazardous substances on, over or under land at or above set threshold quantities (Controlled Quantities) may require Hazardous Substances Consent (HSC) under the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 as amended. The substances, alone or when aggregated with others, for which HSC is required, and the associated Controlled Quantities, are set in The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	HSE	Hazardous Substances Consent would be required if the site is intending to store or use any of the Named Hazardous Substances or Categories of Substances and Preparations at or above the controlled quantities set out in schedule 1 of these Regulations.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	HSE	HSE has not comments to make (on explosive sites) as there are no licensed explosive sites in the vicinity.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	HSE	In respect of waste management the applicant should take account of and adhere to relevant health and safety requirements. Particular attention should be paid in respect of risks created from historical landfill sites. More details can be found on HSE's website at: http://www.hse.gov.uk/waste/index/htm	A Outline Site Waste Management Plan to be produced.	An Outline Site Waste Management Plan has been produced and is contained within Annex B.1 of the ***Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7).***
Appendix 2	HSE	No comment (on electrical safety) from a planning perspective.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Historic England				
Appendix 2	Historic England	We are broadly content with the proposed assessment methodology set out by the applicant in their EIA Scoping Report, but have the following comments to make in respect of designated heritage assets:	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	Historic England	7.2 Study Area - it is our view that the 1km boundary set for the proposed study area is not sufficient to assess potential setting impacts on significant designated heritage assets lying beyond this limit and which may be visually affected by the proposed development. Chapter 8, Landscape and Visual Impact, acknowledges this likely interplay on prominent heritage assets such as South Cadbury Castle and St Michaels Hill (both Scheduled Monuments), but will assess impacts from the perspective of the amenity value to receptors rather than impact on heritage significance. We recommend that Cultural Heritage assessment takes the same approach as Landscape and Visual Impact assessment in identifying designated heritage assets beyond 1km from the centreline of the scheme whose settings may be affected by the development and that it undertakes appropriate assessment of the likely setting impact upon those assets.	The study area and reasons for selection to be detailed within the Cultural Heritage ES chapter. Any assets outside of the formal 1 kilometre study area, which still have the potential to be impacted by the scheme, to be assessed.	The study area and the deviations (the inclusion of Cadbury Castle, St Michael's Hill, Montacute, and Glastonbury Tor) from the 1 kilometre study area, are detailed within Section 6.6 of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage, Volume 6.1.
Appendix 2	Historic England	Hazlegrove House Registered Park and Garden - the scoping report notes the specific meeting held to consider how the scheme will impact upon this designated heritage asset. Detailed advice on assessment methodology was provided to the applicant, to draw out the history, development and thus significance of this designed landscape, in our formal response to non-statutory public consultation dated 29th March 2017. As the impact upon the RPaG is likely to be the most substantial heritage effect of the whole scheme, we are keen to see a robust assessment of the significance of this designated heritage asset so that informed advice can be provided to the applicant upon their emerging plans. It appears that there has been little investigation of this particular RPaG by earlier researchers, so it is imperative that this cultural heritage assessment provides a solid understanding upon which to base advice.	A Statement of Significance (Appendix 6.2, Volume 6.3) has been developed and issued to consultees for comment. Any feedback to be incorporated within the Cultural Heritage chapter of the ES. In addition, Environmental TWGs have been held as an opportunity for consultees to provide comment and influence the junction design at Hazlegrove.	The Statement of Significance (Appendix 6.2, Volume 6.3) was issued to consultees for review and comment, and amendments were made based on the feedback received. The Environmental TWG meeting minutes are contained within Appendix 4.9, Volume 6.3, which detail discussions that have been had relating to Hazlegrove RPG. The mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the design are included within section 6.9 of Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage, Volume 6.1.
National Air Traffic Service (NATS)				
Appendix 2	NATS	The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	NATS	However, please be aware that this response applies specifically to the above consultation and only reflects the position of NATS (that is responsible for the management of en route air traffic) based on the information supplied at the time of this application. This letter does not provide any indication of the position of any other party, whether they be an airport, airspace user or otherwise. It remains your responsibility to ensure that all the appropriate consultees are properly consulted.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	NATS	If any changes are proposed to the information supplied to NATS in regard to this application which become the basis of a revised, amended or further application for approval, then as a statutory consultee NERL requires that it be further consulted on any such changes prior to any planning permission or any consent being granted.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
		National Grid		
Appendix 2	National Grid	Please refer to asset map. National Grid have no assets in the order boundary and therefore would have no objection to the order should it be submitted at a later date.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Dorset Councils Partnership				
Appendix 2	Dorset Councils Partnership	Chapter 13 People and Communities: The proposed economic assessment methodology seems to concentrate on very local economic effects and does not give full consideration to the economic effects further afield. Whilst the local effects are clearly important, there is the potential for effects over a wider scale from changes to a major route in the strategic highway network. The assessment should consider disruption to business traffic during the construction phase (for example, commuters, goods, passengers) and the potential benefits during the operational phase (for example from the reduce average transit times and fewer delays during periods of congestion) over a wider scale, particularly upon businesses in north/mid Dorset and the Yeovil area. The assessment might also consider employment land uplift to the west of the improvements.	A comprehensive economic appraisal was carried out for the benefits of the Scheme based on modelling its impact with specially adapted version of the South West Regional Traffic Model. This captured the impacts of the scheme across a wide area including alternative routes to the south-west via the M4/ M5 motorways and the M27/A31/A35 south coast trunk road. The regional model network included all motorway, A and B	The economic appraisal is reported in the ***Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (TR010036/APP/7.6).***

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
			class roads as well as local roads in the vicinity of the scheme. The appraisal estimated benefits for commuting, employers' business and other travel purposes as well as for freight. Delays during construction to these trips were also estimated and included in the appraisal. Other benefits and impacts in the appraisal included collisions (accidents) and monetised environmental impacts on noise, air quality and greenhouse gases.	
Appendix 2	Dorset Councils Partnership	Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment: The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) should ensure that there is no significant impact for a number of different return periods with an allowance for climate change. Dorset County Council's Flood Risk Management team is the Lead Local Flood Authority and should take lead on addressing flood risk, particularly with surface water management.	An allowance for climate change to be incorporated into the Flood Risk Assessment.	This has been included within section 6.2 of the Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 4.6, Volume 6.3).
Public Health England				
Appendix 2	Public Health England	We understand that the promoter will wish to avoid unnecessary duplication and that many issues including air quality, emissions to water, waste, contaminated land etc. will be covered elsewhere in the Environmental Statement (ES). PHE however believes the summation of relevant issues into a specific section of the report provides a focus which ensures that public health is given adequate consideration. The section should summarise key information, risk assessments, proposed mitigation measures, conclusions and residual impacts, relating to human health. Compliance with the requirements of National Policy Statements and relevant guidance and standards should also be highlighted.	As stated in the Scoping Report, a qualitative assessment of information collated via each of the environmental factors to be undertaken and presented within the Combined and Cumulative Effects chapter of the ES.	A qualitative assessment of information collated via each of the environmental factors has been undertaken and presented within Chapter 14 Combined and Cumulative Effects, Volume 6.1.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	In terms of the level of detail to be included in an ES, we recognise that the differing nature of projects is such that their impacts will vary. Any assessments undertaken to inform the ES should be proportionate to the potential impacts of the proposal, therefore we accept that, in some circumstances particular assessments may not be relevant to an application, or that an assessment may be adequately completed using a qualitative rather than quantitative methodology. In cases where this decision is made the promoters should fully explain and justify their rationale in the submitted documentation.	Ensure assessments included in the ES are proportionate.	Chapter 12 People and Communities of Volume 6.1 provides a proportionate assessment and assesses impacts of the scheme within the study area as defined in Section 12.4.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	It is noted that the current proposals do not appear to consider possible health impacts of Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF). The proposer should confirm either that the proposed development does include or impact upon any potential sources of EMF; or ensure that an adequate assessment of the possible impacts is undertaken and included in the ES.	Radiation to be scoped out of the ES.	The topic of Heat and Radiation has been scoped out of the ES, as detailed in Paragraph 4.1.4 of Chapter 4 Environmental Assessment Methodology, Volume 6.1.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	Public Health England	**General approach** The EIA should give consideration to best practice guidance such as the Government's Good Practice Guide for EIA. It is important that the EIA identifies and assesses the potential public health impacts of the activities at, and emissions from, the installation. Assessment should consider the development, operational, and decommissioning phases. It is not PHE's role to undertake these assessments on behalf of promoters as this would conflict with PHE's role as an impartial and independent body. Consideration of alternatives (including alternative sites, choice of process, and the phasing of construction) is widely regarded as good practice. Ideally, EIA should start at the stage of site and process selection, so that the environmental merits of practicable alternatives can be properly considered. Where this is undertaken, the main alternatives considered should be outlined in the ES. The following text covers a range of issues that PHE would expect to be addressed by the promoter. However this list is not exhaustive and the onus is on the promoter to ensure that the relevant public health issues are identified and addressed. PHE's advice and recommendations carry no statutory weight and constitute non-binding guidance.	Consideration to be given to the guidance such as Government's Good Practice Guide for EIA. Chapter on the consideration of alternatives to be included as part of the ES.	The ES gives consideration to the Government's Good practice guide for EIA. An assessment of alternatives has been completed and can be found in Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives, Volume 6.1.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	**Receptors** The ES should clearly identify the development's location and the location and distance from the development of off-site human receptors that may be affected by emissions from, or activities at, the development. Off-site human receptors may include people living in residential premises; people working in commercial, and industrial premises and people using transport infrastructure (such as roads and railways), recreational areas, and publicly-accessible land. Consideration should also be given to environmental receptors such as the surrounding land, watercourses, surface and groundwater, and drinking water supplies such as wells, boreholes and water abstraction points.	Each of the discipline-specific chapters of the ES to include a detailed description of the baseline.	Each of the discipline-specific chapters (Chapters 5 to 14 of Volume 6.1) includes a description of the baseline conditions.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	**Impacts arising from construction and decommissioning** Any assessment of impacts arising from emissions due to construction and decommissioning should consider potential impacts on all receptors and describe monitoring and mitigation during these phases. Construction and decommissioning will be associated with vehicle movements and cumulative impacts should be accounted for. We would expect the promoter to follow best practice guidance during all phases from construction to decommissioning to ensure appropriate measures are in place to mitigate any potential impact on health from emissions (point source, fugitive and traffic-related). An effective Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (and Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP)) will help provide reassurance that activities are well managed. The promoter should ensure that there are robust mechanisms in place to respond to any complaints of traffic-related pollution, during construction, operation, and decommissioning of the facility.	An outline Environmental Management Plan to be produced to support the ES. A full CEMP to be produced by the appointed contractor.	An ***Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7)*** has been prepared to support the DCO submission. Within the Outline Environmental Management Plan, Table 3.1 contains the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments which details all of the mitigation measures detailed within the discipline-specific chapters (Chapter 5 to 14, Volume 6.1) of the ES. The Outline Environmental Management Plan will be developed into a full Construction Environmental Management Plan by the appointed Contractor.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	**Emissions to air and water** Significant impacts are unlikely to arise from installations which employ Best Available Techniques (BAT) and which meet regulatory requirements concerning emission limits and design parameters. However, PHE has a number of comments regarding emissions in order that the EIA provides a comprehensive assessment of potential impacts.	Agreed. No action required.	Not applicable.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	Public Health England	When considering a baseline (of existing environmental quality) and in the assessment and future monitoring of impacts these: •should include appropriate screening assessments and detailed dispersion modelling where this is screened as necessary • should encompass all pollutants which may be emitted by the installation in combination with all pollutants arising from associated development and transport, ideally these should be considered in a single holistic assessment • should consider the construction, operational, and decommissioning phases • should consider the typical operational emissions and emissions from start-up, shut-down, abnormal operation and accidents when assessing potential impacts and include an assessment of worst-case impacts • should fully account for fugitive emissions • should include appropriate estimates of background levels • should identify cumulative and incremental impacts (i.e. assess cumulative impacts from multiple sources), including those arising from associated development, other existing and proposed development in the local area, and new vehicle movements associated with the proposed development; associated transport emissions should include consideration of non-road impacts (i.e. rail, sea, and air) • should include consideration of local authority, Environment Agency, Defra national network, and any other local site-specific sources of monitoring data • should compare predicted environmental concentrations to the applicable standard or guideline value for the affected medium (such as UK Air Quality Standards and Objectives and Environmental Assessment Levels) − If no standard or guideline value exists, the predicted exposure to humans should be estimated and compared to an appropriate health-based value (a Tolerable Daily Intake or equivalent). Further guidance is provided in Annex 1 − This should consider all applicable routes of exposure e.g. include consideration of aspects such as the deposition of chemicals emitted to air and their uptake via ingestion • should identify and consider impacts on residential areas and sensitive receptors (such as schools, nursing homes and healthcare facilities) in the area(s) which may be affected by emissions, this should include consideration of any new receptors arising from future development	Assessment to be undertaken in accordance with DMRB (HA207/07) and other best practice guidance e.g. TG16.	Detailed dispersion modelling has been undertaken of the operation phase and a qualitative assessment has been undertaken of the construction phase (see section 5.4 of Chapter 5 Air Quality, Volume 6.1). Estimates of background concentrations have considered both Defra background mapping and monitoring at the Charlton Mackrell urban background site (section 5.7 of Chapter 5 Air Quality, Volume 6.1). Committed developments have been included within the traffic data to account for the impacts from other existing and proposed development in the local area. Local authority, Defra and site-specific monitoring data has been considered (section 5.7 Chapter 5 Air Quality, Volume 6.1). The air quality impacts from the scheme at sensitive receptors e.g. residential receptors and schools, have been considered against the UK air quality objectives and EU limit values (section 5.10 Chapter 5 Air Quality, Volume 6.1). The remaining points have not been undertaken as they are applicable to power projects, not highways projects.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	Whilst screening of impacts using qualitative methodologies is common practice (e.g. for impacts arising from fugitive emissions such as dust), where it is possible to undertake a quantitative assessment of impacts then this should be undertaken. PHE's view is that the EIA should appraise and describe the measures that will be used to control both point source and fugitive emissions and demonstrate that standards, guideline values or health-based values will not be exceeded due to emissions from the installation, as described above. This should include consideration of any emitted pollutants for which there are no set emission limits. When assessing the potential impact of a proposed installation on environmental quality, predicted environmental concentrations should be compared to the permitted concentrations in the affected media; this should include both standards for short and long-term exposure.	Assessment to be undertaken in accordance with DMRB (HA207/07) and other best practice guidance e.g. TG16.	A quantitative assessment of operation phase impacts has been undertaken and mitigation measures recommended to reduce the risk associated with dust emissions (section 5.9 of Chapter 5 Air Quality, Volume 6.1). This is a road scheme and therefore does not introduce point sources. Emission standards/limits are set by the European Emission Standards and are based on year of manufacturer and engine size. These are commonly known as the EURO standards and are not assigned to individual road infrastructure schemes. The EIA has instead considered whether ambient air quality standards/EU limit values will be exceeded as a result of the scheme in accordance with IAN174/13 (section 5.10 of Chapter 5 Air Quality, Volume 6.1).

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	Public Health England	*Additional points specific to emissions to air* When considering a baseline (of existing air quality) and in the assessment and future monitoring of impacts these: • should include consideration of impacts on existing areas of poor air quality e.g. existing or proposed local authority Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) • should include modelling using appropriate meteorological data (i.e. come from the nearest suitable meteorological station and include a range of years and worst case conditions) • should include modelling taking into account local topography	Points to be considered as part of the Air Quality chapter of the ES.	The potential impact of the scheme on Yeovil AQMA during the construction phase has been considered (section 5.10). As the local ARN for the operation phase is outside the Yeovil AQMA (section 5.7 of Chapter 5 Air Quality, Volume 6.1), no significant impacts are anticipated within this AQMA as a result of the operation of the scheme. Meteorological data from Yeovilton Air Station has been used (section 5.4 of Chapter 5 Air Quality, Volume 6.1). One year of meteorological data has been applied to dispersion model in accordance with DMRB (HA207/07) as this reflects meteorological conditions that the model has been verified against (comparing monitored data with model data). Introducing additional years of meteorological data may cause further uncertainty with regards to model verification. It is not necessary to consider local topography for roads schemes due to the short dispersion distance of 200m. Where considered appropriate, receptor heights have been assigned to reflect local topography, for example receptors located on embankments adjacent to roads.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	*Additional points specific to emissions to water* When considering a baseline (of existing water quality) and in the assessment and future monitoring of impacts these: • should include assessment of potential impacts on human health and not focus solely on ecological impacts • should identify and consider all routes by which emissions may lead to population exposure (e.g. surface watercourses; recreational waters; sewers; geological routes etc.) • should assess the potential off-site effects of emissions to groundwater (e.g. on aquifers used for drinking water) and surface water (used for drinking water abstraction) in terms of the potential for population exposure • should include consideration of potential impacts on recreational users (e.g. from fishing, canoeing etc) alongside assessment of potential exposure via drinking water	Impacts to human health to be covered within Chapter 9 Geology and Soils for potential impact pathways through surface and groundwater.	This requirement is detailed within section 9.9 'Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures' of Chapter 9 Geology and Soils, and is also included within Table 3.1 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7). A Contaminated Land Risk Assessment Report to be submitted during the examination period.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	**Land quality** We would expect the promoter to provide details of any hazardous contamination present on site (including ground gas) as part of the site condition report. Emissions to and from the ground should be considered in terms of the previous history of the site and the potential of the site, once operational, to give rise to issues. Public health impacts associated with ground contamination and/or the migration of material off-site should be assessed and the potential impact on nearby receptors and control and mitigation measures should be outlined.	A Contaminated Land Risk Assessment Report to be produced following completion of GI results, and submitted during the examination period.	This requirement is detailed within section 9.9 'Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures' of Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Volume 6.1) and is also included within Table 3.1 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7). A Contaminated Land Risk Assessment Report to be submitted during the examination period.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	Relevant areas outlined in the Government's Good Practice Guide for EIA include: • effects associated with ground contamination that may already exist • effects associated with the potential for polluting substances that are used (during construction / operation) to cause new ground contamination issues on a site, for example introducing / changing the source of contamination • impacts associated with re-use of soils and waste soils, for example, re-use of site-sourced materials on-site or offsite, disposal of site-sourced materials offsite, importation of materials to the site, etc.	A Contaminated Land Risk Assessment Report to be produced following completion of GI results, and submitted during the examination period.	This requirement is detailed within section 9.9 'Design, Mitigation and Enhancement Measures' of Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Volume 6.1) and is also included within Table 3.1 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments of the Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7). A Contaminated Land Risk Assessment Report to be submitted during the examination period.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	Public Health England	**Waste** The EIA should demonstrate compliance with the waste hierarchy (e.g. with respect to re-use, recycling or recovery and disposal). For wastes arising from the installation the EIA should consider: • the implications and wider environmental and public health impacts of different waste disposal options • disposal route(s) and transport method(s) and how potential impacts on public health will be mitigated	The ES to demonstrate compliance with the waste hierarchy, within the mitigation section for the Materials chapter of the ES. A full Site Waste Management Plan to be produced by the contractor prior to construction.	A commitment has been made in the ES for the scheme to comply with the waste hierarchy in the mitigation outlined in Section 10.9; this has been specified in the Outline Environmental Management Plan. An Outline Site Waste Management Plan has also been produced which specifies the need to comply with the waste hierarchy. The air quality and noise assessments within the ES have undertaken a construction assessment which considers the impact of construction activities and construction transport on public health.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	**Other aspects** Within the EIA PHE would expect to see information about how the promoter would respond to accidents with potential off-site emissions e.g. flooding or fires, spills, leaks or releases off-site. Assessment of accidents should: identify all potential hazards in relation to construction, operation and decommissioning; include an assessment of the risks posed; and identify risk management measures and contingency actions that will be employed in the event of an accident in order to mitigate off-site effects.	An assessment of major accidents and disasters to be included as part of the ES.	An assessment of major accidents and natural disasters is included within Appendix 4.8 of Volume 6.3.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	The EIA should include consideration of the COMAH Regulations (Control of Major Accident Hazards) and the Major Accident Off-Site Emergency Plan (Management of Waste from Extractive Industries) (England and Wales) Regulations 2009: both in terms of their applicability to the installation itself, and the installation's potential to impact on, or be impacted by, any nearby installations themselves subject to these Regulations.	Any COMAH sites to be included within the Preliminary Sources Study Report and therefore detailed within the Geology and Soils chapter of the ES.	Reference to COMAH sites (see paragraph 9.5.71) is contained within Section 9.7 'Baseline Conditions' of Chapter 9 Geology and Soils, Volume 6.1.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	There is evidence that, in some cases, perception of risk may have a greater impact on health than the hazard itself. A 2009 report4, jointly published by Liverpool John Moores University and the HPA, examined health risk perception and environmental problems using a number of case studies. As a point to consider, the report suggested: "Estimation of community anxiety and stress should be included as part of every risk or impact assessment of proposed plans that involve a potential environmental hazard. This is true even when the physical health risks may be negligible." PHE supports the inclusion of this information within EIAs as good practice.	Details regarding the safety of the scheme to be provided and an assessment of driver stress will be contained within the People and Communities chapter of the ES. The topic of health and wellbeing to be included within each of the relevant discipline chapters and summarised as part of the Combined and Cumulative Effects chapter.	Chapter 12 People and Communities (Volume 6.1) provides an assessment of driver stress for both the construction and operation periods of the scheme. The topic of health and wellbeing to be included within each of the relevant discipline chapters and summarised as part of Chapter 14 Combined and Cumulative Effects, Volume 6.1.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	**Electromagnetic Fields (EMF)** This statement is intended to support planning proposals involving electrical installations such as substations and connecting underground cables or overhead lines. PHE advice on the health effects of power frequency electric and magnetic fields is available in the following link: https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/electromagnetic-fields#low-frequency-electric-and-magnetic-fields There is a potential health impact associated with the electric and magnetic fields around substations, and power lines and cables. The field strength tends to reduce with distance from such equipment. The following information provides a framework for considering the health impact associated with the electric and magnetic fields produced by the proposed development, including the direct and indirect effects of the electric and magnetic fields as indicated above.	Noted but no action required due to nature of the proposed development.	The topic of Heat and Radiation has been scoped out of the ES, as detailed in Paragraph 4.1.4 of Chapter 4 Environmental Assessment Methodology, Volume 6.1.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	Public Health England	Policy Measures for the Electricity Industry The Department of Energy and Climate Change has published a voluntary code of practice which sets out key principles for complying with the ICNIRP guidelines: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/37447/1256-code-practice-emf-public-exp-guidelines.pdf Companion codes of practice dealing with optimum phasing of high voltage power lines and aspects of the guidelines that relate to indirect effects are also available: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/48309/1255-code-practice-optimum-phasing-power-lines.pdf https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/224766/powerlines_vcop_microshocks.pdf	Noted but no action required due to nature of the proposed development.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	Exposure Guidelines PHE recommends the adoption in the UK of the EMF exposure guidelines published by the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). Formal advice to this effect was published by one of PHE's predecessor organisations (NRPB) in 2004 based on an accompanying comprehensive review of the scientific evidence:- http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140629102627/http://www.hpa.org.uk/Publications/Radiation/NPRBArchive/DocumentsOfTheNRPB/Absd1502/ Updates to the ICNIRP guidelines for static fields have been issued in 2009 and for low frequency fields in 2010. However, Government policy is that the ICNIRP guidelines are implemented in line with the terms of the 1999 EU Council Recommendation on limiting exposure of the general public (1999/519/EC): http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publichealth/Healthprotection/DH_4089500	Noted but no action required due to nature of the proposed development.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	**Static magnetic fields** For static magnetic fields, the ICNIRP guidelines published in 2009 recommend that acute exposure of the general public should not exceed 400 MT (millitesla), for any part of the body, although the previously recommended value of 40 mT is the value used in the Council Recommendation. However, because of potential indirect adverse effects, ICNIRP recognises that practical policies need to be implemented to prevent inadvertent harmful exposure of people with implanted electronic medical devices and implants containing ferromagnetic materials, and injuries due to flying ferromagnetic objects, and these considerations can lead to much lower restrictions, such as 0.5 mT.	Noted but no action required due to nature of the proposed development.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	**Power frequency electric and magnetic fields** At 50 Hz, the known direct effects include those of induced currents in the body on the central nervous system (CNS) and indirect effects include the risk of painful spark discharge on contact with metal objects exposed to the field. The ICNIRP guidelines published in 1998 give reference levels for public exposure to 50 Hz electric and magnetic fields, and these are respectively 5 kV m−1 (kilovolts per metre) and 100 μT (microtesla). The reference level for magnetic fields changes to 200 μT in the revised (ICNIRP 2010) guidelines because of new basic restrictions based on induced electric fields inside the body, rather than induced current density. If people are not exposed to field strengths above these levels, direct effects on the CNS should be avoided and indirect effects such as the risk of painful spark discharge will be small. The reference levels are not in themselves limits but provide guidance for assessing compliance with the basic restrictions and reducing the risk of indirect effects.	Noted but no action required due to nature of the proposed development.	Not applicable.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	Public Health England	**Long term effects** There is concern about the possible effects of long-term exposure to electromagnetic fields, including possible carcinogenic effects at levels much lower than those given in the ICNIRP guidelines. In the NRPB advice issued in 2004, it was concluded that the studies that suggest health effects, including those concerning childhood leukaemia, could not be used to derive quantitative guidance on restricting exposure. However, the results of these studies represented uncertainty in the underlying evidence base, and taken together with people's concerns, provided a basis for providing an additional recommendation for Government to consider the need for further precautionary measures, particularly with respect to the exposure of children to power frequency magnetic fields.	Noted but no action required due to nature of the proposed development.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	The Stakeholder Advisory Group on ELF EMFs (SAGE) SAGE was set up to explore the implications for a precautionary approach to extremely low frequency electric and magnetic fields (ELF EMFs), and to make practical recommendations to Government: http://www.emfs.info/policy/sage/ SAGE issued its First Interim Assessment in 2007, making several recommendations concerning high voltage power lines. Government supported the implantation of low cost options such as optimal phasing to reduce exposure; however it did not support not support the option of creating corridors around power lines on health grounds, which was considered to be a disproportionate measure given the evidence base on the potential long term health risks arising from exposure. The Government response to SAGE's First Interim Assessment is available here: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130107105354/http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/PublicationsandstatisticsPublications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_107124 The Government also supported calls for providing more information on power frequency electric and magnetic fields, which is available on the PHE web pages (see first link above).	Noted but no action required due to nature of the proposed development.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	**Ionising radiation** Particular considerations apply when an application involves the possibility of exposure to ionising radiation. In such cases it is important that the basic principles of radiation protection recommended by the International Commission on Radiological Protection5 (ICRP) are followed. PHE provides advice on the application of these recommendations in the UK. The ICRP recommendations are implemented in the Euratom Basic Safety Standards6 (BSS) and these form the basis for UK legislation, including the Ionising Radiation Regulations 1999, the Radioactive Substances Act 1993, and the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016.	Noted but no action required due to nature of the proposed development.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	PHE expects promoters to carry out the necessary radiological impact assessments to demonstrate compliance with UK legislation and the principles of radiation protection. This should be set out clearly in a separate section or report and should not require any further analysis by PHE. In particular, the important principles of justification, optimisation and radiation dose limitation should be addressed. In addition compliance with the Euratom BSS and UK legislation should be clear.	Noted but no action required due to nature of the proposed development.	Not applicable.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	Public Health England	When considering the radiological impact of routine discharges of radionuclides to the environment PHE would expect to see a full radiation dose assessment considering both individual and collective (population) doses for the public and, where necessary, workers. For individual doses, consideration should be given to those members of the public who are likely to receive the highest exposures (referred to as the representative person, which is equivalent to the previous term, critical group). Different age groups should be considered as appropriate and should normally include adults, 1 year old and 10 year old children. In particular situations doses to the fetus should also be calculated7. The estimated doses to the representative person should be compared to the appropriate radiation dose criteria (dose constraints and dose limits), taking account of other releases of radionuclides from nearby locations as appropriate. Collective doses should also be considered for the UK, European and world populations where appropriate. The methods for assessing individual and collective radiation doses should follow the guidance given in 'Principles for the Assessment of Prospective Public Doses arising from Authorised Discharges of Radioactive Waste to the Environment August 2012 8.It is important that the methods used in any radiological dose assessment are clear and that key parameter values and assumptions are given (for example, the location of the representative persons, habit data and models used in the assessment).	Noted but no action required due to nature of the proposed development.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	Any radiological impact assessment should also consider the possibility of short-term planned releases and the potential for accidental releases of radionuclides to the environment. This can be done by referring to compliance with the Ionising Radiation Regulations and other relevant legislation and guidance.	Noted but no action required due to nature of the proposed development.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Public Health England	The radiological impact of any solid waste storage and disposal should also be addressed in the assessment to ensure that this complies with UK practice and legislation; information should be provided on the category of waste involved (e.g. very low level waste, VLLW). It is also important that the radiological impact associated with the decommissioning of the site is addressed. Of relevance here is PHE advice on radiological criteria and assessments for land-based solid waste disposal facilities9. PHE advises that assessments of radiological impact during the operational phase should be performed in the same way as for any site authorised to discharge radioactive waste. PHE also advises that assessments of radiological impact during the post operational phase of the facility should consider long timescales (possibly in excess of 10,000 years) that are appropriate to the long-lived nature of the radionuclides in the waste, some of which may have half-lives of millions of years. The radiological assessment should consider exposure of members of hypothetical representative groups for a number of scenarios including the expected migration of radionuclides from the facility, and inadvertent intrusion into the facility once institutional control has ceased. For scenarios where the probability of occurrence can be estimated, both doses and health risks should be presented, where the health risk is the product of the probability that the scenario occurs, the dose if the scenario occurs and the health risk corresponding to unit dose. For inadvertent intrusion, the dose if the intrusion occurs should be presented. It is recommended that the post-closure phase be considered as a series of timescales, with the approach changing from more quantitative to more qualitative as times further in the future are considered. The level of detail and sophistication in the modelling should also reflect the level of hazard presented by the waste. The uncertainty due to the long timescales means that the concept of collective dose has very limited use, although estimates of collective dose from the 'expected' migration scenario can be used to compare the relatively early impacts from some disposal options if required.	Noted but no action required due to nature of the proposed development.	Not applicable.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	Public Health England	**Human health risk assessment (chemical pollutants)** The points below are cross-cutting and should be considered when undertaking a human health risk assessment: • The promoter should consider including Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) numbers alongside chemical names, where referenced in the ES • Where available, the most recent United Kingdom standards for the appropriate media (e.g. air, water, and/or soil) and health-based guideline values should be used when quantifying the risk to human health from chemical pollutants. Where UK standards or guideline values are not available, those recommended by the European Union or World Health Organisation can be used • When assessing the human health risk of a chemical emitted from a facility or operation, the background exposure to the chemical from other sources should be taken into account • When quantitatively assessing the health risk of genotoxic and carcinogenic chemical pollutants PHE does not favour the use of mathematical models to extrapolate from high dose levels used in animal carcinogenicity studies to well below the observed region of a dose-response relationship. When only animal data are available, we recommend that the 'Margin of Exposure' (MOE) approach is used.	Noted but no action required due to nature of the proposed development.	Not applicable.
		Queen Camel Parish Council		
Appendix 2	Queen Camel Parish Council	**Section 2 The Scheme:** The Scheme is predicated on a longer term plan for the A303 which anticipates "that future enhancements would make this section 'expressway' compatible" (2.3.3, p.6). We would be grateful if you would advise the applicant that the environmental impact of the current proposals cannot be properly assessed without more information on the nature and scale of these possible "future enhancements". We hope that the ES will include a summary of any further engineering works required to turn the road into an 'expressway', a list of the licensed and unlicensed classes of vehicles and drivers which would be excluded from the 'expressway', an indication of what provision would be made for the excluded vehicles, and a forecast of any consequential change in traffic volumes.	The environmental assessment to be undertaken for the scheme that Highways England are seeking development consent for.	The environmental assessment has been undertaken for the scheme that Highways England are seeking development consent for, as described in Chapter 2 of Volume 6.1.
Appendix 2	Queen Camel Parish Council	**Section 6 Air Quality:** The proposed road realignment at the Sparkford end of the Scheme as well as a probable increase in traffic on the upgraded A303 would likely increase the exposure to pollutants of young children and staff at Hazlegrove School, along with residents of properties at Camel Hill and Blue Haze. These properties would be closer to the realigned road and in the prevailing southwesterlies they are downwind from it. We would therefore be grateful if you would advise the applicant to reconsider his decision not to implement any air quality mitigation measures (6.8.2, p.30) and we hope that such measures will be included in the ES.	Dispersion modelling to be undertaken for the worst case receptors within 200 metres of the affected road network e.g. at Camel Hill. The air quality assessment at these receptors will determine if mitigation is required.	Dispersion modelling has been undertaken at the worst case receptors within 200 metres of the affected road network, including at Camel Hill (Figure 5.4, Volume 6.2). Concentrations modelled at this receptor and all other worst case receptors were well below the annual NO2 and PM10 air quality objectives (40µg/m3), which exist for the protection of human health and apply to residential properties and schools. Blue Haze and Hazlegrove Preparatory School have not been explicitly modelled as they are located further away from the affected road so are not considered 'worst case' receptors. However, these receptors are expected to experience lower pollutant concentrations than those included in modelling (as these receptors are further away from the affected road network and concentrations of pollutants decrease with distance from roads). As no significant air quality impacts are anticipated during the operational phase, no operational mitigation measures are required (section 5.9 of Chapter 5 Air Quality, Volume 6.1). Nonetheless, best practice mitigation measures have been recommended for the construction phase.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	Queen Camel Parish Council	**Section 8 Landscape and Visual Effects:** we hope that the ES will detail measures to mitigate the visual impact of the raised section of road on the western ridge of Camel Hill, as seen from the south.	The ES to detail measures to mitigate the visual impact of the raised section of road on the western ridge of Camel Hill, as seen from the south, within the Landscape chapter of the ES.	The impacts of the raised section of the road have been assessed in detail in particular with regards to the visual impacts. The scheme has been designed to include a false cutting / bund and native shrub and tree planting along this section of the road to reduce visual impacts of traffic and signage.
Appendix 2	Queen Camel Parish Council	**Section 13 People and Communities:** 1. Study area (13.2, p.97): there may be technical reasons why the study area extends no further than 250m. from the scheme but this does seems unduly limited. It implies that the scheme will not greatly affect the majority of Queen Camel residents (who live <1200m. from the scheme) let alone the children and staff at Hazlegrove School (<600m.) In reality all will be much affected by the Scheme, especially during the construction phase. 2. Severance (13.3.8, p.101): the list of communities in the vicinity of the Scheme should include the hamlet of Wales and the Preparatory boarding School at Hazlegrove Park. 3. The impact of the scheme on the local road network: this is a matter of major concern to this Council and residents of Queen Camel, especially in relation to the construction phase. • In claiming it is “possible” that overnight work “could cause temporary disruption for MT’s along the A303, A359 and adjoining side roads…and cause disruption for local communities” (13.7.1, p.106) the applicant gravely understates the problem. • We appreciate assurances that “The People and Communities assessment will factor these traffic management requirements in” (13.7.1, p.106) and that “A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) would be implemented during the construction phase of the Scheme, to ensure that access is maintained and disruption is minimised as far as possible” (13.8.1, p.108). However more concrete detail is needed at an early stage. • We therefore respectfully request that you advise the applicant to show a far greater appreciation of the magnitude of the traffic management problem and ask that detailed mitigation measures be set out in the ES rather than leaving them to be worked out with consultants and contractors at a later time.	1. Any additional facilities outside of the baseline within Queen Camel to be included as part of the baseline section of the People and Communities chapter of the ES. 2. These communities to be considered within the baseline section of the People and Communities chapter of the ES. . 3. A Traffic Management Plan to be produced by the contractor as part of the DCO application, and an Outline Environmental Management Plan to be produced to support the DCO application, to include as much detail on mitigation measures as possible at the time of writing. This will be developed into a Construction Environmental Management Plan, by the contractor.	1. Any additional facilities outside of the baseline within Queen Camel have been included as part of the baseline section of the People and Communities chapter of the ES. 2. These communities have been considered within the baseline section of the People and Communities chapter of the ES. . 3. A Traffic Management Plan has been produced by the contractor as part of the DCO application (Appendix 2.2, Volume 6.3), and an Outline Environmental Management Plan (Volume 6.7) has been produced to support the DCO application, to provide as much detail on mitigation measures as possible at the time of writing. This will be developed into a Construction Environmental Management Plan, by the contractor.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	Queen Camel Parish Council	The applicant may find the following local information helpful in assessing the problem: 1. Local traffic on Queen Camel High Street (the A359) averages c.7,000 vehicles in the course of a 12-hour day, with almost 800 vehicles per hour at peak times, resulting in periodic congestion. Whenever there is congestion on the Sparkford-Ilchester section of the A303, for example at weekends and holiday times (especially in the summer) or after an RTA, the High Street is flooded with through traffic using Satnavs to find a way round via local roads. The knock-on effects include more severe congestion on Queen Camel High Street, heavy traffic along the West Camel Road (an unclassified road) and gridlock on Wales Road and Blackwell Road (a narrow unclassified road, partly single lane). 2. The A359 is heavily used by emergency service vehicles and as a result congestion in Queen Camel can have a serious effect on people and communities over a much wider area. 3. Vehicles avoiding the congested section of the A303 are often directed by Satnavs to the West Camel Road, passing close to the Medical Centre and the Primary school - both of which serve communities far beyond the village. Patients attending the Medical Centre use the road and local children have to cross it on their way to and from school, so congestion on the A303 inconveniences and can endanger two of the most vulnerable groups in Queen Camel and neighbouring communities. 4. We understand that throughout the construction period the applicant plans to keep open one lane of the A303 in each direction, as at present, but it will be necessary to reduce the speed limit from 50mph to 40mph in coned lanes. This is bound to increase the frequency and severity of congestion on the A303 with greater congestion of local roads an inevitable knock-on effect. 5. We understand that nighttime closures of the A303 will be required on occasion and this is likely to result in heavy traffic flows through the heart of Queen Camel all night. 6. There is a 7.5t. weight restriction on the High Street and other Queen Camel roads but it is widely flouted and seems unlikely to deter HGV drivers trying to avoid congestion on the A303. 7. There is a right-angled corner at the southern end of the High Street where long or wide commercial vehicles trying to squeeze past each other find it difficult to avoid mounting the narrow pavement at times, endangering pedestrians including children walking to and from school. 8. At times the density of traffic on the A359 leads to gridlock between the three pinch points on the High Street. 9. Roadside parking on the High Street and at Hill View (on the A359 to the north of the bridge) often restricts traffic to a single lane, especially when wide agricultural and commercial vehicles are involved, and this creates further congestion.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Queen Camel Parish Council	We would therefore request that the following mitigation measures be considered to supplement whatever official diversions are put in place: i. Signage on the A303 (east of Sparkford and west of Ilchester) advising drivers that using Queen Camel High Street and West Camel Road to bypass congestion on the A303 are likely to encounter longer delays. ii. Similar signage warning HGV drivers of the measures in place to enforce the 7.5t. weight limit on local roads (see iii below). iii. Setting up a system in conjunction with the County Highways Department and the Police to ensure compliance with and enforcement of the 7.5t. weight restriction on the A359 and West Camel Road. One possible model is the Hinkley Point traffic management scheme with its use of advanced number plate recognition technology. iv. In the longer term, investigating the merits of retaining the existing A303 carriageway as a possible A303 relief road and for local traffic.	i. It is assumed that this relates to the construction phase. During construction planning and preparation appropriate temporary signage to discourage 'rat running' will be considered for this location. ii. As above iii. As above iv. The retention of the existing A303 carriageway as a permanent relief road is not proposed as part of this scheme.	This will be addressed during construction planning.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Somerset County Council				
Appendix 2	Somerset County Council	The Council has engaged with Highways England as proposals have developed but anticipates a number of highway matters in relation to the preferred route will have to be resolved in detail with Highways England if adversarial representation to the Planning Inspectorate Examination is to be avoided following submission of the DCO application. Such matters are likely to include: • Impact of the scheme on the local road network, including any TROs to regulate use of former A303 if necessary, and agreement in relation to construction access and construction vehicle routing. • Design of local road elements of the scheme, including alterations of junctions and side roads as appropriate. • Flood risk and surface water drainage. • Rights of way and access, including segregated crossings. • De-trunking and transfer of former Highways England assets to Somerset County Council as necessary. • Requirements for local Traffic Regulation Orders.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Somerset County Council	Of particular importance to Somerset County Council as Local Highway Authority; in relation to the Environmental Impact Assessment for the scheme; is that the impact of the proposed scheme and associated junction strategy on local traffic movement, congestion, safety and accessibility are fully quantified by Highways England, and understood by all parties, with any necessary mitigations agreed.	Details to be included within the relevant documents to be submitted as part of the DCO application, including the Traffic Management Plan and the Traffic Modelling Statement.	An outline Traffic Management Plan has been produced by the Contractor and is contained in Annex B.5 of the ***Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7).***
Appendix 2	Somerset County Council	As noted in our response to the non-statutory consultation dated March 2017, The Council has requested a workshop with Highways England to understand in detail the proposed scope of the assessments to be undertaken in support of the application, and agree detailed methodologies. This has recently been verbally agreed and is likely to take place in January 2018. The Council would have preferred to have undertaken this workshop and jointly agreed the methodologies (particularly traffic modelling methodologies), before commenting on a formal EIA scoping report, since we may find that requirements emerge from the joint discussion that should be included in the EIA process. Nonetheless we note the statutory requirement to inform your scoping opinion by 28 December and have set out in principle below the key areas where we feel the scoping report as drafted requires further consideration:	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Somerset County Council	**5.5.5 – 5.5.12: Traffic Modelling:** The EIA proposes to use the South West Regional Traffic Model (SWRTM). The Council has not had any engagement on the SWRTM and is unable to comment on its robustness as a tool upon which to base the EIA. The Council would like to understand how well the model validates with local traffic conditions before agreeing its use is appropriate. Highways England have used a different model up to this point and that model has not been used in conjunction with a variable demand model. The Council is concerned that the SWRTM may not be a sufficiently detailed model to understand local re-routing impacts such as those arising from reducing the number of access points to the A303, and would request that robust analysis is taken at a sufficient level of detail using a jointly agreed methodology to identify local adverse impacts arising from the proposal and develop suitable mitigation.	The traffic model approach has been discussed with Somerset County Council and SWRTM has been enhanced in the local area so that it can forecast local traffic impacts as well as strategic impacts whilst it also includes a variable demand response model. The specially adapted model to be assessed against industry standard criteria for calibrating and validating transport models that is contained in WebTAG M3. Technical Working Group meetings to be held with local authorities to share and discuss information on the traffic modelling.	Adaptation of the SWRTM was discussed at the meeting held with Somerset County Council and WSP on 5 June 2018. The ***Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (TR010036/APP/7.6)*** which explains the use of the SWRTM and associated enhancements in the local area has been provided to Somerset County Council / WSP. A cross reference to the ***Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (TR010036/APP/7.6)*** is provided within paragraph 4.3.4 of Chapter 4 Environmental Assessment Methodology, Volume 6.1.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	Somerset County Council	**13.2.1. Severance:** Scoping needs to acknowledge that severance impacts may occur outside of the localised study area should the scheme and associated changes to local network connectivity increase traffic flows on sections of the local network. These impacts will need to be identified and where appropriate mitigated.	Study area to be informed by appropriate guidance within DMRB.	The study area in Section 12.4 Chapter 12 People and Communities, Volume 6.1 has been informed by the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 11 Section 3 Parts 6, 8 and 9 and professional judgment, based on the type and scale of the scheme and the context of the surrounding area.
Appendix 2	Somerset County Council	**13.7.12. Potential Impacts – Operation:** It is not correct to state at this stage that *"The proposed Scheme is anticipated to remove the majority of through-flow traffic from the existing A303 onto the new road, which would be a high speed, free flowing dual carriageway for its length. This would provide significant relief from congestion upon the local road network and reduce driver stress"*. The preferred route comprises largely online improvements to the existing A303 resulting in reduced local network connectivity and may create new congestion pressures through re-routing local network traffic onto potentially longer and more convoluted routes than currently available. This may create adverse impacts for road users and communities on the local road network.	Environmental assessment to be undertaken making use of up-to-date traffic data.	It is correct to state that the proposed scheme would remove the majority of through-flow traffic onto the new road. It is also true that the existing local single carriageway section of the A303 suffers from congestion that would be relieved by the proposed scheme. Although the proposed scheme would reduce connections between the local roads and the A303, a junction is proposed at Downhead that would provide safer access to local settlements compared with the existing junctions. There are consequential changes in traffic on the local road network, with both increases and reductions. Traffic is forecast to increase through West Camel and Sparkford. With improved capacity on the A303 then it is also expected that there would lower levels of congestion during the summer holiday peak periods and lower occurrence of traffic 'rat running' through the local road network to avoid delays on the A303.
Appendix 2	Somerset County Council	**13.7.15. Potential Impacts – Operation:** It is not correct to state at this stage that *"..the Scheme would result in relief from congestion on the local road network, which is likely to improve access to community facilities in the study area, in terms of journey time."* For the same reasons as set out above the scheme might increase congestion and delay on parts of the local network which might adversely impact on access to community facilities within and potentially outside the study area.	Environmental assessment to be undertaken making use of up-to-date traffic data.	It is not expected that the increases in traffic on the local network are sufficient to cause significant congestion and delays. However it is proposed to consider whether appropriate measures to limit traffic increases could be included with the proposed scheme in discussion with the local highway authority, Somerset County Council.
Appendix 2	Somerset County Council	**13.8.2. Design, mitigation and enhancement measures – operation.** The DCO may also need to include mitigation for adverse traffic impacts arising from the scheme, the nature of which cannot be specifically identified at this stage but which may need to be designed once any local impacts are identified.	It is not expected that the increases in traffic on the local network are sufficient to cause significant congestion and delays. However, it is proposed to consider whether appropriate measures to limit traffic increases could be included with the proposed scheme in discussion with the local highway authority, Somerset County Council.	Adaptation of the SWRTM was discussed at the meeting held with SCC and WSP on 5 June 2018. The ***Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (TR010036/APP/7.6)*** which explains the use of the SWRTM and associated enhancements in the local area has been provided to SCC/WSP.
Appendix 2	Somerset County Council	**13.11.19. Private Property and Associated Land Take, Community Land and Community Facilities, Development Land, and Local Economy.** It should be noted that there may be receptors outside the immediate area (due to impacts which may be created by re-routing local traffic). It is not possible at this stage to identify where these might be since there has been no assessment agreed by the Council which quantifies the extent of changes to traffic flow on the local road network associated with the scheme.	Additional facilities outside of the study area to be referenced where relevant.	Additional facilities outside of the study area have been referenced where relevant, as detailed in section 12.7 of Chapter 12 People and Communities, Volume 6.1.
Appendix 2	Somerset County Council	The South West Heritage Trust has requested that their response on cultural heritage matters be incorporated into the County Council response as follows: The methodology set out in the Scoping Opinion Cultural Heritage section is comprehensive in terms of the assessment of non-designated assets. The commitment to intrusive (trial trench) evaluation following the desk based assessment and geophysical survey is welcomed to fully describe the significance of buried heritage assets with archaeological interest. The use of DMRB assessment is standard for these types of assessment and we agree that this is the correct assessment method. Historic England has responded to the Scoping Opinion with comments concerning the assessment of Designated assets and we endorse those comments.	Consultation with South West Heritage Trust to take place as part of the Environmental Technical Working Group.	Consultation has taken place with South West Heritage Trust as part of the Environmental TWG who have confirmed that trial trench surveys can be completed following the submission of the DCO (see Appendix 4.9, Volume 6.3, for the meeting minutes.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
South Somerset District Council				
Appendix 2	South Somerset District Council	Environmental Protection - it would be useful to include the rationale for the LOAEL and SOAEL in table 12.1 and confirm that these are pre-mitigation levels for assessing noise impact.	Rationale for LOAEL and SOAEL to be included within the Noise and Vibration chapter of the ES.	Section 11.4 of Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.1) justifies where the LOAEL and SOAEL values (as outlined in Table 11.5) have been informed by.
Appendix 2	South Somerset District Council	Arboricultural Issues - the Scoping Report states that the Hazlegrove Park County Wildlife Site is within the scheme foot-print, however, it does not appear to mention the; " important assemblage of veteran trees (which we believe are a designated Priority Habitat) with specialist invertebrate fauna" (which might include the Violet Click-Beetle and/or Noble Chafer). Notwithstanding the likely presence of Potential Roosting Features for bats, if the foot-print of the proposal does require the removal of veteran trees, that would be a particular cause for concern and would seem deserving of specialist arboricultural input in order to minimise the impact. As an aside, many sections of the A303 have benefitted from significant linear woodland plantings running parallel with the carriageway, these plantings have become well established and clearly provide multiple ecological and community benefits. It is likely that the project will require the removal of a large quantity of adjoining trees and hedgerows. Unfortunately, South Somerset has particularly low levels of tree-cover – only around 4% as opposed to a national county average of 12% - so the loss of adjoining trees and hedgerows could prove to be a blow ,that is quite dis-proportionate. We would particularly welcome an emphasis upon enhancing the scheme by actively seeking opportunities to create significant areas of new woodland plantings within and adjoining the areas of land to be purchased. The existing Forestry Commission and Countryside Stewardship schemes may provide useful resources of knowledge and perhaps even potential funding for this (e.g. The Woodland Creation Grant). We expect that future woodland plantings would be informed by appropriately experienced and qualified arboricultural input. The current threat of pests and diseases affecting trees is unprecedented. The robust provision of robust bio-diversity and the insistence upon healthy planting stock of UK-provenance should certainly be considered a high priority.	Arboricultural technical reports to document veteran trees. All veteran trees have been assessed for potential bat roosts, and invertebrate surveys have been undertaken in the woodland at Hazlegrove. Chapter 8 Biodiversity to detail the mitigation strategy proposals to ensure that woodland, hedgerows and shrubs / trees are replanted to ensure no net loss.	Veteran trees (for which 1 is being lost) has been documented within the Arboricultural Constraints Report (Appendix 7.1) and Arboricultural Implications Report (Appendix 7.3). All veteran trees have been assessed for potential bat roosts (see Appendix 8.10 bat Technical Report), and invertebrate surveys have been undertaken in the woodland at Hazlegrove (see Appendix 8.11 Invertebrate Technical Report and 8.12 Brown Hairstreak Technical Report, Volume 6.3). The mitigation strategy is detailed in paragraphs 8.93 to 8.9.5 of section 8.9 'Design, mitigation and enhancement measures' and depicted in Figure 2.8 Environmental Masterplan of Volume 6.2.
South Somerset District Council - Area East Committee				
Appendix 2	South Somerset District Council - Area East Committee	Councillors representing communities either along, or close to, the Sparkford – Ilchester section of the A303 acknowledged that many people were relieved and encouraged when the preferred route was announced. There appeared to be stronger support for the preferred route and this is reflected in the feedback which we have received to-date. Inevitably, there are localised concerns about the actual route, detail designing, signage for the tourist attractions close to the route, the loss of a diversionary route for emergency/other closures and how the construction phase will be managed.	Tourist attraction signage is being discussed and agreed with the local highway authority (Somerset County Council). Highways England will appoint a contractor for the works sufficiently early to be able to plan the works in detail, with a particular focus on minimising disruption to traffic on the A303 and local traffic, and addressing the risk of A303 seeking to find alternative routes should there be congestion.	Details of the proposed signage included as part of the scheme has been provided in paragraphs 2.5.128 to 2.5.134 of Chapter 2 The Scheme, Volume 6.1. The locations of the proposed signage are shown on the general arrangement drawings contained within Figure 2.3 of Volume 6.2. Construction disruption will be addressed during construction planning.
Appendix 2	South Somerset District Council - Area East Committee	There is a particular need to establish a mechanism for ongoing and regular liaison, through design, inception and delivery with stakeholders such as Parish Councils to anticipate, minimise and manage adverse impacts. I believe that you are arranging to meet with one Parish Council and trust that similar arrangements will be put in place for other Parishes/stakeholders.	Consultation to be undertaken.	Technical Working Groups involving South Somerset District Council have taken place.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	South Somerset District Council - Area East Committee	In selecting option 1, it is generally accepted that it will be more difficult to manage traffic during construction. Will the measures to mitigate the disruption and traffic congestion be factored in through the detailed design phase?	A Delivery Partner is on board to develop the most suitable construction strategy to avoid disruption and traffic during the construction period as best as possible. This strategy to be detailed within the ES and will be further developed prior to construction.	The construction strategy is detailed within Section 2.5 of Chapter 2 The Scheme, Volume 6.1. An Outline Traffic Management Plan has been produced, and is contained within Annex B.5 of the ***Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7)***. This will be developed into a full Traffic Management Plan by the Contractor prior to construction.
Appendix 2	South Somerset District Council - Area East Committee	Junctions have prompted concerns, the loss of direct access for westbound vehicles to Yeovilton and an absence of support for the alternative (a potential new junction near Steart Lane/Howell Hill)	The proposed Camel Cross junction will provide direct access to Yeovilton from the new A303 westbound carriageway.	The proposed Camel Cross junction has been included in the final design.
Appendix 2	South Somerset District Council - Area East Committee	Concerns that small settlements which are already 'rat runs' will see traffic surges as motorist seek alternative routes during construction	A Delivery Partner is on board to develop the most suitable construction strategy to avoid disruption and traffic during the construction period as best as possible. Strategy to be detailed within the ES and will be further developed prior to construction.	An outline Traffic Management Plan has been produced by the Contractor and is contained in Annex B.5 of the ***Outline Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010036/APP/6.7).***
Appendix 2	South Somerset District Council - Area East Committee	Designing in service vehicle provision, in particular a connection for agriculture vehicles where a farm holding has been severed by the preferred route	This is rather a generic statement which is difficult to address with any specifics. However it is considered that all accesses to land adjacent to the A303 that will be severed as a result of the scheme will be appropriately re-provided.	Comprehensive proposals for private accesses for all adjacent land plots are included in the ***Rights of Way and Access Plans (document reference TR010036/APP/2.4)***
Appendix 2	South Somerset District Council - Area East Committee	Noise levels are, and continue, to cause concern, with the need to moderate noise impacts for residents of the park home site at West Camel raised; due to the nature of construction these homes are not afforded the same level of noise protection as conventionally built residential properties.	Noted – to be examined in light of any noise changes predicted.	Receptors considered within the assessment that have the potential to experience significant adverse effects are outlined in Table 11.45 within Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration, Volume 6.1.
Wales and West Utilities				
Appendix 2	Wales and West Utilities	According to our mains records Wales & West Utilities has not apparatus in the area of your enquiry. However Gas pipes owned by other GT's and also privately owned may be present in this area. Information with regard to such pipes should be obtained from the owners.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Wales and West Utilities	Safe digging practices, in accordance with HS(G)47, must be used to verify and establish the actual position of mains, pipes, services and other apparatus on site before any mechanical plant is used. It is your responsibility to ensure that this information is provided to all persons (either direct labour or contractors) working for you on or near gas apparatus.	Noted and information to be provided to the Contractor(s).	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	Wales and West Utilities	Please note that the plans are only valid for 28 days from the date of issue and updated plans must be requested before any work commences on site if this period has expired.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
West Camel Parish Council				
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	**General Observation –** the design and consultation process appear to be out of sync, with Highways England's (HE) consultant Mott-MacDonald 'lagging behind' the milestones set by HE, and much of the design detail just isn't available. In the HE Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report (EIASR) so much vital detail is listed as, 'yet to be decided', that stakeholders are restricted in making an 'informed' response.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	The proposed location of junctions (if built) above the village of West Camel is perhaps the most outstanding omission, closely followed by gradient and eventual height of the proposed Expressway.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	What we can only interpret as 'political pressure' to start construction in 2020, is in grave danger of delivering a design that will not be the best outcome for anyone, road users, local communities, other undertakers etc. and may well fail to satisfy checks and balances at the DCO stage.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	**'Garden Village' Proposals –** We wish to draw the attached proposal issued by South West Strategic Developments to the Planning Inspectorate's attention. This proposal to build up to 15,000 homes in the area where the western end of Option 2 would have been sited. This proposal needs to be factored into the ES in terms of future transport movements, surface water discharge, air and noise pollution etc.	To be considered as part of the ES.	The Garden Village Proposal has been noted within Chapter 14 Combined and Cumulative Effects, Volume 6.1. However, as the proposal does not meet the assessment criteria it has not been considered further within the assessment.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	Although probably not applicable to this response, the Planning Inspectorate need to satisfy themselves that an early sight of these proposals by HE, didn't form a mitigating factor in the choice of, what was until recently the more expensive Option 1 as their preferred route?	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	This question may well be raised at the DCO stage as the inevitable increase in land acquisition costs for Option 2, following early sight of development proposals by HE, may well have invalidated that option, leaving stakeholders and members of the public no real choice?	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	**Dual Carriageway or Expressway?** – section 2.3.3 of the EIASR states that 'it is anticipated that future enhancements would make the section 'Expressway' compatible. An article in 'The Times' of Thursday 14th December (below) clearly states that parts of the A303 between the M3 and M5 will be upgraded to 'Expressway' standard in the periods 'up to 2020' and '2020-2025'. These improved A roads will be designated A(M) and 'slow moving vehicles and bicycles will be banned'.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	From discussions with Mott-MacDonald, it is apparent that (probably to save cost and time) they **are tasked by HE to build a dual carriageway NOT an 'Expressway'**. If the Sparkford to Podimore section of the A303 is to become the A303(M) in the period 2020-2025, then logically the proposals should be to 'Expressway' standard NOW to avoid expensive and invasive reworking within 5 years of completion?	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	The ES (Environmental Statement) should in ALL respects reflect the likely conditions and design aspects of an 'Expressway' and the Planning Inspector should satisfy himself (and probably The National Audit Office) that these increased standards are transparent, well before the DCO stage of the process.	Noted. No action required.	Not applicable.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	**5.5.7 Base Model Assumptions –** basing all assumptions on weekday traffic flows in March appears to be ludicrous on what is clearly acknowledged to be a seasonal holiday route and one of the main road arteries into the South West. **A Friday in August would be much more reflective of potential Environmental impact.**	Design standards and many of the proposed Scheme appraisals are based on accounting for traffic variation during the year by factoring traffic model outputs to represent an annual average daily traffic (AADT) level so that the peak levels of holiday traffic are represented in this. The conventional way of achieving this is to build traffic models for a weekday in a neutral month and then use annual count data to factor traffic levels to represent AADT levels. However, exceptionally for this scheme, further modelling of a summer weekend traffic level (Friday to Sunday) was undertaken and used for further assessment work.	Not applicable (see response in 'action' column). Development of both neutral month and summer models are explained in the ***Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (TR010036/APP/7.6).***
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	**6. Air Quality –** there appears to be an almost total lack of 'base-line' data in this area (6.3.12 Summary of the Baseline Conditions) supports this view. The ES should undertake to produce robust 'base-line' data prior to work commencing and take into account the impact of a northerly wind dispersing increased levels of pollutants over the community of West Camel and similarly the impact of a southerly wind on the outlying communities within the parish of West Camel at Downhead and Steart.	A robust baseline for the purposes of determining significance of impacts to be presented in the ES. The assessment to take into account meteorological parameters such as prevailing winds and their effect on dispersion of pollutants at sensitive receptors.	The baseline for air quality has considered local authority and scheme specific air quality monitoring as well as Defra background concentrations, which is considered sufficient to be able to establish a robust baseline (section 5.7 of Chapter 5 Air Quality, Volume 6.1). The dispersion modelling undertaken has taken into account meteorological parameters such as prevailing winds and their effect on dispersion of pollutants at sensitive receptors (section 5.4 of Chapter 5 Air Quality, Volume 6.1). Pollutant concentrations have been modelled at receptors in close proximity to the road (less than 10m from the current A303 alignment). Pollutant concentrations at these receptors are well below the respective air quality objectives for NO2 and PM10; on Steart Hill, the modelled annual NO2 concentration was 15.8µg/m3, which is well below the annual NO2 objective of 40µg/m3. As residential properties in West Camel are further away from the A303 (the closest receptors are more than 100m away), the impact of the scheme will be less than that modelled and therefore would not experience a significant air quality impact.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	**6.7.3 Human Health & Wellbeing –** the EIASR recognises that there are 200 residential receptors (Human Beings??) within 200 metres of the realigned road BUT fails to recognise that around 50 'receptors' live together at Orchard Park. This is a mobile home park and the construction of these units makes their inhabitants (Receptors) much more vulnerable to noise pollution. Added to which the demographic is slightly older than the parish average with the majority of residents in the 75+ age bracket, including 4 registered disabled. **Orchard Park should be singled out for some very sensitive treatment in terms of both design and during the construction phase.**	Orchard Park to be outlined as separate residential receptors rather than one single community facility within the baseline.	Additional consideration has been given for Orchard Park in Section 12.5 of Chapter 12, Volume 6.1 which identifies the park is incldunig over 30 detached mobile homes. It should be noted that the Equality Impact Assessment gives consideration to both older people (ages 65+) and disabled people and potential impacts that may arise from the scheme and disproportionately impact these groups.

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	Another group of houses that should be singled out for separate consideration are the four sets of semidetached 'round houses'. Although re-roofed some years ago their overall construction is probably well short of modern standards especially in terms of sound insulation. These homes are directly downhill of the proposed 3 - 4 m high elevated section of the new road to the east of Conegore Corner and probably contain the highest density of children in the village of West Camel.	Temporary access and permanent access to be assessed as part of the People and Communities chapter of the ES. These properties are located within the calculation area for noise and will therefore be considered within the Noise and Vibration chapter of the ES. For air quality, these receptors have not been included within the air quality modelling as there are other receptors in the area which are much close to the new road alignment and are likely to therefore experience a larger air quality impact. If following modelling, large impacts are identified at these receptors, this receptor is to be included within the model.	Temporary access and permanent access changes have been assessed as part of the People and Communities chapter of the ES. These properties are located within the calculation area for noise and will therefore be considered within the Noise and Vibration chapter of the ES. For air quality, these receptors have not been included within the air quality modelling as there are other receptors in the area which are much close to the new road alignment and are likely to therefore experience a larger air quality impact. If following modelling, large impacts are identified at these receptors, this receptor is to be included within the model.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	**8 Landscape and Visual Effects –** the EIASR is sadly silent on the visual impact of current proposals for the dual carriageway east of Conegore Corner being built up on a 3 – 4m high bank as it passes to the east of West Camel Village and the hamlet of Wales (Queen Camel parish). **This needs to be specifically mentioned in the ES and detail added as to how this eyesore is to be mitigated.**	Specific details relating to mitigation and potential visual effects to be included as part of the Landscape chapter of the ES.	The impacts of the raised section of the road have been assessed in detail in particular with regards to the visual impacts. The scheme has been designed to include a false cutting / bund and native shrub and tree planting along this section of the road to reduce visual impacts of traffic and signage.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	**12 Noise and Vibration –** the EIASR clearly states at 12.6 that no consultation has taken place as to the potential impact of noise and vibration. Orchard Park needs to be singled out as a ''special area' because the impact of noise and vibration will be felt most by these residents. **This has not been recognised so far in the Consultation process.**	Noted. Baseline noise readings to be undertaken in the vicinity of Orchard Park.	Orchard Park has been identified as a sensitive receptor within Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration, Volume 6.1. No significant adverse effects have been predicted as a result of operational noise for Orchard Park.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	**13 People and Communities –** The EIASR is in grave danger of taking a base-line of an already unacceptable traffic volume exacerbated by the use of sat-nav guidance that increases the north-west to south-east 'rat-run' of traffic through the village of West Camel, along Plowage Lane and Howell Hill. The ES should acknowledge that the base-line is unacceptably high and HE need to work collaboratively with SCC Highways to reduce volumes of transient road users, whilst still maintaining connectivity with the outlying populations at Downhead and Steart. West Camel PC are currently working with SCC Highways to calm and reduce traffic and it is essential that the ES acknowledges and co-operates with these efforts to prevent public money being wasted through abortive actions / proposals.	Baseline to be considered in full as part of the People and Communities chapter of the ES.	The baseline for driver stress can be found in Section 12.5 of Chapter 12 People and Communities, Volume 6.1. An assessment of potential effects on driver stress has been provided as part of section 12.10 of Chapter 12 People and Communities, Volume 6.1.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	**13.3.22 Community Land and Community Facilities –** the Davis Hall (Village Hall) the 'heart' of West Camel parish and the WCPC Playing Field both fall within the 'Land Interest envelope declared by HE, yet are not mentioned in this section. Both areas will be impacted during and after the proposed scheme. **These areas / buildings need to be included in the ES document.**	These facilities within WCPC to be included as part of the baseline.	These facilities within WCPC to be included as part of the baseline, as detailed in section 12.7 of Chapter 12 People and Communities, Volume 6.1.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	**13.3.17 Local Businesses –** the EIASR currently does not recognise the potential impact on the Walnut Tree public house, restaurant and hotel in the village of West Camel. This business draws passing trade from the existing A303, which will potentially be lost and this loss may well endanger the viability of a village amenity. The Walnut Tree public house, restaurant and hotel needs to be included in the ES and proposals developed to mitigate the potential loss of trade through signage etc.	These facilities within WCPC to be included as part of the baseline.	Section 12.7 of Chapter 12 People and Communities (Volume 6.1) highlights that there are facilities in West Camel, including several guest houses, a Church and a Community centre. The chapter also considers disruption of traffic during the construction stage (including access to facilities) within the severance effects section (Section 12.10 of Chapter 12 People and Communities, Volume 6.1).

Ref.	Respondent	Comment	Action	Outcome
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	**14. Road Drainage and Water Environment –** the EIASR is currently silent on the discharge of surface water from the existing A303 (a section being retained and de-trunked) to the east of Plowage lane where surface water is collected and discharged into the field ditch network and into Cottis Lane. This is a significant source of surface water flood for the village of West Camel and needs to be included within the ES and proposals developed to include diverting this outfall to be managed within the overall scheme drainage.	A Drainage Strategy Report and associated plans to be produced to support the DCO application.	A Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 4.6, Volume 6.3) and Drainage Strategy Report (Appendix 4.7, Volume 6.3) have been produced.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	**16 Combined and Cumulative Effects –** there is scope to both mitigate and potentially improve the Combined and Cumulative effects of this scheme of the residents of West Camel Parish BUT this can only be achieved through engagement and dialogue. HE's current practice of ignoring parish councils in favour of land owners will only result in dissatisfaction, complaint and missed opportunities. There is a real opportunity to 'win the hearts and minds' of a community most affected by this project; there is potential for HE to change perceptions without incurring unacceptable costs.	Engage with Parish Councils during the non-statutory and statutory consultations, as set out in the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC).	Engagement took place in the form of private meetings with Parish Councils during the non-statutory and statutory consultations, as set out in the Statement of Community Consultation. As well engagement within the consultation periods, additional engagement took place outside of the consultation period to discuss design changes. A full record of engagement can be found in the ***Consultation Report (document reference TR010036/APP/5.1 to 5.15)***.
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	West Camel Parish Council remained neutral during phase 1 of the HE consultation process, feeding back the 'pros and cons' of each option upon the Parish of West Camel and clearly stated that they would support the HE preferred route and work with HE to obtain the best outcome for our community. This positive and constructive attitude only works if we are included in an iterative process and are treated as a major stakeholder as the body representing the whole community of West Camel Parish. We did manage to arrange an initial meeting with Mott-MacDonald on 17th November but requests for further meetings have been politely declined and feedback from neighbouring parishes suggests that what we see in the spring of 2018 will be incomplete!	Engage with Parish Councils during the non-statutory and statutory consultations, as set out in the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC).	Engagement took place in the form of private meetings with Parish Councils during the non-statutory and statutory consultations, as set out in the Statement of Community Consultation. As well engagement within the consultation periods, additional engagement took place outside of the consultation period to discuss design changes. A full record of engagement can be found in the ***Consultation Report (document reference TR010036/APP/5.1 to 5.15).***
Appendix 2	West Camel Parish Council	Should HE continue to ignore this most directly affected community and seek to upgrade this section of the A303 to a lower standard, exposing our community to further disruption within 5 years of completion, we would feel compelled to reflect this serious breach of public trust, formally to the Planning Inspectorate at the DCO stage.	Engage with Parish Councils during the non-statutory and statutory consultations, as set out in the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC).	Engagement took place in the form of private meetings with Parish Councils during the non-statutory and statutory consultations, as set out in the Statement of Community Consultation. As well engagement within the consultation periods, additional engagement took place outside of the consultation period to discuss design changes. A full record of engagement can be found in the ***Consultation Report (document reference TR010036/APP/5.1 to 5.15).***