

APPENDIX 5.5: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT SCOPING OPINION AND CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Table 1: Summary of the EIA Scoping Opinion and Consultee Responses

Consultee / Date of Response	Comments Provided in the Scoping Response	Consideration in the ES
Northamptonshire County Council / Response on 16/08/2018	<p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>Section 4.4 states that the exact scope of the air quality assessment for the Proposed Scheme will be confirmed through consultation with Northampton Borough Council. It also provides a list of various documents to be referred to and I would suggest adding the Northampton Low Emission Strategy to this list.</p>	Please refer to Chapter 6: Air Quality (Volume II of the ES)
Daventry District Council / Response on 04/09/2018	<p><u>Air quality</u></p> <p>4.2.1: The Daventry District Council Environmental Health Officer should be able to provide any relevant Daventry District Council baseline information. There is no objection to the proposed methodology.</p> <p>4.2.18: The receptors need to also include (a) the JCS Policy N8: Northampton North of Whitehills SUE (aka Buckton Fields) development (as partly constructed and proposed – see DA/2011/0666); and (b) an approved (on appeal) residential site on the west side of Welford Road. (See DA/2014/0521 and DA/2017/0551).</p> <p>4.4.1: As part of the Site is in the administrative area of Daventry District Council, there should be consultation with the Daventry District Council Environmental Health Officer, as well as with Northampton Borough Council.</p>	<p>The baseline information has been utilised for the air quality chapter with the receptors stated considered as part of the impact assessment.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 6: Air Quality (Volume II of the ES)</p>
Boughton Parish Council / Response 18/09/2018	<p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>Air quality as the proposed road is near to the AQMA in Kingsthorpe.</p>	<p>Kingsthorpe AQMA has been considered as a receptor within the air quality chapter.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 6: Air Quality (Volume II of the ES)</p>
Highways England / Response 4/9/2018	<p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>Adverse change to noise and air quality should be particularly considered, including in relation to compliance with the European air quality limit values and/or in local authority designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs).</p>	<p>AQMAs have been considered as part of the baseline and impact assessment for the air quality chapter.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 6: Air Quality (Volume II of the ES)</p>

Consultee / Date of Response	Comments Provided in the Scoping Response	Consideration in the ES
Northampton Borough Council / Response 17/9/2018	<p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>Section 4.4 states that the exact scope of the air quality assessment for the Proposed Scheme will be confirmed through consultation with Northampton Borough Council. It also provides a list of various documents to be referred to and I would suggest adding the Northampton Low Emission Strategy to this list.</p>	<p>The air quality assessment has taken into consideration the consultations undertaken to date, within the air quality chapter and subsequent impact assessment.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 6: Air Quality (Volume II of the ES)</p>
Northamptonshire County Council / Response on 16/08/2018	<p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>Section 11.3.11 states 'in terms of future dwellings and development, it is understood these have been, or are being, designed with the Proposed Scheme in mind. Hence, no scheme-related effects are anticipated for proposed development and so these receptors are scoped-out of the assessment'.</p> <p>The supporting evidence for this statement should be detailed for the avoidance of doubt.</p>	<p>The assessment of cumulative effects is detailed within the noise chapter which addresses this comment.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration (Volume II of the ES)</p>
Daventry District Council / Response on 04/09/2018	<p><u>Noise and Vibration</u></p> <p>There is no objection to the proposed methodology.</p>	<p>Please refer to Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration (Volume II of the ES)</p>
Highways England / Response 4/9/2018	<p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>Adverse change to noise and air quality should be particularly considered, including in relation to compliance with the European air quality limit values and/or in local authority designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs).</p>	<p>Please refer to Chapter 6: Air Quality (Volume II of the ES)</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration (Volume II of the ES)</p>
Northampton Borough Council / Response 17/9/2018	<p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>Section 11.3.11 states 'in terms of future dwellings and development, it is understood these have been, or are being, designed with the Proposed Scheme in mind. Hence, no scheme-related effects are anticipated for proposed development and so these receptors are scoped-out of the assessment'.</p> <p>The supporting evidence for this statement should be detailed for the avoidance of doubt.</p>	<p>The assessment of cumulative effects is detailed within the noise chapter which addresses this comment.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration (Volume II of the ES)</p>
Boughton Parish Council / Response 18/09/2018	<p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>A 24-hour noise assessment</p>	<p>Noise surveys have been undertaken as part of the baseline work required for the noise chapter.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration (Volume II of the ES)</p>

Consultee / Date of Response	Comments Provided in the Scoping Response	Consideration in the ES
Northamptonshire County Council / Response 18/9/2018	<p><u>Biodiversity</u></p> <p>I think the proposed scope for the ecology section is broadly fine. One thing they haven't specifically mentioned is important arable plants. I know they're not statutory – although some are in the s.41 list – but given the surroundings I'd ask that they keep an eye out for them when they're out doing the field work. The fields might be too intensively farmed for anything to thrive but I think it's worth having a look. Other than that, I think what they're proposing makes sense.</p>	<p>Ecology fieldwork surveys have been undertaken for the scheme as part of the baseline survey work as a pre-requisite too the biodiversity chapter.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 7: Biodiversity (Volume II of the ES)</p>
Daventry District Council / Response on 04/09/2018	<p><u>Ecology and biodiversity</u></p> <p>7.4.2: The local Wildlife Trust (which has a service level agreement with Daventry District Council) should be consulted, along with local specialist groups for e.g. badgers and bats.</p> <p>Proposed Scheme (paragraph 2.1.5) – part of the Site has Green Wedge designation (Daventry District Local Plan saved policy EN10).</p>	<p>The local Wildlife Trust has been consulted at the Scoping stage and comments taken into consideration within both the biodiversity chapter and biodiversity net gain appendix of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 7: Biodiversity (Volume II of the ES)</p>

Consultee / Date of Response	Comments Provided in the Scoping Response	Consideration in the ES
<p>Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridge and Northamptonshire / Response on 30/09/2018</p>	<p><u>Ecology and biodiversity</u></p> <p>For information, with reference to Drawing No. Figure 2, entitled "Site Boundary and Current Route Alignment", Rev. A, dated 03/07/18, as included at the very back of this same WSP report document, the proposed overall red-line footprint for this construction's Site Boundary has the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ There are several instances of existing site designations, of varying categories, lying inside an assumed zone of approximately 2 kilometres around it. These are a Local Nature Reserve (LNR), a Nature Reserve, Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), Local Geological Sites (LGS), Potential Wildlife Sites (PWS), and Pocket Parks too. ■ The Site lies wholly inside an 'arm' of the Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area (NIA) zone. We are aware of a good number of historical records of sightings of 'protected species matters' within 2 kilometres away from the outline boundary of this overall proposed development area. <p>We strongly recommend that a GI approach be followed here. This process should be incorporated as an integral part of the EIA analysis. The key ecological aspect of GI that we would expect to see is the linking of existing and / or potential wildlife habitat within the Site and connections out of the Site to create more sustainable ecosystems. The Wildlife Trust strongly recommends that Green Infrastructure be afforded its own separate Chapter within the supporting ES / EIA documentation.</p> <p>Therefore, in-line with our previous comments, please note the repeated assertion that we are strongly of the view that this development proposal needs to consider the topic of GI as a fully-integrated, front-loaded and cross-cutting theme, both throughout, beyond and underpinning the whole site area, and that, in point-of-fact, the subject of GI, and indeed 'Blue Infrastructure' too, should be given the treatment of its own separate Chapter within the E.S. documentation.</p>	<p>Please refer to Chapter 7: Biodiversity (Volume II of the ES)</p> <p>Please refer to Appendix 7.15: Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment (Volume III of the ES)</p>

Consultee / Date of Response	Comments Provided in the Scoping Response	Consideration in the ES
<p>Daventry District Council / Response on 04/09/2018</p>	<p><u>Cultural Heritage</u></p> <p>6.2.1: Baseline conditions – refers to Northampton Borough Council but not Daventry District Council.</p> <p>6.2.2: The conservation areas for Harlestone, Boughton & Chapel Brampton, and Boughton’s registered park, should be included in the list (they are picked up in the LVIA chapter, but the cultural heritage chapter draws the boundary of the study area too narrowly. Only listed buildings in Harlestone are identified, but those in the other surrounding villages may also be affected by the proposals. They may need to consider the potential impact on the setting of more distant assets and elements of the historic landscape.</p> <p>6.3.3: Also need to consider impact on any undesignated heritage assets that are identified by the heritage assessment</p> <p>6.4.1: Needs to have regard to changes in the new/updated NPPF</p> <p>Planning practice guidance relating to conserving and enhancing the historic environment was updated February 2018</p> <p>Refer to Daventry District Council planning policy & guidance, instead/in addition to Northampton Borough Council</p> <p>Refer to Harlestone conservation area appraisal and management plan (can be downloaded from the Council’s website at: https://www.daventrydc.gov.uk/living/planning-policy/conservation-areas/).</p>	<p>A Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment has been compiled within the appendices that contains data on baseline conditions considered as part of the cultural heritage chapter.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage (Volume II of the ES)</p>
<p>Northampton Borough Council / Response 17/9/2018</p>	<p><u>Cultural Heritage</u></p> <p>It would be prudent to seek clarity regarding where the 1km is to be measured from, if the identified buffer zone on figure 3 includes all the circles and how the centre points for each circle has been determined as this will directly influence which heritage assets, both designated and non-designated, will need to be considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>This will then need to be reflected in the narrative which currently states that there are no conservation areas within a 1km study area. It is also likely to increase the number of listed buildings within the study area. The study should include both designated and non-designated assets. There are the remains of Upper Mill (corn) within/close to the Site and some surviving Ridge & Furrow.</p> <p>The Kingsthorpe Conservation Area Appraisal and Management plan identifies the location on sloping land on the edge of Northampton, overlooking the northern arm of the River Nene.</p>	<p>Please refer to Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage (Volume II of the ES)</p>

Consultee / Date of Response	Comments Provided in the Scoping Response	Consideration in the ES
Historic England / Response 28/09/2018	<p><u>Cultural Heritage</u></p> <p>This includes consideration of the impact of any associated ancillary infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The potential impact upon the landscape, especially if a site falls within an area of historic landscape; ■ Direct impacts on historic/archaeological fabric (buildings, sites or areas), whether statutorily protected or not; ■ Other impacts, particularly the setting of listed buildings, scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens, conservation areas etc., including long views and any specific designed views and vistas within historic designed landscapes. All grades of listed buildings should be identified. In some cases, inter-visibility between historic sites may be a significant issue; ■ The potential for buried archaeological remains; ■ Effects on landscape amenity from public and private land; and ■ Cumulative impacts. 	Please refer to Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage (Volume II of the ES)
Northamptonshire County Council / Response 3/10/2018	<p><u>Cultural Heritage</u></p> <p>Chapter 6 Cultural Heritage- I would expect the Desk based Assessment to include a full HER consultation with the HER not just a look at the online Heritage Gateway. The suggested search area of 300m is too narrow for undesignated assets. I would expect at least 500m or an area suggested by the Historic Environment Record officer. It is accepted within the EIA Scoping Report that a desk based assessment is insufficient to allow a full assessment of the archaeological potential along the route. I note however that the scoping document only suggests the undertaking of a geophysical survey Paragraph 6.4.6 to inform the Cultural Heritage chapter.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.4.12- without the undertaking of intrusive evaluation in the form of trial trenching it will not be possible to understand the nature, extent and preservation of the archaeological resource within the route. It will also not be possible to outline suitable mitigation measures without the results of the geophysical survey and trial trenching.</p> <p>It is expected that WSP 6.4.9 will consult with the County Archaeological Advisor with regard to all aspects of cultural heritage.</p>	Please refer to Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage (Volume II of the ES)
Daventry District Council / Response on 04/09/2018	<p><u>Geology and Soils</u></p> <p>8.2.10: The local Wildlife Trust (which has a service level agreement with Daventry District Council) should be consulted.</p> <p>8.2.11/12: The Daventry District Council Environmental Health Officer may be able to provide relevant information. There is no objection to the proposed methodology</p>	Please refer to Chapter 10: Geology and Soils (Volume II of the ES)

Consultee / Date of Response	Comments Provided in the Scoping Response	Consideration in the ES
Daventry District Council / Response on 04/09/2018	<p><u>Landscape and Visual</u></p> <p>The Daventry District Council Landscaper Officer should be involved in the establishment of the methodology, including the identification of viewpoints. 4.2.18, above, is also relevant.</p>	<p>Daventry district council have been consulted in relation to the viewpoints proposed as part of the Landscape and Visual chapter.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual (Volume II of the ES)</p>
Northampton Borough Council / Response 17/9/2018	<p><u>Landscape</u></p> <p>The broad approach is acceptable in principle. Proposed viewpoints should be agreed in advance with both the County Council Planning Services and Northampton Borough Council Planning.</p>	<p>Northampton Borough and the County Council have been consulted in relation to the viewpoints proposed as part of the Landscape and Visual chapter.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual (Volume II of the ES)</p>
Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridge and Northamptonshire / Response on 30/09/2018	<p><u>Landscape</u></p> <p>In a similar vein to the comment made immediately here above, and with reference to the Chapter headed as “Landscape and Visual”, Chapter 9, on Pages 51 to 55, inclusive, within this same report document, please note that we are also strongly of the view that the Planning Application for this NWRR development site area must clearly demonstrate how its own biodiversity enhancements, habitat retention / creation areas and GI provision are all going to knit with, and be entirely complementary to, the delivery / pre-existence of the other relevant qualifying areas all around it.</p>	<p>Please refer to Chapter 11: Landscape (Volume II of the ES)</p>
Boughton Parish Council / Response 18/09/2018	<p><u>Landscape</u></p> <p>Landscape and visual impact assessment to look at limiting the impact of the road on the landscape character.</p> <p>Assessment of the road levels so they do not impact on the landscape.</p>	<p>Please refer to Chapter 11: Landscape (Volume II of the ES)</p>
Daventry District Council / Response on 04/09/2018	<p><u>People and Communities</u></p> <p>12.2.6: A primary school is proposed as part of the JCS Policy N8 allocation.</p> <p>12.2.13: The receptors need to also include (a) the JCS Policy N8: Northampton North of Whitehills SUE (aka Buckton Fields) development (as partly constructed and proposed – see DA/2011/0666); and (b) an approved (on appeal) residential site on the west side of Welford Road. (See DA/2014/0521 and DA/2017/0551).</p> <p>Is it considered that ‘human health’ (per Regulation 4. (2) (a)) is covered sufficiently via other topic areas?</p>	<p>Please refer to Chapter 14: Population and human health (Volume II of the ES)</p>

Consultee / Date of Response	Comments Provided in the Scoping Response	Consideration in the ES
Network Rail / Response 02/10/2018	<p><u>People and Communities</u></p> <p>The diversion of the public footpath - HW44 away from the level crossing is progressed by the developer under s257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.</p> <p>Diversion of the footpath should be included as a planning condition should the development be granted planning consent.</p> <p>Closure of Dallington Level Crossing and the creation of the diversionary route must be completed prior to the occupation of the proposed new dwelling and this should be included as a condition.</p>	Please refer to Chapter 14: Population and human health (Volume II of the ES)
Daventry District Council / Response on 04/09/2018	<p><u>Other supporting documents</u></p> <p>14.1.1: 'Planning Policy Statements' no longer exist, of course – it is the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) + the related NPP Guidance. The planning statement needs to consider relevant saved Daventry District local plan policies and emerging Daventry District Council Part 2 Local Plan policies.</p>	Please refer to the Planning Statement (not part of the ES)
Highways England / Response 4/9/2018	<p><u>Transport</u></p> <p>An assessment of transport related impacts of the proposal should be carried out and reported as described in the Department for Transport (DfT) 'Guidance on Transport Assessment (GTA)' and in accordance with Circular 02/2013. It is noted that this guidance has been archived, however still provides a good practice guide in preparing a Transport Statement (TS) or Transport Assessment (TA). In addition, the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) also provide guidance on preparing Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Environmental impact arising from any disruption during construction, traffic volume, composition or routing change and transport infrastructure modification should be fully assessed and reported.</p>	A Transport Assessment has been completed and is identified within the appendices which indicates the transport impact arising from the proposed scheme. Please refer to Appendix 1.1: Transport Assessment (Volume III of the ES)
Highways England / Response 4/9/2018	<p><u>Traffic</u></p> <p>Highways England recommends the following site-specific considerations should inform the final EIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ We note that the proposed relief road is located approximately 7 Km away from the M1 Junction 23, therefore there is no shared boundary to be considered. ■ Whilst the proposed Relief Road will not in itself generate traffic movements, it will result in the re-distribution of traffic movements. We therefore advise you to assess the likelihood and effect of the re-distribution of traffic resulting from the relief road. At this stage, we consider that this assessment will need to include the potential impact of the proposals on the M1, Junction 16. ■ Furthermore, we advise the applicant to provide details regarding the potential impact of traffic on the M1 and A45 during the construction phases of the relief road. This should include details of HGV trips during the construction period and the routing to and from the Site. 	A Transport Assessment has been completed and is identified within the appendices which indicates the transport impact arising from the proposed scheme. Please refer to Appendix 1.1: Transport Assessment (Volume III of the ES)

Consultee / Date of Response	Comments Provided in the Scoping Response	Consideration in the ES
<p>Northamptonshire County Council / Response 2408/2018</p>	<p>Traffic</p> <p>The EIA scoping report does not include a 'Transport' Chapter in order to consider the proposed methodology of the EIA assessment required from a transport perspective. In the 'Other Supporting documents' section it references the provision of a 'Transport Statement' which is a lesser general document, rather than a 'Transport Assessment' which as you are aware is very detailed, the report then goes on to list the criteria necessary for a 'Transport Assessment'. There is clearly some confusion in the document as to the transportation requirements of an EIA. To clarify, the LHA expects a full Transport Assessment (TA) to be produced, which would normally form the 'Transport Chapter' of the EIA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The LHA expect the TA to be Scoped out with NH Development Management. · The transport modelling will require the use of the NSTM to assess the wider implications of the proposed scheme. · The traffic flows taken from the NSTM will need to be agreed with NH Development Management before any detailed design work is undertaken. · NH Development Management will need to check if the distribution and reassigned trips across the local highway network are likely to be accurate & realistic assumptions. · The impacts of the proposed development in this north-western area of the town as a result of the road scheme being implemented will inevitably require mitigation; particularly on Boughton Lane; where dualling may be necessary, & also on the A508 Harborough Road mitigation will be sought. A scheme will also need to be developed to manage the traffic eastwards beyond the A508. · The design of the proposed road and junctions will need to comply with NCC Development Management Standards, please ask the applicant to refer to Development Management for the advice. · The TA will also need to consider the impact of construction traffic on the local highway network; to that end an agreed with DM Routing Agreement will need to form part of the necessary Construction Traffic Management Plan, this document will be sought by way of a planning Condition, however early discussion and agreement would be welcomed by this authority. 	<p>A Transport Assessment has been completed and is identified within the appendices which indicates the transport impact arising from the proposed scheme.</p> <p>Please refer to Appendix 1.1: Transport Assessment (Volume III of the ES)</p>

Environment Agency
/ Response on
04/09/2018

Road Drainage and the Water Environment

The proposed route is on land located within Flood Zone 3 and defined by the Environment Agency Flood Map as having a high and medium probability of flooding. Paragraph 163, footnote 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires applicants for planning permission to submit a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) when development is proposed in such locations.

Following the significant flooding to Northampton town centre in Easter 1998 improvements were made to the defences along the River Nene. To secure the level of protection afforded by the new defence we have agreed with the West Northants Joint Planning Unit that the standards set for new development should also be improved, beyond industry standards.

Therefore, all new development in the Upper Nene catchment will be designed for a flood with a 0.5% probability (1 in 200 chance) occurring in any year, including an appropriate allowance for climate change. This includes design of mitigation for main river flooding and any surface water attenuation. This applies across the whole of the Upper Nene catchment including all branches and arms of the Nene, upstream of Billing Aquadrome, and all tributaries such as Wootton Brook, Dallington Brook and Bugbrooke Brook.

It is recommended that any main river crossings are clear span (no piers in the river). If the road is classified as essential infrastructure it should not flood in the 0.1% (1 in 1000) plus climate event.

The soffit of the structures should be a minimum of 600mm above the 0.5% (1 in 200) plus climate change flood level and no lower than 300 mm above either of the upstream banktops.

The structures should provide a minimum of 8m flat working area either side for (maintenance) vehicular access along banks. With a 3m headroom.

The road should cross the floodplain in the most direct route possible to reduce the impact on flood levels and flows. The road within the floodplain may require flood relief culverts.

The majority of the proposed road appears to be located in flood zone 3. And parallel to the Brampton Branch of the River Nene, this means the floodplain of the river will be restricted. The road should not block flood water flowing into its natural floodplain.

There should be no loss of floodplain as a result of the proposed road and the FRA should provide further details on any raising or lowering of land within the floodplain.

Any loss of floodplain should be compensated for on a level for level, volume for volume basis (i.e. re-grade the land at the same level as that taken up by the development) therefore providing a direct replacement for the lost storage volume. Within the FRA, detailed information must be provided to demonstrate how this can be achieved. For further advice and guidance on the provision of floodplain

A Flood Risk Assessment and associated modelling has been undertaken for the proposed scheme as identified in the appendices in addition to a Water Framework Directive Assessment which is appended to the water chapter of the Environmental Statement.

Please refer to Chapter 15: Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Volume II of the ES)

Please refer to Appendix 15.1: WFD Assessment (Volume III of the ES)

Please refer to Appendix 15.3: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Volume III of the ES)

Consultee / Date of Response	Comments Provided in the Scoping Response	Consideration in the ES
	<p>compensation, please refer to direct replacement of flood storage within Section A3.3.10 Compensatory Flood Storage</p> <p>of CIRIA Guide C624: Development and Flood Risk, guidance for the construction industry.</p> <p>The Upper Nene 2016 model is now available. The main purpose of this model update was to refine the operation of specific structures. The opportunity was taken to include reruns for the latest climate change allowances, however the model was not updated for this purpose and is not capable of performing beyond the 0.1% with 25% increase in flows.</p> <p>We would wish to agree the scope of the modelling work prior to any work taking place. Please submit a model scope in which you set out how you intend to update the model to demonstrate that there is no increase in flood risk either upstream or downstream and no loss of floodplain storage or channel capacity as a result of the proposed works.</p> <p>Once this scope has been submitted, we can ask our Modelling team to review this. Updated guidance on how climate change could affect flood risk to new development - 'Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances' was published on gov.uk on 19 February 2016. Any modelling should include hydraulic modelling and sensitivity testing to take account of this. At this stage a meeting or teleconference can be arranged if our Modelling team deem it necessary.</p>	
<p>Boughton Parish Council / Response 18/09/2018</p>	<p><u>Road Drainage and the Water Environment</u></p> <p>Drainage assessment as the road crosses flood plain.</p>	<p>Road drainage has been considered as part of the design for the proposed scheme within the Water chapter.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 15: Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Volume II of the ES)</p>
<p>Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridge and Northamptonshire / Response on 30/09/2018</p>	<p><u>Climate Change</u></p> <p>With reference to the content of Chapter 5, "Climate Change", on Pages 21 to 27, inclusive, The Wildlife Trust would wish to recommend that the cross-cutting theme and subject-matter of the proposed development's possible impacts upon, and contributions to, the adaptation to climate change effects would indeed be important to be included within this same EIA documentation too.</p>	<p>A climate change chapter has been produced which assesses the implications of the proposed scheme upon the climate relating to the scheme.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 8: Climate Change (Volume II of the ES)</p>