



Department for Transport

Jane Osayimwen
Greater Cambridge Partnership
Shire Hall
Castle Hill
Cambridge
CB3 0AP
VIA EMAIL

Natasha Kopala
Transport Infrastructure Planning Unit
Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London
SW1P 4DR

E-mail: transportinfrastructure@dft.gov.uk

Web Site: www.dft.gov.uk

Our Ref: TWA/2/2/166
Your Ref: ESR15001

27 November 2020

Dear Jane,

TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT (APPLICATIONS AND OBJECTIONS PROCEDURE) (ENGLAND AND WALES) RULES 2006

PROPOSED CAMBRIDGE SOUTH EAST TRANSPORT (PHASE 2) SCHEME

1. I refer to your letter of 15 October 2020 requesting a scoping opinion under rule 8 of the above Rules.

2. You enclosed with your letter an Environmental Scoping Report dated 13 October 2020 ('403394-MMD-ENV-00-RP-EN-0436_E CSET Phase 2 Environmental Scoping Report') which describes the proposed scope of and methodology for the Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") of this scheme. This will be reported in the Environmental Statement ("ES") to accompany an application for an Order under the Transport and Works Act 1992 to authorise the scheme. The intended scheme would involve the necessary works and land acquisition powers required to enable the Greater Cambridge Partnership ("the Applicant") to construct a public transport and non-motorised user route from Cambridge to Babraham and a travel hub at the Babraham end of this route.

3. We have considered your request for an opinion on the proposed scope of the EIA in accordance with rule 8 of the above Rules. In formulating the scoping opinion, we have consulted the following organisations and have considered their responses:

- Natural England
- The Environment Agency
- Historic England
- Cambridgeshire County Council
- Greater Cambridge Shared Planning ("GCSP", on behalf of Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council)
- Network Rail
- Highways England

4. Responses were received from all consultees. Copies of the consultation responses are included with this letter, the contents of which should be noted.

5. The response from GCSP also included the responses of their consultation with Cambridge International Airport, the Defence Infrastructure Organisation, Stapleford Parish Council, and Cambridge Past, Present and Future (“CPPF”). Additionally, CPPF forwarded their response to the Secretary of State.

6. The Secretary of State has considered the assessment of potentially significant effects of the scheme set out in section 6 to 18 of the Scoping Report. Subject to the comments in paragraphs 10 to 39 below, he agrees with the scope of the EIA outlined in the Scoping Report.

7. The responses include several detailed comments on and questions arising from the Scoping Report including suggestions as to the content of the ES, the criteria that should be used to assess the baseline and significance of impacts and the sensitivity of receptors, guidance that should be referred to, and the extent and methodology of ecological and other surveys that should be carried out. You should review these responses in carrying out the EIA and in preparing the ES for this scheme.

8. Please note that this scoping opinion is given without prejudice to our consideration of any Order application which may be made for the scheme. The giving of the opinion implies no view on the Department’s part about the merits or otherwise of the scheme.

9. The Secretary of State considers that the following matters should also be addressed in the ES, some of which you may already be intending to address. References in brackets are to paragraphs in the Scoping Report.

General

10. The ES should provide full details of the scheme including more detail on the Travel Hub, as outlined in the consultation response from GCSP.

11. The ES should also provide details on how many vehicles and passengers are expected to use the high quality public transport, and the hours and days of operation initially and in the future.

Cumulative Impact Assessment (Chapter 4, section 6)

12. The ES should clarify how it proposes to consider the combined effects of individual environmental topics (4.6.1), particularly with regard to health, quality of life and amenity as set out in the consultation response from GCSP.

13. It is noted that the Scoping Report refers to the proposed Cambridge South station, but this is not included in the list of schemes in Table 4.3. The cumulative assessment should take account of Network Rail’s planned Cambridge South Infrastructure Enhancements scheme of which Cambridge South Station is part.

14. Noting the lead applicant for this scheme will be Cambridgeshire County Council, agreement to the list of projects to be assessed cumulatively should be sought from the relevant local authorities.

Air quality (Chapter 6)

15. The air quality assessment should include an analysis of the impact of the additional heavy duty vehicles travelling into central Cambridge and into the Cambridge Air Quality Management Area. It should also include consideration of infrastructure requirements for charging electric buses if relevant, including potential grid capacity constraints.

16. The Applicant should provide justification for 2015 being used as a base year for the air quality assessment, as suggested in section 17.4.1.

Biodiversity (Chapter 7)

17. Under table 7.1, the relevant survey guidance for designated sites for bats should refer to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 115 rather than the 2009 guidance.

Community and Human Health (Chapter 9)

18. In relation to section 9.4.2.2, consideration should be given to access to open space and recreation, and access to healthcare facilities.

19. Consideration should be given to operational noise and potential health impacts.

Historic Environment (Chapter 10)

20. The assessment should use a historic environment study area of radius 1.5km from the scheme as the baseline for the EIA, as set out in Historic England's comments.

21. The ES should include a photomontage taken from the Church of St Andrew in Stapleford, to better allow the assessment of visual impacts on its setting and the Stapleford Conservation Area.

22. Any intrusive archaeological investigation carried out as part of the archaeological assessment (10.4.1) should follow the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' 'Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation' (December 2014).

23. The Conservation Officer and archaeological staff at the relevant District and County Councils should continue to be consulted in the development of this assessment.

Landscape and Visual (Chapter 11)

24. The Applicant should provide an Environmental Lighting Impact Assessment (ELIA) as part of the Environmental Statement, covering the likely lighting effects that would result from the construction and operation of the scheme, as detailed in the consultation response from GCSP.

25. If the visibility of lighting apparatus has not been included in the zone of theoretical visibility (ZTV), the landscape and visual impact assessment should consider the effect of lighting on receptors outside the 2km study boundary.

26. The Applicant should clarify for what stage in the development the ZTV has been chosen. The Applicant should further consider developing separate zones for the date of opening and year 15 of operation, in order to show the impacts of mitigation and changes to the ZTV in the long term.

27. The potential for adverse effects on users of public spaces should be considered alongside the other visual effects discussed in section 11.6.1.

Noise and Vibration (Chapter 12)

28. The baseline noise survey (12.5) should be compliant with BS7445 or similar.

29. The EIA should consider relative increases above the existing baseline noise level ('BNL'), in addition to the proposed use of LOAELs and SOAELs. Relative increases above BNL should be assessed separately in the short and long term, and changes above or below BNL should be reported.

30. If the noise levels in 12.4.3.1 are used in the EIA, full justification for their source and selection should be provided.

31. Noting that BS5228:2009+A1:2014 has maximum levels for vibration but not for airborne noise, the EIA should consider the potential for and the impact of maximum levels of airborne noise (L_{Amax}) if night-time works are envisaged.

32. The EIA should consider noise impacts on external amenity areas (such as public open spaces and private gardens) as per BS8233:2014 in addition to the proposed consideration of impacts at or near building facades.

Soils, Geology and Land Contamination (Chapter 14)

33. The ES should contain a detailed assessment for each historic landfill site on or near the proposed route, including: assessment of associated potential pollution risks based on investigations, precautions around landfill gas and leachate, and investigation and engineering to protect the scheme from these risks.

34. The EIA should provide a piling risk assessment, including baseline monitoring, to confirm that any piling will not cause adverse effects, including turbidity.

35. The Applicant should provide evidence to support the decision to scope out geological impacts on a regional level.

Water Resources and Flood Risk (Chapter 15)

36. The EIA should provide a Phase I Contaminated Land Assessment, including a desk study, conceptual model and initial assessment of risk. This should ensure that the risks to controlled waters are understood and can be addressed should potential pollutant linkages be identified.

37. The potential for contamination and any risks arising should be properly assessed and assurance provided that the necessary expertise has informed this assessment.


38. Given that the route passes near or over the River Granta, Nine Wells and Hobson's Brook, is located in groundwater protection zones SPZ2 and SPZ3, and is underlain by the Cam and Ely Ouse Chalk groundwater body, impacts on groundwater and surface water should not be scoped out.

39. The Applicant should clarify what 'significant' below-ground works means in section 15.6.1, and whether dewatering would be required. If dewatering is required, the EIA should assess the impacts of this.

Distribution

40. Copies of this letter are being sent to those organisations which were consulted on the request for a scoping opinion, as listed at the beginning of this letter.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'N. Kopala'.

Natasha Kopala