

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Table 1 Responses to the overarching Interim Review Response on the 2019 ES and the 2020 Scoping Opinion comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	Please explain what meanwhile uses are proposed, in what development zone, what use, and maximum/indicative floor area. What impacts would this lead to (across all ES chapters)?	Meanwhile uses are described in Chapter 4: The Site and the Proposed Development. These works are likely to include minor vehicular access arrangements, ground works, setting up of construction compounds and other works required for the delivery of the development. The temporary use of spaces would not introduce new uses or development that is not assessed in the full build-out scenario.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	Describe where the information related to construction activities can be found in order to understand its potential for significant effects	Key construction assumptions are provided in Chapter 4: The Site and the Proposed Development. Where relevant, further information and assumptions are provided in the topic chapters. ES Appendix 4.17, the Code of Construction Practice, also provides the construction assumptions.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	How has the maximum and minimum population been assessed, given the range of provision in residential unit sizes?	The worst-case parameters and Rochdale Envelope approach are described in Chapter 2: EIA Approach and Methodology. A household density of 2.4 persons per dwelling has been assumed to inform assessment of socio-economic effects (Chapter 14) to support the OPA. This is considered a reasonable assumption to use in estimating social infrastructure need in the absence of more detailed understanding of the housing mix.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	Within the proposed residential mix, what is the range of assisted/sheltered accommodation proposed, and how does this affect other elements in the ES, such as employment, local spending and transport.	The overall level of affordable housing is 22%, as set out in the Housing Strategy. The minimum and maximum parameters of affordable housing are provided in Table 4-3 and Table 4-4 of this ES. The worst-case scenario is described in Chapter 2: EIA Approach and Methodology. The socio-economic

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
			impact assessment (Chapter 14) assumes 22% affordable housing.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	What tertiary education facilities are proposed and how has this been assessed?	There are no tertiary education facilities as part of the proposed Development, and reference to this has been removed from the ES.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	How has the flexibility in health centre requirements been assessed in the ES?	The socio-economic assessment (Chapter 14) assesses healthcare centre needs arising from the proposed Development based on a monitor and manage approach up to agreed “worst case” caps.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	How was worst-case car/cycle parking assessed, if these details will be provided at RMA stage?	The TA is based upon trip generation according to floorspace and land use class. The principles for car and cycle parking are set out in the Transport Assessment and Transport Strategy. Details are to be confirmed at the Reserved Matters Application stage for each phase that comes forward, in line with the three tier consenting approach.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	How will the required 11km long water main be assessed with respect to its potential for significant effects as part of, or in combination with, the scheme?	An assessment of the off-site infrastructure required for the proposed Development has been undertaken in ES Appendix 4.7.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	How have the three wastewater treatment options been assessed?	The preferred option selected is to dispose of wastewater by a new purpose built onsite Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) in a defined location in the northwest corner of the site. Additionally, disposal of the wastewater off-site to the Southern Water’s existing Sellindge Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW), located approximately 1 km northwest of the site, may come forward after the initial development phase of the WWTW following resolution of nutrient neutrality issues. This would involve upgrading Sellindge WWTW. As such, permission for options is no longer sought and the ES assesses the proposed location for

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
			the WWTW and the disposal off-site. Consideration of the land-based impacts associated with the off-site works is located in ES Appendix 4.7.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	To what part of the buildings are the maximum heights measured?	It is stated in Chapter 4: The Site and the Proposed Development that 'The heights are maximums and will be up to and including roof ridge lines.'
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	Which are the correct phasing plans?	This chapter has been updated, and the comment is no longer applicable.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	The NTS should consistently describe the residual effects, the cumulative assessment and where the ES can be viewed in full.	The NTS from the 2019 ES has been revised, and provides a consistent description of the residual effects including cumulative effects and highlighting those which are significant. A link to the full ES is provided.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	Please clarify the compatibility between allotment and SuDS uses shown on the image above, as well as the flooding risks to the existing housing on the western edge of Lympne.	This comment is no longer applicable to the updated application as the layout has been revised so that there is no conflict between the proposed orchard/allotment land use and the area demarked for infiltration SuDS features. As the SuDS solution in this area is infiltration based (replicating how this land would currently drain), there would be no areas of open/standing water to pose a flood risk to the existing properties on the western edge of Lympne.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	Explain how the reasonable worst-case effects have been assessed and how flexibility has been allowed for in the scheme.	Chapter 2: EIA Approach and Methodology provides a description of how the reasonable worst-case has been derived. Flexibility has been allowed for by virtue of the agreed three tier consenting approach, the Development Specification, Parameter Plans and Strategic Design Principles which accompanies the Plans. The three-tier approach to consents is

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	Provide an assessment of intra-project cumulative effects	<p>explained in Chapter 2: EIA Approach and Methodology.</p> <p>Intra-project cumulative effects are assessed within the topic chapters of the ES, the location of intra-project cumulative effects assessments is referred to in Chapter 2: EIA Approach and Methodology.</p>
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple IRR April 2019	Provide justification for the large study area and the scale of schemes considered, whilst apparently not including the balance of homes from the OFMA and the associated/enabling development (water and waste water connections).	<p>The study area has been selected to encompass the largest topic study area. Further explanation of the rationale for the selection of cumulative schemes is provided in the Cumulative assessment subsections of ES Chapters as appropriate to the topic being assessed.</p> <p>The Framework Masterplan has been assessed as a cumulative scheme in all relevant topic chapters, and off-site infrastructure has been assessed within ES Appendix 4.7</p>
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	Enabling infrastructure for the development will include three road bridges across the River Stour, highway improvements to junction 11 of the M20, access to the A20 and to Westenhanger Station. It is possible but 'highly unlikely' that the Proposed Development may include an energy centre. All works associated with the scheme should be assessed in the ES, even if they are to be secured by a separate planning application. All enabling infrastructure should be clearly described in the ES, and the environmental impacts of that infrastructure should be considered.	<p>Table 4-5 of Chapter 4: The Site and the Proposed Development sets out the potential infrastructure requirements and the triggers for those infrastructure requirements. Table 4-5 is subdivided into on-site infrastructure and off-site infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>On-site infrastructure set out in the table has been assessed in this ES.</p> <p>Those infrastructure elements outside the application site boundary have been assessed within ES Appendix 4.7. Due to the uncertainty surrounding the off-site works a number of assumptions have been made, these are detailed in ES Appendix 4.7.</p>

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	Baseline data used for the previous 2019 Application should be ‘in date’ and updated, if required.	Generally, the baseline data for the topic has been updated to comprise the most recently available data to ensure robustness. Where this approach has differed for topics, e.g. transport, this has been described in the relevant topic chapter.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	As this is an outline application, there will be flexibility in the parameters presented. The Scoping Report commits to assessing the worst case scenario in line with ‘Rochdale Envelope’ principles. The parameters for assessment of the outline scheme elements should be clearly set out and should consider flexibility in size, massing, unit mix, tenure mix, provision of community facilities such as healthcare and education, and flexibility in commercial/retail use classes.	Chapter 2: EIA Approach and Methodology describes how the Rochdale Envelope has been applied to this EIA.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	FHDC underscores its previous advice that flexibility regarding phasing (and otherwise) is acceptable for EIA purposes provided the following is the case: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the ES is clearly based on that level of flexibility so that chapter authors have reflected it in their reports; and • a form of condition is developed and imposed on the permission which provides a clear mechanism for phases to come forward 	Chapter 2: EIA Approach and Methodology describes how the Rochdale Envelope has been applied to this EIA.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	The Applicant should make clear what assumptions are being made as to phasing. These should include any “fixes” which are relevant to phasing and which are included in the proposal e.g. in the parameter plans, the design and access principles (in the Spatial Principles document), or in the mitigation measures being recommended	There are no spatial or temporal phasing fixes for the development. The timing of infrastructure delivery will be managed through triggers as set out in Section 4.3 of this ES, that will be imposed as planning condition(s) on any planning permission granted.

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	The 2020 Scoping Report notes that there is a relatively long construction timeframe (25 years) and phasing is not known. A reasonable worst case scenario approach should be taken to construction phasing, taking into account early phase occupation as well as the order in which retail and community infrastructure is delivered, which will have implications particularly for noise, air quality, traffic, socioeconomics, health, and landscape and visual impact. We recommend a section or broader commentary explaining how reasonable worst case assessments have been derived and whether any sensitivity testing has been applied to allow for flexibility within any future uses. Specific comments relating to phasing are provided in the topic sections below.	Chapter 2: EIA Approach and Methodology describes how the Rochdale envelope has been applied to this EIA. It is noted that the construction programme has been altered since submission of the scoping report, and is now anticipated to be of 19 years duration for the proposed Development.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	Any highway, junction or footpath improvements, and any enabling other infrastructure beyond the main development site needs to be assessed and the existing red line boundary extended if the improvements are for approval as part of the same consent.	Off-site infrastructure will not be delivered through the same consent. An assessment of the environmental impacts of the off-site infrastructure has been provided within ES Appendix 4.7.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	A draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) should be submitted with the ES for approval to evidence delivery of construction mitigation measures. A more detailed CoCP or Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will likely be required at the start of each phase of work.	An Outline CoCP is provided as ES Appendix 4.17. Detailed CoCPs will be provided at Tier 3 stage application submissions.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	It should be clearly stated in the ES whether the energy centre will provide for the whole development. The ES should contain sufficient details of the type of energy generating facility being proposed and an assessment of environmental effects. If a temporary solution is required because of phasing, this also needs to be assessed.	The proposed Development does not include an Energy Centre.

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	The 2020 Scoping Report notes that main alternative designs will be discussed; however, the 2017 EIA Regulations require a description of 'reasonable alternatives' including a comparison of the environmental effects.	Chapter 3: Development Need and Consideration of Alternatives provides a description of the 'reasonable alternatives' considered in line with the EIA Regulations.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	The do-nothing scenario should also be presented.	The 'do-nothing' scenario is considered and is presented in Chapter 3: Development Need and Consideration of Alternatives.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	It is accepted that further detail [on mitigation] will be provided at later design stages. However, sufficient detail must be provided on operational mitigation to fully justify any reported residual effects. It should be made clear where this would need to be secured by condition.	All topic chapters provide sufficient information to secure the mitigation relied upon. The summary table of each topic chapter provides a summary of the mitigation required and the anticipated mechanism for securing such mitigation.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	It is stated that mitigation measures for the construction phase effects would be included in a CoCP. This may not be appropriate for some mitigation measures, for example where the responsibility for mitigation measures may fall with someone else other than the principal contractor. If mitigation measures need to be secured by pre-commencement conditions, this should be made clear.	All topic chapters provide sufficient information to secure the mitigation relied upon. The summary table of each topic chapter provides a summary of the mitigation required and the anticipated mechanism (and its timing where relevant) for securing such mitigation.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	Residual effects from enhancement measures will be presented in the ES as beneficial effects. Enhancement measures should be treated in the ES the same as mitigation measures: pre-enhancement and residual effects should both be reported so that the contribution of the enhancement measure can be understood. The assessment of residual effects after an enhancement measure should follow the standard methodology for that topic area; it is likely but not necessarily guaranteed that an enhancement measure would result in a beneficial effect	This methodology in relation to enhancement measures is the same as has been undertaken for mitigation measures.

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	Interactive effects will be considered in the ES. It is noted that interactive effects will also be presented in the socio-economic chapter where they are considered to cause a nuisance during construction. These should nonetheless be presented alongside all other interactive effects for ease of navigation	Intra-project cumulative effects are assessed within the topic chapters of the ES, the location of the assessment of intra-project cumulative effects is signposted to in Chapter 2: EIA Approach and Methodology.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	It is noted that an extant planning permission for a materials recycling facility and anaerobic digestion plant at Otterpool Quarry is situated within the red line boundary and that the Applicant proposes to justify the loss of this facility rather than accommodate a development buffer around it. If this approach is revised prior to planning submission, and the facility is expected to be developed, the cumulative impact of this facility and the Proposed Development should be assessed	The Permitted Waste Facility has been considered as a cumulative scheme as set out in Chapter 2: EIA Approach and Methodology, and assessed in the topic chapters. Alternative parameter plans have been prepared (ES Appendix 2.8) for the scenario in which the Permitted Waste Facility is built out, these have informed the cumulative assessments undertaken in the topic chapters.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	The ES will need to provide clear justification for the inclusion or exclusion of cumulative schemes identified within the 10 km radius.	All topic chapters provide a summary of the cumulative schemes assessed, and justification for the inclusion and exclusion of the schemes.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	Two different cumulative scenarios are presented within the 2020 Scoping Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Proposed Development and the rest of the Framework Masterplan (a further 1,500 homes); and • the Proposed Development, Framework Masterplan and cumulative schemes beyond the masterplan boundary. While it is accepted that the cumulative assessment of the Proposed Development and wider Framework Masterplan may be useful in understanding the effect of the Masterplan as a whole, any summaries of cumulative effects should place primary importance on the cumulative effect of the Proposed Development, Framework Masterplan, and all relevant committed or reasonably foreseeable schemes.	The cumulative assessment approach is set out in Chapter 2: EIA Approach and Methodology.

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	The cumulative assessment should also include reasonably foreseeable schemes which are not yet consented. This may include schemes which are submitted, and those part of “adopted and emerging development plans.”	The list of cumulative developments, as provided in ES Appendix 2.5, includes schemes which are submitted and those that are part of adopted and emerging development plans.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	The Applicant will need to monitor the status of all proposals before submitting the ES to confirm whether they should form part of the cumulative assessment and reflect the most up to date proposals.	A review of the cumulative developments has been completed in October 2021, and has been frozen as of this date to allow completion of the assessments.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	The ES will need to clearly set out details of any difficulties encountered in compiling the ES and those assumptions upon which the assessments have been based. This will be particularly important given the outline nature of the planning application.	Limitations and assumptions of the assessment are identified where relevant in the ES.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	Assumptions around land use should be clearly defined for the assessment, including the location of the industrial energy centre.	The proposed Development is described in Chapter 4: The Site and the Proposed Development, the assessment has been based on the parameter plans and proposed land use schedule as defined by the Development Specification. There is no industrial energy centre included in the proposed Development.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	It would aid understanding if some of the figures were presented throughout the main text. If they are to be presented in a separate volume, care should be taken to ensure referencing is correct and figures are easy to find. This is particularly important if Volume 2, as a digital document, needs to be split for the purposes of submission. All figures must be clearly legible on the digital version of the ES.	Figures are clearly referenced within the ES.

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	The NTS should summarise all the information presented in paragraphs 1-8 of Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations. It should therefore provide all the pre-mitigation effects, required mitigation and enhancement measures, and residual effects for each chapter, including cumulative effects.	The Non-Technical Summary is provided as Volume 1 of this ES and is considered to satisfy the requirements of the EIA Regulations.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	It is noted that the Sustainability Strategy, Energy Strategy, Equalities Impact Assessment, Design and Access Statement, Spatial Principles Document, Green Infrastructure Strategy, Heritage Strategy and Planning Statement will be submitted separately to the ES but contain information relevant to the environmental effects of the ES. Relevant information from these documents should be included in the ES where it is necessary to understand the effects of the Proposed Development; it should be possible to fully understand the nature of the development and its effects without reference to planning documents outside the ES.	All information required to understand the proposed Development as assessed in the ES is provided in the ES, with specific reference to Chapter 4: The Site and the Proposed Development. Relevant strategies and assessments are appended to the ES. Further information if relevant to a single topic assessment is provided in the relevant topic chapter.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	As the application will be made in outline, the ES should pay particular attention to ensuring that the reasonable worst case scenario is considered for all topic chapters in line with 'Rochdale Envelope' principles. The comparatively long duration of the construction period requires careful assessment of interim scenarios where both construction and occupation are occurring on Site, with sufficient information provided about construction phasing to support the basis of assessment.	Chapter 2: EIA Approach and Methodology describes how the Rochdale Envelope has been applied to this EIA, including assessment of a construction peak year..
Historic England	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	Section 2.1.5: Westenhanger Castle is both a grade I listed building and scheduled monument; this should be clarified here.	This comment applied to the Scoping Report text only, and therefore no updates have been required.
Historic England	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	Section 3.2.2: We note the quantum of overall development has increased slightly from the previous proposal. It will be necessary to assess whether there is any additional heritage impact from this.	The heritage assessment contained in Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage is based on the proposed Development as presented in Chapter 4: Description of the Site and Proposed Development.

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
Historic England	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	<p>Section 3.2.4 outlines that 'Character areas' are anticipated to be created across the site (named Town Centre, Westenhanger, Riverside, Otterpool Slopes, Woodland, Hillside, and Valley & Woodland Edges); these are illustrated in Figure 3 [of the Scoping Report].</p> <p>It is not clear to us how these Character areas relate to the known (and emerging) heritage significance of the development site, and the Historic Environment Framework that is in preparation. At present they appear to be concepts imposed on a landscape with significant historic importance. The HEF and any new assessment/fieldwork results should be used as the springboard from which to make design decisions. This will be essential to ensure the character areas respond to heritage sensitivities and are translated meaningfully into the relevant Master Plans for the castle and park.</p>	<p>The DAS and Strategic Design Principles document defined Character Areas, where the design of new architecture, landscape and public realm will be derived from and appropriate to the existing heritage features and historic landscape in that area. These have altered slightly since the 2020 scoping report and they now correspond with the indicative construction phases. The 8 CAs evolved from the 20 distinct landscape areas identified in the LVIA which took much inspiration from the historic landscape and the emerging research that the project was carrying out (especially in the area of the Castle's deerpark).</p> <p>The CAs recognise the Distinctive Character of the site and its heritage-rich context. The CAs were created relating to and taking influence from the existing landscape, historic landscape and retained natural features.</p> <p>The Heritage Strategy (what the Scoping Opinion comment refers to as the HEF) has been formulated since the LVIA was carried out and has had (and will continue to have) a large influence on the landscape led design of Otterpool Park. The importance of the settings of key heritage features, in particular the designated features, and the need for green, pleasant, and welcoming spaces to appreciate the features has led to the creation of green spaces that have heritage at their centre. Even the drainage has been influenced by the heritage, with significant water and ecological features, including the former Folkestone Racecourse Lake, being incorporated into the system.</p>
Historic England	Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020	Section 3.2.7 notes that Westenhanger Castle is adjacent to and north of the site; this needs updating as the castle is now within the development boundary.	This comment applied to the Scoping Report text only, and therefore no updates have been required.

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
<p>Countryside Access Improvement Plan Officer, KCC</p>	<p>Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020</p>	<p>2.1 – 2.2 Site Location / Surrounding Area</p> <p>Public Bridleways HE271, HE271A, HE317 and Public Footpaths HE221A, HE274, HE275, HE277 HE281, HE302, HE303, HE314, HE315, HE316 and HE371 would all be directly affected by proposed development.</p> <p>We would request specific mention of the PROW network in these paragraphs as it provides an important facet of the area, within and adjacent to the development site.</p>	<p>These public rights of way have been identified in Chapter 4: The Site and the Proposed Development.</p>
<p>Natural England, Sustainable Development Team</p>	<p>Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020</p>	<p>4. Access and Recreation</p> <p>Natural England encourages any proposal to incorporate measures to help encourage people to access the countryside for quiet enjoyment. Measures such as reinstating existing footpaths together with the creation of new footpaths and bridleways are to be encouraged. Links to other green networks and, where appropriate, urban fringe areas should also be explored to help promote the creation of wider green infrastructure. Relevant aspects of local authority green infrastructure strategies should be incorporated where appropriate.</p>	<p>The Green Infrastructure Strategy contains this information, submitted as ES Appendix 4.11.</p>
<p>Natural England, Sustainable Development Team</p>	<p>Temple Scoping Opinion July 2020</p>	<p>8. Cumulative and in-combination effects</p> <p>A full consideration of the implications of the whole scheme should be included in the ES. All supporting infrastructure should be included within the assessment.</p> <p>The ES should include an impact assessment to identify, describe and evaluate the effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with other projects and activities that are being, have been or will be carried out. The following types of projects should be included in such an assessment, (subject to available information):</p>	<p>The cumulative assessment approach is set out in Chapter 2: EIA Approach and Methodology and aligns with the approach described. An assessment of supporting infrastructure off-site is provided as Appendix 4.7</p>

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
		<p>a. existing completed projects; b. approved but uncompleted projects; c. ongoing activities; d. plans or projects for which an application has been made and which are under consideration by the consenting authorities; and e. plans and projects which are reasonably foreseeable, i.e. projects for which an application has not yet been submitted, but which are likely to progress before completion of the development and for which sufficient information is available to assess the likelihood of cumulative and in-combination effects.</p>	
F&HDC	Scoping Opinion Addendum Response, Email, 27 October 2021	The red line boundary amendments are relatively minor and we are content that they would not affect the scope of the EIA.	Noted
F&HDC	Scoping Opinion Addendum Response, Email, 27 October 2021	<p>It is understood that works on Westenhanger Castle will not be included in the planning application. They therefore cannot be included as embedded mitigation measures against the harm caused to the setting of the castle.</p> <p>Improvements to Westenhanger Castle that can be considered additional mitigation measures would be limited to restoration works – as the effects of anything else, such as new uses, should be assessed as part of the ‘ES Project’.</p> <p>To include these in the ES without including new uses of the castle etc would only be acceptable if any restoration works are entirely independent of the new proposed uses of the castle, which is considered unlikely based on what we’ve seen on the project to date.</p> <p>Otherwise, one of two options should be proposed, either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A worst case (or Rochdale) scenario of new uses for the castle should be assessed, even if they aren’t part of the planning application, because they would still be considered part of the EIA project. This way, restoration of, and new uses for, the castle can be included as mitigation. 	A revised approach to Westenhanger Castle has been taken in the assessment following this feedback, this approach is set out in Chapter 2: EIA Methodology and Approach.

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
		<p>2. The effects of Otterpool Park on Westenhanger Castle should be assessed absent of any work on Westenhanger Castle, including restoration and new uses.</p> <p>For these two options the LPA recommendation is Option 1 and we refer to our previous advice contained within the M&R Heritage Note dated July 2020.</p>	
F&HDC	Scoping Opinion Addendum Response, Email, 27 October 2021	The LPA strongly recommends a summary table is included outlining all the proposed mitigation and monitoring measures so that it is clear to all parties what needs to be secured through legal or other mechanisms	A summary table of all commitments in the ES, and other application documents, is provided as Appendix 2.6.
F&HDC	Scoping Opinion Addendum Response, Email, 27 October 2021	There is reference to 'three tier assessment' in the scoping addendum and we think this appears to conflate Rochdale Envelope or 'worst case' principles with the three tier approach which is a separate concept and not directly associated with EIA assessment. We refer to our advice above and previously on the Rochdale principles and we suggest these references are removed or reworded throughout the documents to avoid confusion.	Referencing to 'Tiers' of assessment have been reduced, and the issue of a three tier planning approach and the Rochdale Envelope assessment process are not conflated. It will be necessary to undertake further work at the following planning application stages, and there will be differences between what will be provided at Tier 2 and Tier 3. It is considered useful to provide additional clarity within the ES on which assessments would be most suitable at subsequent Tier stages. The Rochdale Envelope approach has been applied at this Tier 1, Outline Planning Application stage.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple High Level Review December 2021	<p><u>Description of the site and development including construction:</u></p> <p>The outline planning application seeks planning permission for a residential led mixed use development, comprising up to 8,500 homes, a range of community uses including primary and secondary schools and health centres, retail, leisure and business and commercial uses, open space and public realm with supporting infrastructure.</p>	Noted
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple High Level Review December 2021	The Proposed Development would be constructed with an opening date of 2042, with peak construction anticipated to be 2030. This construction programme - and presumably construction traffic – are informed by infrastructure constraints on the occupation of the scheme rather than a	The reasoning for selecting 2030 as the peak construction year is set out in Chapter 2: EIA Approach and Methodology. A worst-case assessment has been undertaken on the bases of unknown construction

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
		<p>formal phasing plan. While this is considered a sensible approach the detailed ES review will look into more depth on the implications of not having a phasing plan on ES topic assessments where geographical proximity is relevant to the assessment, such as the noise and air quality implications of construction works adjacent to new site residents.</p>	<p>phasing, and limitations and assumptions identified in the topic chapters where relevant.</p>
<p>Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)</p>	<p>Temple High Level Review December 2021</p>	<p>Sufficient information on the Site, and the Proposed Development, including its construction, has been presented in the ES. However, this section should align with the assessment methodology in making clear the Applicant intends to bring the scheme forward in phases which are not yet defined. An indication as to what parts of the scheme would be coming forward first would be useful in understanding the scheme. This use should be clearly built in as an assumption, and all the topic authors should be assessing on that basis.</p>	<p>There is no defined phasing for the proposed Development, and the Development could come forward in any order of geographical areas. The EIA is based on this flexibility of construction.</p>
<p>Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)</p>	<p>Temple High Level Review December 2021</p>	<p>The principle behind the use of a three-tier approach is understood to be that Tier 1 would always present the worst possible (but reasonable) assessment case to start with that presents the basis upon which permission could be granted. Then as long as the info provided at later stages/tiers are within the worst case parameters/assumptions then it should be possible to say that the scheme is 'in conformity' with that assessed in the ES and that permission is granted for. Where information regarding an element of the Proposed Development is not fully known, then reasonable and clear assumptions should be provided upon which to be an assessment, in compliance with Rochdale Envelope principles.</p>	<p>Noted, this is the approach adopted within the EIA.</p>
<p>Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)</p>	<p>Temple High Level Review December 2021</p>	<p>The various project strategies identified, if relied upon by the technical assessments to describe how the scheme will operate and be mitigated, should form part of the ES (or be consistent with the mitigation reported).</p>	<p>The relevant project strategies are appended to the ES.</p>
<p>Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)</p>	<p>Temple High Level Review December 2021</p>	<p><u>Alternatives</u> The Alternatives section includes sufficient information on the do nothing alternative, site selection, design evolution and the comparison of environmental effects.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple High Level Review December 2021 - Associated Email	Both the ES chapter 3 and the DAS seem to cover design evolution. We recommend a “say it once and refer across” approach but it is ok to duplicate –they just need to be consistent	Noted
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple High Level Review December 2021	<u>Factors likely to be significantly affected</u> The ES topics assessed are in line with those identified in the 2020 Scoping Opinion. The ES does not include the assessment of effects of the water main or offsite highways works as it is not considered part of the EIA project. This is not necessarily agreed, as these aspects appear to be enabling/mitigating works and therefore as part of the scheme these should be considered in the ES, and where detailed information is not available reasonable assumptions should be made.	An assessment of the off-site infrastructure has been undertaken and is presented in ES Appendix 4.7.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple High Level Review December 2021	<u>Likely significant effects</u> Schedule 4, clause 5 states that significant effects resulting from the construction and operation of the development, use of resources and their sustainability, emissions of pollutants, risks to health, heritage or the environment, cumulative effects, climate change and technologies used, should be assessed. The ES makes a reasonable attempt to meet these requirements in the relevant context. There are exceptions to this, however, and these are detailed below.	Noted
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple High Level Review December 2021	<u>Cumulative Effects</u> The identified cumulative schemes are considered acceptable, subject to agreement by FHDC. The approach to the assessment of the wider framework masterplan and the Permitted Waste Facility is in general considered to be an acceptable approach although this will be reviewed in more depth on a topic by topic basis by our specialists. The approach to effect interactions should be reviewed. It is not clear, for example, why agricultural businesses are distinguished from the wider local economy, as this seems to preclude socioeconomic and other effects on agricultural businesses. The local and wider economy could also be affected by heritage, landscape, agriculture and transport. Local residents and people working or passing through the site appear to have been considered only with respect to human health, meaning that	The approach to effect interactions has been updated following this comment, and is set out within Chapter 2: EIA Approach and methodology.

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
		considerations such as the combined nuisance of multiple construction phase effects (noise, air quality, landscape and transport, for example) have not been assessed. An unrealistically small number of receptors are considered to be affected by climate change, when we would expect an in-combination assessment of the potential for climate change to enhance or exacerbate reported effects to be included in the climate change chapter (as per IEMA guidance). The matrix in Section 2 therefore results in a limited approach to potential Type 1 cumulative effects, and this should be revisited to ensure all reasonable interactions are picked up.	
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple High Level Review December 2021	<u>Forecasting methods or evidence</u> Methods, limitations and assumptions are identified in each topic chapter.	Noted
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple High Level Review December 2021	<u>Description of mitigation measures</u> Some topic chapters do not sufficiently distinguish between embedded and additional mitigation. Some topic assessments do not include assessment of effects prior to identified mitigation, such as the water resources chapter. All mitigation identified in the ES should be identified as either embedded or additional (noting that there is a 'third category' relating to mitigation associated with Westenhanger Castle. All chapters should assess effects before and after additional mitigation. We recommend a full summary of mitigation measures, embedded and additional, across the ES, ideally in table form, along with any intention to bring forward further details as part of future Tier 2 or Tier 3 submissions. This will aid FHDC in ensuring that mitigation, further assessment and monitoring measures are appropriately secured.	All chapters differentiate between the different types of mitigation, and identify whether effects are likely to be significant prior to the application of additional mitigation. A full summary of the mitigation measures required in the ES is provided in ES Appendix 2.6.
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple High Level Review December 2021	<u>Major Accidents and Disasters</u> This has been adequately scoped out in the Scoping Report as noted in the Scoping Opinion. It would have been useful for a summary of this to be included in the ES main text however as it is included in the appendix this satisfies Schedule 4 requirements.	Noted

Otterpool Park
Appendix 2.4 Responses to overarching comments

Consultee	Document	Comment	Response/Action
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple High Level Review December 2021	<p><u>Non-technical summary</u> The NTS presents all the required information under Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations and is presented in non-technical language with a good use of figures to aid understanding. However it would be useful if the nature of residual effects was explained in more detail, ideally explaining the level of significance (e.g. major adverse) rather than simply stating whether an effect is significant or not significant. For an example of further detail in residual effects, the transport summary could go further in explaining the significant effects on safety so that a non-technical reader can understand what this means in practice.</p>	<p>The majority of the general public will likely not understand the nuances around differences in significance levels. For the purposes of the Non-Technical Summary it is considered sufficient to state whether effects are significant or not significant.</p>
Temple (on behalf of F&HDC)	Temple High Level Review December 2021	<p><u>Appropriate references</u> References are consistently presented at the end of ES chapters.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Arcadis UK

80Fen

80 Fenchurch Street

London EC3M 4BY

T: +44 (0) 20 7812 2000