

EIA Screening Request

Date - 06/05/21 Further comments on EIA Screening Request by LBRuT and Agreed by LBHF

Document	Comments	Action	Revised Document Issued	Document Replaced
Main Report	piling - Spud legs confirmed in 2.2.8 and piling in 4.4.4 – however, no details of extent	Further details regarding size and length provided	2048-BRL-02-XX-RP-C-1000 - EIA Screening Report P03	2048-BRL-02-XX-RP-C-1000 - EIA Screening Report P02
	further details of all the designations of the site and its surrounds and their environmental sensitivities - 3.2.4 – the river is MOL, not just riverside	Item corrected in relation to MOL		
	Amount of bed levelling detailed – 4.3.1 – however, how deep piling?	Further details regarding size and length provided	Appendix A - Full set of accompanying drawings included. Drawing Issue List on Page 75 of EIA report	Appendix A - All drawings within Appendix A to be replaced
	Para. 1.4.4 states “the EIA Screening Report is supplemented by the information from the following reports” – however, these reference numbers do not correspond to the reference number of the documents	References / Conclusions updated		
	3.2.45 – refers to outdated navigation report	References updated	Appendix B - Full set of accompanying appendices included. Document Issue List on Page 76 of EIA report	Appendix B - All previously submitted appendices to the report to be replaced / removed from consideration.
	3.5.9 – Still refers to the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal based on the temporary bridge scheme – this is not acceptable. The PEA must be bespoke to the proposed ferry development.	Thomson Ecology have prepared a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal specifically in relation to the Ferry service which has informed the EIA Screening Opinion.		
	3.5.9 – refers to an ecological appraisal that you have requested is superseded. - Not prepared to accept an EIA Screening Opinion Request that relies on a PEA for another development. Needs to be bespoke to	The bridge reports are appended as references to		
	4.5.8 – refers to the PEA, this relates to the temporary bridge development not the ferry and therefore not			
	3.10.1 – refer to an out of date land contamination report and seems to base conclusions on such	References / Conclusions updated		
	4.4.1 –refers to an Hydrodynamic Modelling and Scour Assessment associated to the bridge for consideration on impact; states in para. 4.4.2 that an assessment has not been complete – however, a Hydrodynamic and Scour Assessment has been submitted (DER648—RT001-T01-01), which relates to this	References / Conclusions updated		
	4.4.3 – seems to refer to an out of date WFD	References updated		
	3.5.20 – refers to an out of date Aquatic Ecology desktop study	References updated		
	4.5.15 – refers to an aquatic ecology desktop study that doesn't not have the same reference number to the once accompanying the screening opinion.	References updated		
	4.5.19 – refers to an noise assessment with a different reference number to the one submitted.	References updated		
	4.6.1 – refers to the archaeology report associated to the bridge and bases its conclusions on such (not relevant to this screening). The screening opinion report has not been updated to reflect the new archaeological assessment that was submitted with the revised screening opinion.	References / Conclusions updated		
	5.1.5 states a Bio-diversity Net Gain report will be produced – however, this has not been submitted with the application.	Issue clarified in report. Biodiversity Net gain is proposed to be addressed upon dismantling of the piers and improved landscaping scheme.		
	Still no reference to transboundary impact	Additional information provided to address		
Little reference to matter such as 'intensity', 'reversibility', 'spatial extent' and 'nature of the impact' -	Additional information provided to address			
Correction of minor drafting errors.	Updated to reflect comments from review process			