Page in EA Letter	EA Planning Condition Referring to / Comment	EA Comment	Location of response/data	WSP Response	Ref. Response covered in Waterman Report
3	Water Framework Directive (WFD) Assessment	One example of missing information is WFD assessment which isn't carried forward into any proposed condition. In our opinion, as discussed at our meeting on 13 June 2023, we do not think this can/should be conditioned. The assessment informs the scheme principles, process and mitigation and ultimately guides robust/transparent decision making. We note that the Waterman report appears to agree with a number of our concerns, highlighting areas for further assessment/ work including WFD. For instance, Section 3.12 states – Waterman…"…agree with the requirement for a WFD assessment to fully consider piling works or road pollution spills, especially relating to public water supply sources and high groundwater conditions. In relation to it informing/being part of the EIA application, it also confirms that "spatial planning is therefore not clearly and robustly identified which may notably impact the scheme design principles". We are not satisfied that the potential impact and deterioration risk to the water environment and public water supply has been adequately assessed (see previous letters for detailed explanation). As such, we do not consider that the LPA has demonstrated compliance with Regulation 33 of the Water Environment Regulations 2017 (WFD) and we would question whether you have complied with Regulation 19. We note the Waterman review suggests a way forward was agreed at a meeting with Shropshire Council on 17 October 2023 for this matter "to be conditioned" and that 'WSP would discuss with the EA to agree the way forward'. We are not aware of this meeting (but appreciate that you were minded to take this application to committee). The current conditions do not include for such, and we would question what was meant to be conditioned? Whilst it may not be procedurally correct to condition a WFD assessment, if you are minded to approve in the absence of such, you could impose a condition along with any subsequent amendments, avoidance/mitigation, from any review.	• ES Feb 21 Appendix 17.5 WFD Assessment • SEI Jan 23 Appendix 6.C WFD Assessment • WSP response to the EA dated 21st June (Annex A) • WSP response to the EA dated 31st July (Annex B)	We agree a tighter link is required between extreme pollution events & emergency response planning. This was included in linked SEI docs. However, we do not agree this was the case regarding proposed piling works & the PWRA. Regarding possible interference from high groundwater levels on performance/design of certain proposed drainage features this point is accepted. However, we do not agree that the risks/effects were understated and, as such, the scheme has been designed with regard to the appropriate level of risk/effect. Further, we would also add: 1.WSP was not privy to Waterman suggestions about possible conditioning of the WFDa and not aware of this. 2.Our response to the EA letter dated 1st September 2023, it is our opinion that the use of Regulation 19 of the WFD is not considered necessary or appropriate. We would like to point out that under Regulation 18 (Article 4.6) of the WFD we consider; i.The extreme accident scenarios assessed are so extreme they should be regarded as exceptional and or worse case. Despite this, even those scenarios, which give rise to a precautionarily assessed significant effect, can be mitigated given the deployment of an emergency response plan (referred to under point 3 below). ii.The proposed scheme satisfies 'normal' DMRB tests regarding pollution risk (see the Drainage Network Water Quality Assessment (DNWQA) detailed in SEI Jan 23 Chapter 6, Appendix 6.D) and the scenarios informing these assessments may be regarded as those which are likely to be reasonably foreseen. Additionally, we point out that the EA collaboratively worked with Highways England to agree the said DMRB methods. iii.That due and appropriate regard should be given to applying extreme precautionary principles and basing related decisions on outcomes stemming from assessments of worse case scenarios. This point is highlighted in the SEI DQRA (see Section 1.8 and Annex A therein). 3. The Applicant and WSP have met with the authors/owners/managers of the Multi Agency Response Plan (MARP) to discuss the scheme. It has been confirmed that it is not appropriate to revise the MARP, for any specific situation, as it is a framework for action and working together. However, the Applicant will make full details of the drainage system and its management available to the Fire Service (and any other party that is likely to be on scene in the event of a spill) that explains the location and operation of the pollution containment features and equipment. By making the information available to them, the fire service will assess the situation and will formulate their own emergency action plan for potential events and scenarios at the related location. As always, WSP will be happy, and encourage a chance, to meet with the EA to further discuss this matter and seek resolution.	C.16.5
3	Dispersivity modelling	No condition or further information on this aspect has been submitted to inform potential significant impact, avoidance, and mitigation options. The Waterman review states that – "Further consideration of the surface water- groundwater interaction is required and whether additional potential pollutant pathways (PPL) need to be included in the DQRA/dispersity modelling". We question how this is intended to be appropriately secured? We are not advocating such an approach but maybe a pre-commencement condition could include - No development shall take place until a scheme for dispersivity modelling including reporting, and any mitigation measures, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA. Any subsequent changes to mitigation shall be implemented.	• ES Feb 21 Appendix 10.2 Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) • ES Feb 21 Appendix 17.1 Water Environment Risk Assessment (WERA), Annex A Dispersivity Modelling • ES Feb 21 Appendix 17.4 Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) • SEI Jan 23 Appendix 5.C Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) • SEI Jan 23 Appendix 6.B Water Environment Risk Assessment (WERA), Annex A Dispersivity Modelling • WSP response to the EA dated 21st June (Annex A) • WSP response to the EA dated 31st July (Annex B)	Regarding river water to groundwater interaction there has been significant convergence regarding the EA & WSP understandings - this draws upon the EA's understanding defined in their response dated 1 Sept 2023. The only difference now concerns the potential significance of this under high/flood flow conditions in the river with the EA advocating significantly greater significance than WSP. However, significant available hydrometric data (both for groundwater and surface water) indicate that the drift separating the river, including its flood plain, with the underlying bedrock Sandstone only permit a semi-confined and muted interaction between the two water body systems. Further, we would point out; 1. Under low to normal river flow range conditions the head gradient is from groundwater to river and under these conditions, as applies to the Dispersivity Modelling assumptions coincident with very/extreme low flows, river to groundwater interaction is not relevant. 2. Under high to flood river flow range conditions the head gradient is reversed from river to groundwater and, under these conditions, river to groundwater interaction is possible. However; a. For reasons already indicated we believe the nature/properties of the intervening drift retards significant interaction, being semi-confining in nature; and b. Under high/flood flow conditions dilution of contaminants is very high and any interaction occurring is very unlikely to prove significant. Regarding the DQRA, commentary on this remains the same as our response to Waterman's C.16.6. Furthermore we'd add that model scenario 3 (risk of incident occurring immediately east of the River Severn to impact the Shelton Abstraction, modelled as concentrations in groundwater at their effective solubility) in itself models a worst case scenario of transport of a spill occurring at the River to the abstraction (BH1). Should the spill contaminants originate in the River and enter groundwater instead via induced leakage (heightened further during flood conditions) then source concentrations would be significantly lower than those modelled under MS3 given the significant capacity for dilution in the watercourse. It is therefore considered that model outputs (albeit extremely conservative) and mitigation measures associated with the existing DQRA model scenario 3 would be suitably protective of equivalent impacts via induced leakage.	R.9.1 - Waterman *agree that DQRA appears to satisfy this original query. Given the highly conservative assessment that has been necessary, would hope that the EA/STWL would agree to conditions in respect of MARP and engineering designs.* C.9.8 C.16.6
4	Annex B – Confidential SEI Documents/Condition 21	It is unclear how our 'confidential' comments were addressed and communicated to the Planning Committee on the DQRA, Dispersivity Modelling and Groundwater Surface water Interaction and Bedrock Connectivity. No specific planning conditions within the draft document reference these other than the suggested 10m standoff in condition 21.	• ES Feb 21 Appendix 10.2 Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) • ES Feb 21 Appendix 17.1 Water Environment Risk Assessment (WERA), Annex A Dispersivity Modelling • ES Feb 21 Appendix 17.4 Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) • SEI Jan 23 Appendix 5.C Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) • SEI Jan 23 Appendix 6.B Water Environment Risk Assessment (WERA), Annex A Dispersivity Modelling • WSP response to the EA dated 21st June (Annex A) • WSP response to the EA dated 31st July (Annex B)	It is up to the LPA to confirm how the confidential elements were communicated to the Planning Committee. However we would add; 1. There is very little difference, in detail, between confidential/public versions of the both the SEI DQRA & Dispersivity Modelling reports for there to be a significant detraction to the client/LPA being restricted to seeing public versions only. 2. The corresponding differences between Groundwater - Surface water interaction and Bedrock Connectivity reports are more significant. However; a. The evidence presented to demonstrate lack of fracture/fissure connectivity in the shallow regions of the bedrock Sandstone between STWL groundwater abstraction sources and viaduct pile/abutment locations is both compelling and solid; and b. The situation regarding understanding of river to groundwater interaction is already covered in various correspondence and, the current situation, is described previously under Point 2 with regards to Dispersivity Modelling.	R.9.1 C.9.8 C.16.6
4	DQRA	Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) -There are no conditions relating to furthering the outstanding DQRA aspects. We previously saw, as the Waterman report refers to, the suggestion that the DQRA detailed comments are to be 'dealt with separately, subsequently & confidentially in due course in a full response to the EA's comments'. We would point out Waterman comments which state – "The DQRA should be updated in line with the latest consultation responses with the Environment Agency and Severn Trent Water Limited…". We question how this information and any update to avoidance/protection measures is to be secured? Some example wording to include a DQRA update: No development shall commence until a scheme for an update to the Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) is submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The scheme shall include, but may not be limited to – a review of technical comments provided by the EA and Severn Trent Water Ltd, further revised modelling, review of risk. Review strategy, any monitoring, and implementation of any necessary avoidance and mitigation measures. (To avoid impact and provide protection of the groundwater environment and associated sensitive public water supply sources).	• ES Feb 21 Appendix 10.2 Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) • SEI Jan 23 Appendix 5.C Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) • WSP response to the EA dated 21st June (Annex A) • WSP response to the EA dated 31st July (Annex B)	WSP believe this matter was fully dealt with in it's written responses dated 31 July 23 to the EA's letter dated 3 May 23. STWL have indicated that the modelling is a secondary concern. Their focus is instead on developing a suitable emergency response plan (and mitigation regarding incident prevention) and the Turbidity Protocol. The conservatism to which the assessments have been undertaken has already been acknowledged by Waterman in their previous review. Accordingly, WSP do not consider the DQRA warrants a related Condition associated with it.	R.9.1 C.9.8 C.16.6
4	Condition 46 on EIA detail to be secured.	Of relevance, one of the draft suggested conditions (condition no. 46) seeks to ensure that development will accord with the EIA, Environmental Statement (ES) mitigation (in compliance with the mitigation measures identified and set out in the supporting ES). However, as the EIA is inadequate/incomplete in some key areas, we would not consider this to be a robust condition particularly if other conditions are necessary which could amend the overall ES conclusion/mitigation.	N/A	WSP reiterate the EIA is robust. Following the Waterman review it is stated they are happy that the EIA provides a robust assessment. LPA to seek clarity from the EA as to how they regard the EIA / ES as inadequate/incomplete when WSP and Waterman believe otherwise.	N/A
4 to 5	Condition no. 20, 21, and 22– piling/standoff	Condition no. 20, 21, and 22– piling/standoff – the detail should be about avoiding impact on, not solely managing the risk, and should focus on protection of the water environment (including public water supply). We refer you to our previous letters but make some key points for context. There is a level of uncertainty around the potential impacts or efficacy of current proposed mitigation. We previously outlined to you that - It is also plausible that at the point any potential impacts are observed there may already be short to long term (some years of impact/loss), or potentially irreversible impact, particularly in relation to any water supply abstraction/intake feature. Such mitigation options, including corrective action, have not been fully explored within the EIA, but for impacts to public water supplies it could include provision of alternative supplies potentially including alternative mains water supply provision, at someone's cost. The feasibility of any such options would have to be investigated with Severn Trent Water Ltd. These elements have not been considered further as part of the application and do not appear to be picked up sufficiently within the conditions. We are advising as part of the EIA for the applicant to assess and consider necessary measures and as developer to make a commitment to provide financial reparation options for any foreseen and unforeseen impact arising from the construction and future operation of the proposed application. Waterman report states (5.1) – 'Appropriate mitigation measures to the construction through monitoring and reporting, design through containment and control, and operation through funding and management agreements of the road by the Highways Agency and emergency services, should be evidenced'. How are these important outstanding points being comprehensively controlled? With regard to piling works, we note that Conditions 20, 21, 22, and 23 (trial test piling) are related to this and identify the requirement for development of a written Turbidity Protocol and monitoring plan which would be key to informing any piling methodology, monitoring protocols, trigger criteria. This is covered in essence by condition 20. However, the condition doesn't address the need for action plans (financial, replacement sources, impact/remedial actions, investigation/monitoring of) if adverse impact arises. Possible impacts? What solutions are to be delivered? Feasibility and timeframes? How would they be implemented? This is a key element as monitoring, triggers and control of construction/methods are only part of the required mitigation. No further work was forthcoming as part of the EIA and the applicant did not wish to undertake further work. At the June 2023 meeting, the applicant/WSP disagreed on the need to further consider an impact from their piling works, or a pollution incident from the road, in this regard. In relation to impact and commitment to providing appropriate financial reparation to fund /implement any necessary corrective actions/alternative supplies. How would this be identified and secured? We have previously suggested that another mechanism, such as legal agreement, could secure such, including monitoring and the feedback. We have previously advised on the inclusion of appropriate mechanisms to react appropriately/timely to any impact or concern that	• ES Feb 21 Appendix 10.3 Pilling Works Risk Assessment (PWRA) • SEI Jan 23 Appendix 5.D Piling Works Risk Assessment (PWRA) • WSP response to the EA dated 21st June (Annex A) • WSP response to the EA dated 31st July (Annex B) • WSP Test piling specification to the EA dated 3rd November 2023 (issued to the EA, and STWL, for comment) (Annex C - CONFIDENTIAL)	The piling stand-off aims to avoid impact and certainly reduce risk and this is a fundamental design approach. The Turbidity Protocol aims to manage any residual risk and hence why WSP have been seeking dialogue with the EA/STWL to help make it as practicable & comprehensive as possible. As indicated previously the LPA propose to directly initiate further engagement with key stakeholders (including STWL and the EA) with the aim of pursuing agreement on this as a Planning Condition. Further, in their letter dated 6th October 2023 (STWL to Shropshire Council) STWL indicated their requirements for the Turbidity Protocol on the basis that it is further developed and subsequently implemented as a Planning Condition and we will continue to engage with STWL, in bi-weekly meetings in this regard. Accordingly, we would very much appreciate/welcome the EA, who are already invited, to participate in this forum going forward. As part of the Turbidity Protocol we seek agreement from both the EA and STWL to the proposed Scope and Specification for the works. Draft copies of this have been sent to both parties on 3rd November 2023, but WSP are yet to receive comments from the EA.	C.9.8 C.16.6

		could secure such, including monitoring and the feedback. We have previously advised on the inclusion of appropriate mechanisms to react appropriately/timely to any impact or concern that may be encountered. There remains a degree of uncertainty for decision makers and, ultimately, a liability with the developer/another. Details of any contingency and mitigation proposals should a trigger level be breached and an impact apparent at the public water supply are not included within condition 20. A separate condition should be imposed to secure – 'if the turbidity/monitoring scheme approved under 'condition 20 above' shows any adverse risk of deterioration to water features (groundwater and surface water quality) including public water supply boreholes/abstraction, proposals: 1. to investigate the cause of deterioration 2. to remediate any such risks and secure alternative water supplies. 3. to monitor and amend any failures of the remediation undertaken, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval…' We would also recommend you add in some points to refer to the Piling Works Risk Assessment (PWRA) aspects into Bullet Point 3 (of condition 20) as follows - 'Agreed Piling methodology including a Piling Works Risk Assessment and standoff limits between toe of piling and bedrock'. (PWRA refinements are still required). Reasoning of conditions (21-23) – main focus should be 'to avoid impact and provide protection of the groundwater environment and associated sensitive public water supply sources'. Note: Cost recovery/Review - In terms of future potential review work and noting the absence of a legal agreement or ability to sign one with yourselves as Shropshire Council, we would recommend a commitment to cover costs involved in any subsequent review of monitoring plans and actions – this would be subject to cost recovery work, not as a direct requirement through a planning condition. If a legal agreement is not possible, maybe a statement of intent would address this for future security and understanding?			
6	Condition 23 (test piling)	Condition 23 (test piling) - details the approach to the test piling and needs to include reference to these works being undertaken to inform the agreed turbidity protocol and PWRA. Your condition should include for this. It is understood that the piling test location will be selected to minimise risk so that 'most appropriate location of' could be part of your condition. We suggested this work should have been submitted as part of the EIA, to inform the risk assessment.	• ES Feb 21 Appendix 10.3 Pilling Works Risk Assessment (PWRA) • SEI Jan 23 Appendix 5.D Pilling Works Risk Assessment (PWRA) • WSP response to the EA dated 21st June (Annex A) • WSP response to the EA dated 31st July (Annex B) • WSP Test piling specification to the EA dated 3rd November 2023 (issued to the EA, and STWL, for comment) (Annex C - CONFIDENTIAL)	The PWRA includes reference to the test piling works and how they will be used to inform the Turbidity Protocol (including reference within the Outline Turbidity Protocol). Furthermore, a specification for the proposed test piling works has been prepared and shared with both STWL and the EA. STWL have indicated that they hope to provide their feedback in mid January 2024; the EA are yet to provide an estimated time by which they hope to provide their feedback. WSP believe this is already included in the EIA but are happy for details to be included in the Condition, including: • Approach to the test pilling • Reference to test pilling works being undertaken to inform the agreed turbidity protocol and Pilling Works Risk Assessment (PWRA) • Text with "piling test location will be selected to minimise risk so that 'most appropriate location of…'"	C9.1 C16.10 C16.11
6	Condition 24 – Bank (River Severn) protection works (Bank stability /geomorphology)	Draft condition 24 doesn't cover the extent and nature of the bank protection (Right Bank) and how it transitions to natural bank (which is very important), including any habitat improvement. We would question if the SEI January 2023 Appendix 1P is the most up to date drawing/plans and shows this. You could also reference to the most recent Geomorphological Assessment - SEI App 6.F? Also, we previously discussed and reviewed drawings for light touch bank treatments on the opposite side (Left Bank) principally relying on coppicing willows, managing vegetation etc which also needs to be accommodated into the design, and secured here. In addition to 'construction of…' the condition should also include for a 'longer term vegetation/bank protection management strategy', to ensure good structural vegetation is maintained appropriately (important for habitat and structural resilience) thereafter. And including – 'maintenance of the 8 metre buffer zone (from the top of bank) within the boundary of the site'. We previously advised that additional bankside habitat enhancement as well as the mitigated length should be provided for in the plans. Your condition could add – 'including consideration of additional bankside habitat enhancement as well as the mitigated length'. This could link to condition no. 19 regarding similar enhancements. Of relevance here, a Flood Risk Activity Permit (prior to any works commencing) is also likely to be required for such works. You could cross reference to this within the condition as you appear to have for condition no.19 regards ordinary watercourse consenting or include as an informative.	• SEI Jan 23 Appendix 1.P Bank Protection Technical Note • SEI Jan 23 Landscape Drawing: 70056211-WSP-ELS-L3-DR-LE-30014 Version C01.2	The WFD assessment submitted in February 2021 states that there would be riparian planting implemented along the left bank for approximately 130m. The landscape plans, as part of the SEI Jan 23 (70056211-WSP-ELS-L3-DR-LE-30014 Version C01.2), show riparian planting on the left bank and at the upstream and downstream end of the bank protection. The left bank will include coir product and suitable riparian plant species to encourage re-vegetation after works on the banks as appropriate. Planting on the right bank would renaturalise and not require regular management (like existing scenario). A transition to natural bank from rock bags is enabled by the proposed planting. The 8 metre buffer zone on the right bank would be maintained by the periodic maintenance for the access track to STW. The plans are to be approved through Condition 24. This is a precommencement condition and will be approved by the LPA before any work on site starts. These requirements can be incorporated into the detailed design. It is acknowledged that a Flood Risk Activity Permit will be required from the Environment Agency for these proposed works, which is a statutory requirement. Therefore, it is not deemed necessary to cross reference the need for a FRAP in Condition 24.	C.7.2
7	Condition 25 - Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)	The CEMP condition has been written in the context of protecting residents and properties. The introductory text refers to 'including means for protecting the nearby receptors from noise and vibration'. The reason for the condition is stated as being 'In the interest of the amenity of the occupants of surrounding sensitive properties and the safe operation of the highway network'. However, the CEMP is also a key document for securing protection of the water environment. The ES originally referred to this. The introductory text should be amended to 'including means for protecting the nearby receptors from pollution, noise and vibration' and the reason amended to include specific reference to 'protect the water environment'. Notwithstanding the above, many of our previous comments on the CEMP are covered by condition 25. Provision has been made to acknowledge Sensitive working practices and robust pollution prevention control measures in proximity to sensitive locations, including (but not limited to) the Severn Trent Water surface water intake on the River Severn, Groundwater Source Protection Zones (SPZ) and other sensitive surface water receptors such as Hencott Pool and Oxon Pool. However, we do think it necessary to include these additional points as raised in our letter of 3rd May 2023, and previous replies. • Mobile storage such as fuel bowsers should not be left in Source Protection Zone 1 and 2 overnight and should be in locked compounds. • Details of any facilities for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals • All temporary drainage must be designed to the same principles as detailed in the Drainage Strategy (see our latest reiteration of comments on) to ensure that there are no inappropriate discharges to ground within Source Protection Zone 1 and 2. • Use of materials (aggregate) with recycled content would have to be subject to stringent quality protocol. The use of secondary materials in Source Protection Zone 1 and 2 would only be supported based on rigorous testing and characterisation regime. It is not clear as to how Pulverised Fuel Ash is to be used onsite and further details should be provided. • Construction related incident response plans will be required to deal with potential incidents. These are key to ensuring rapid action is instigated and minimising subsequent risk. • Mitigation for impacts of noise, vibration, lighting and water flow changes during construction and operation have been included in the design and draft Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to ensure that there are no residual adverse effects on the fish populations in the River Severn at Shrewsbury which are integral to the Severn Estuary SAC and Ramsar sites. The critical fish spawning and migration periods is 1st May to 15th July inclusive and 15th September to 31st December inclusive to include critical timing for shad as well as salmon. This should be listed in the condition. • Recommend you add – including any such works within the floodplain (as indicated within the Flood Risk Assessment) at the end of your bullet point 'construction compounds including the storage of plant and materials…' Note – Other Permits or consents may be necessary such as abstraction licences e.g. construction dewatering, Environmental Permits e.g. surface water discharges.	N/A	WSP are happy with the heightened reference to sensitive Water Environment concerns and amendments. Most of these additions are already incorporated in the development of the detailed CEMP which will be discharged by precommencement condition. This will include the stipulation to the contractor to follow the same design principles for the temporary drainage and the other points raised by the EA.	C.16.8
7	Condition no. 27 - Waste management plans.	Noted	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	Condition 36 – road drainage management plan.	We note the applicant/WSP originally proposed to progress matters as a "Planning Condition which will cover both (i) maintenance of road drainage system and (ii) the setting up of appropriate and specific emergency response mechanisms for incidents within the SPZ (Source Protection Zone) under the umbrella of the MARP (Multi Agency Response Plan)". Condition 36 attempts to address the (i) maintenance of road drainage system. However, there is currently no provision within the draft condition to address point (ii) concerning appropriate and specific emergency response mechanisms for incidents within the Source Protection Zones under the umbrella of the Multi Agency Response Plan. Confirmation is required on the following aspects. (See rows 13 to 17 below). We need to reiterate our previous comments and concern that…. 'Given the sensitivity and potential risk to receptors defined by the source protection zones (SPZ) and Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment modelling at Shelton, we would seek a commitment to an immediate and timely remediation clean up strategy for any pollutant spill within the SPZ and specifically highly sensitive SPZ 1 and 2 as part of the emergency response. Taking into consideration the proximity to the sensitive receptors, an emergency contingency fund must be made available to expedite the rapid deployment of remedial measures and/or corrective actions'. We would also seek reassurances that appropriate mechanisms are put in place to fund the maintenance plan of the road carriageway drainage and attenuation system, for the life span of the roads use. Long-term integrity of the construction/build is fundamental to the success of the mitigation measures. There remains a degree of uncertainty for decision makers and, ultimately, a liability with the developer/another. Your draft condition wording also suggests – the plan will be 'developed in consultation with Severn Trent and the EA…' We may comment on the plan but not develop/produce it, as this could be seen as directing a third party action to deliver something.	• ES Feb 21 Appendix 10.2 Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) • SEI Jan 23 Appendix 5.C Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) • WSP response to the EA dated 21st June (Annex A) • WSP response to the EA dated 31st July (Annex B)	The Applicant and WSP have met with the managers of the MARP and it has been confirmed that it is not appropriate to revise the Plan, for any specific situation, as it is a framework for action and working together. The Applicant will, however, make full details of the drainage system, and its management, available to the Fire Service (and any other party that is likely to be on scene in the event of a spill) that explains the location and operation of the pollution containment features and equipment. Following completion, the North West Relief Road and associated structures will become a maintainable asset of Shropshire Council under its established Highway Maintenance Programme. It will be subject to the established asset inspection and proactive maintenance regime as is currently effectively delivered across the wider c.5,200 km of highway asset. Forward funding of the maintenance programme is set annually by Council on a rolling basis. Based on future expected financial allocations, and in the light of the recent Government announcement around enhanced funds for Highways and Pothole maintenance in particular (up to 2036 at least), the Councils Highway Department can give a categoric undertaking that the NWRR asset will be effectively managed and maintained within required standards for the lifetime of the road.	C.16.15 C.16.16
8	Condition 36 – road drainage management plan.	What are the third-party management responsibility, responses, or actions?	• WSP response to the EA dated 31st July (Annex B)	Third parties would only be brought in for maintenance of specialist equipment (if at all). The Highways Authority would manage the remaining responsibilities.	C.16.16
8	Condition 36 – road drainage management plan.	How would the monitoring, proactive preventative maintenance and corrective actions of the road drainage system be secured? (not just a 'schedule').	• WSP response to the EA dated 31st July (Annex B)	WSP will produce a full Operation and Maintenance Plan which will cover the highways drainage. This plan will include a maintenance schedule covering monitoring, proactive maintenance and corrective actions. In addition to the statement above (repeated below for ease of reference), Shropshire Council will review the proposals in the Maintenance Plan and confirm to the LPA, in writing, that the plan will be followed. As stated above in row 14, following completion, the North West Relief Road and associated structures will become a maintainable asset of Shropshire Council under its established Highway Maintenance Programme. It will be subject to the established asset inspection and proactive maintenance regime as is currently effectively delivered across the wider c.5,200 km of highway asset. Forward funding of the maintenance programme is set annually by Council on a rolling basis.	C.16.16

8	Condition 36 – road drainage management plan.	How will remedial mitigation options (not solely limited to the immediate emergency services response) and associated financial provision (i.e. an emergency contingency remedial fund made available) be secured?	• WSP response to the EA dated 31st July (Annex B)	As stated above in Row 14, following completion, the North West Relief Road and associated structures will become a maintainable asset of Shropshire Council under its established Highway Maintenance Programme. It will be subject to the established asset inspection and proactive maintenance regime as is currently effectively delivered across the wider c.5,200 km of highway asset. Forward funding of the maintenance programme is set annually by Council on a rolling basis. Based on future expected financial allocations, and in the light of the recent Government announcement around enhanced funds for Highways and Pothole maintenance in particular (up to 2036 at least), the Councils Highway Department can give a categoric undertaking that the NWRR asset will be effectively managed and maintained within required standards for the lifetime of the road. In terms of funding for an emergency event, Shropshire Council's Emergency Planning Team have confirmed that there is no specific funding for emergency response to any risk as this does not influence any reaction or commitment to any emergency response.	C.16.16
8	Condition 36 – road drainage management plan.	There is currently no provision within the draft condition to address our concerns about appropriate and specific emergency response mechanisms for incidents within the Source Protection Zones under the umbrella of the bespoke Plan. In the absence of such reassurances, we expected you might include the provision for amended 'drainage plans' within the SPZ to be included as a precommencement condition to ensure this error is rectified and not carried through to final design/construction. The design, construction and future maintenance of an effective sealed road drainage system is fundamental to providing groundwater protection to the highly sensitive nature of the underlying source protection zones. Suggested Condition wording - No development shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme for all road systems and infrastructure within the Shelton Source Protection Zone has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The scheme shall include design, construction, pollution control, and future maintenance of an effective sealed road drainage system.	• WSP response to the EA dated 31st July (Annex B)	The Applicant has confirmed to the LPA that the EA suggested amendment to this Condition is acceptable. This has been previously addressed in the WSP letter to the EA on 31st July 2023.	C.16.15 C.16.16
9	Condition 45 Highways	Condition 45 Highways – Linked to the above, we note this condition mentions a wider signing strategy on Local and Strategic Highway network in the interests of highway safety. This should be expanded (or a separate condition added) to request implementation of/consideration of providing bespoke signage denoting groundwater vulnerability at the point the road sections enter and pass through source protection zone 1 and 2 for the Shelton Water Supply sources protection area. This should include details of what to do in the event of a spillage occurring.	N/A	Location signs for Pollution Control Devices (PCD) will be placed within the source protection zone to signify the location of PCDs. These would be limited to standard variants, in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) requirements, visible from the carriageway and locally specifying the distance and/or direction to devices (e.g. a penstock) for those attending an incident. The appropriateness of public information and warnings at the site need to be carefully considered in the context of drawing attention to the sensitive nature of the location. I.e. a information sign asking drivers to take action to reduce the risk of an accident could highlight the opportunity to someone who wished to cause harm to the public.	C.16.7
9	Condition 45 Highways	No reference is made to requirements/consideration of lower speed limits through the Shelton water protection area section area, which could be considered/included for here, as previously suggested.	Outline Business Case 2017	WSPs current position is not to adopt even lower speed limits - than the currently proposed 40mph limits - in line with justifications set out in the Outline Business Case, which is explicit that the case has been made on the basis of the NWRR being at 60mph.	C.16.7, C. 16.15, C. 16.16
9	Suggested condition - Viaduct barrier system	Suggested condition - No development shall commence until a scheme for the viaduct barrier design is submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA. Details shall include, but may not be limited to, design, including pollution control measures, construction and future maintenance of an effective containment barrier system. Thereafter it shall be maintained for the lifetime of the road.	N/A	The parapets containment classes are appropriate based on the Road Restraint Risk Assessment Process (RRRAP) which the highways team undertook to determine the required H2 / N2 parapets. The highways team will be able to provide more details on this process if required. At per previous stakeholder requests, the parapets will be solid, i.e. solid panels attached to the inward facing elements, the base of which will be aligned with the top of the concrete beam, supporting the parapet posts. This will help contain splashes from puddles or debris in the event of an incident, however it will not provide a "tank" solution to contain water on the bridge deck above the surface level. The H2 parapet on the northern side has no cycle-walkway whereas the N2 parapet on the southern side has a cycle-walkway between it and the traffic running lane, creating a greater separation, hence the difference in parapet type on north and south side of the viaduct. The concrete beam, referred to above, is higher than the verge surfacing so will provide the main containment. Surface water will be drained from the deck via positive drainage systems, and surface water, from the west onto the bridge deck will be minimised as much as possible, in accordance with DMRB. The bridge deck has 3% longitudinal and 3.81% transverse gradients, although the verge at the low end has a 2.5% fall back towards the low side of the carriageway so will provide some further containment above the drainage kerb level. In the unlikely event that a fuel tanker deposits its entire load instantly in one location, the kerbing and highways drainage system would mitigate the pollutant risk, directing flows towards the pollution control features at Basin 5.	N/A
10	Suggested condition - Baseline water quality and water quality construction monitoring strategy including Borehole decommissioning	No development shall commence until a scheme for groundwater and surface water monitoring is submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The scheme shall include, but may not be limited to – details of the proposed groundwater and surface water monitoring strategy, the proposed monitoring network, monitoring frequency/ duration and analytical testing suites. - Assessment criteria including screening levels and reporting mechanisms (standard and in response to screening exceedances). - Review and implementation of any necessary mitigation measures should screening levels be exceeded. - Once the monitoring scheme has been fully completed to the satisfaction of the LPA, a borehole decommissioning methodology shall be submitted. The monitoring and borehole decommissioning shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme, including any components of the above. The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.	• WSP response to the EA dated 31st July 2023 (Annex B) See also; • WSP response to the STWL dated 8th July 2021 (copied to EA in an email dated 16th Sept 2021) (Annex D - CONFIDENTIAL); and • WSP response to the EA dated 21st March 2022 (Annex E - CONFIDENTIAL)	WSP believe that these are reasonable suggestions and they have all been raised in the past as possible Conditions (see our letters already referred to).	N/A
11	Suggested condition - Protection of private water supplies	We previously commented that… 'the location and presence of non-licenced small volume private groundwater sources (springs, wells and boreholes nominally supplying potable water to farms and rural isolated residential properties) is not commented upon or risk assessed. These sources will be afforded protected rights against any derogation impact (quantity or quality) arising directly from the development'. As advised previously, this information should be detailed within the EIA and used to inform the proposals and any subsequent conditions. How is this information, any monitoring requirements and protection/mitigation measures to be secured?	• WSP response to the EA dated 31st July (Annex B)	WSP accept that both licensed & non-licenced small volume private groundwater sources (springs, wells and boreholes nominally supplying potable water to farms and rural isolated residential properties) will be afforded protected rights against any derogation impact (quantity/quality) arising directly from the development. A response to the EA was provided in the Leet dated 31st July on page 13-14. WSP agrees with the suggested inclusion of a Condition for a Water Features Survey, which will identify any currently unknown sources and ascertain the condition/functionality of all features.	9.4, 16.7
13	Condition 13	Condition 13 - There is no mention of otters which we have previously raised in connection with mammal passage. We note some reference to badger tunnels in condition 13 and plans to be submitted regarding a mammal ledge at Willow Pool Culvert. We would recommend you expand this condition to secure/include for details to be provided of all mammal passages within each part of the route/phasing plan.	• ES Feb 21 Chapter 8 Biodiversity • SEI Jan 23 Chapter 3 Biodiversity	WSP are happy with the wording to make reference to all culverts that have a mammal ledge. These culverts are listed in ES Feb 21 Chapter 8 Biodiversity: Alkmund Park Culvert, Willow Pool Wildlife Culvert and the Hencott Pool Culvert. As a riparian mammal, Otters are expected to use the proposed mammal ledges, in addition to badgers.	7.3