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1 Qualifications and experience

1.1 I am Emma Lunt. I have a BSc (Hons) in Environmental Science and an MSc in Environmental Impact Assessment, Auditing and Management Systems. I am a full member of the Institution of Environmental Sciences and I am a Chartered Environmentalist with the Society for the Environment. I have over 17 years’ experience in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), including several large transport schemes in the UK.

1.2 My role in the EIA for the Boston Barrier Project (the Scheme) included responsibility for the technical review of the Environmental Statement (ES) (A/17/1).

2 Scope of Evidence

2.1 I focus on the environmental effects identified as significant in the EIA, the measures proposed by the Environment Agency to mitigate adverse effects, and the residual significant effects arising from the Scheme with mitigation measures incorporated. I outline the main alternatives considered.

2.2 The evidence is my opinion. I have not undertaken the individual environmental assessments myself, but I have familiarised myself with and critically reviewed the assessments undertaken and their key findings.

2.3 I discuss the objections and representations in so far as they relate to environmental matters and statements 2, 3, 4, 5c, 5d, 6, 7, 8, 9a, 9b, 9c and 10 of the Statement of Matters.

3 Main alternatives to the Scheme

3.1 A preliminary screening exercise was undertaken for the development of the Boston Haven Flood Risk Management Studies (BHFRMS) (D/1). I have critically reviewed the 2004 Scoping Report and the environmental constraints and opportunities remain valid.

3.2 The BHFRMS recommends an - Advance the existing line of defence - encompassing a barrier to be located between the Swing Bridge and upstream of Hob hole outfall. A barrier downstream of Hob hole was considered unacceptable due to the environmental impacts on the Wash SPA/SAC/RAMSAR/SSSI.

3.3 Between September 2005 and October 2006, the Environment Agency undertook a SEA - the BCS SEA included as an appendix to my proof of evidence (EA/8/2)– which built upon the 2004 Scoping Report. In my opinion, it is reasonable to have focused the barrier options upstream of Hob hole outfall and ideally even upstream of Maud Foster Sluice.

3.4 I have reviewed Section 2 of the ES, and can confirm based on my knowledge of the Scheme development, that it accurately represents where environmental considerations have played an important factor in determining the preferred Scheme selection.

3.5 I have critically reviewed the environmental considerations that were used to inform the selection of the location of the proposed barrier. In my view the proposed barrier location
remains the best overall in environmental terms, when trying to balance, and weight against each other, a number of environmental factors. The Environment Agency’s choice of location for the barrier is therefore justified from an environmental perspective.

3.6 Furthermore, the location selected for the barrier in my opinion is most likely to allow a future water level management scheme to be implemented at a later stage with the least environmental harm, and is therefore least likely to preclude the delivery of water level management in the future.

3.7 To confirm, I am of the opinion that there is no alternative barrier / barrage type or alternative location which would have less environmental impact than the proposed Scheme.

**Environmental Effects of a Combined Barrier and Water Level Management Scheme**

3.8 I understand that the Scheme has been designed so as not to compromise the introduction of WLM in the future. In my opinion, the assessment of environmental WLM impacts has shown that there are a number of potential significant environment effects that are likely to arise if WLM was introduced in the future after construction of the Scheme.

**Sea Lock and Barrage towards the mouth of the Haven**

3.9 I have critically examined the 1994 Boston Sea Lock Preliminary Feasibility Study (included as an appendix to the proof of evidence of James Anderson (EA/1/2)) and I agree that the most upstream location would be the least damaging overall in environmental terms. In addition, the current legislative requirements protecting designated sites requires alternative locations to be considered. Alternative locations clearly do exist (i.e. the Scheme) therefore I believe that a sea and lock and barrage proposal in the location identified would not secure approval.

**Adequacy of the Environmental Statement and compliance with the statutory procedural requirements**

3.10 The Scheme was the subject of a full scoping exercise pursuant to the Transport and Works (Applications and Objections Procedure) (England and Wales) Rules 2006 (Rules 2006) (B/11).

3.11 The ES also complies with requirements of the Rules 2006; Rule 11, together with the Annex 1 to the Rules 2006.

3.12 I believe that the ES complies with the requirements of the 2006 Rules.

**Likely environmental impacts of constructing and operating the Scheme and proposed mitigation measures**

3.13 The EIA findings were presented in the submitted ES (C/17/1) and Technical Reports (C/17/2A – D and C/17/3) that accompanied the Order application.

3.14 Significant residual effects are defined as moderate or major effects. These are detailed in listed in Table 18.1 (construction effects) and Table 18.2 (operation effects) of the submitted ES (A/17/1).

3.15 Nine environmental management plans are proposed for the Scheme to ensure adequate the delivery of the mitigation measures which will be secured through pre-commencement planning
conditions. A draft of the proposed planning conditions is provided in the Request for section 90 (2A) direction submitted (A/10).

Transportation of Waste Materials

3.16 A full description of this issue is set out within the Traffic and Transport Technical Report (A17/2D) of the ES. A draft Construction Traffic Management Plan has been produced for the TWAO application. The measures identified in the submitted ES for the transportation of dredged and excavated materials to landfill resulting from the construction of the Scheme will not give rise to debris being left throughout Boston, or along the proposed haul routes and that the use of specific haul roads will minimise any potential disturbance.

Planning conditions

3.17 A series of draft conditions (A/10) have been developed with Boston Borough Council. I believe they comply with the six tests referred to in the Planning Practice Guidance, Use of conditions (Section ID:21a).

3.18 Two further planning conditions are proposed for a Navigation Management Plan and relating to the grain conveyor for Frontier Ltd.

3.19 Extent to which the scheme would be consistent with local flood risk, environmental, economic and planning policies

3.20 Section 6 of the Statement of Case (I/1), Chapter 4 of the submitted ES (A/17/1) and the Planning Statement (A/12) all provide the planning and environmental policy context for the Scheme.

3.21 At the national level, the Scheme is in accordance with the NPPF (C/1/1) and the East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan (C/1/2) and the principal need for the Scheme is supported by local policy, both existing and emerging.

4 Objections and Representations

Transportation of dredged and excavated materials

4.1 The issue of dredged materials being disposed on land has been raised by Captain. BDC Franklin (OBJ/8). I consider that the transportation of dredged and excavated materials to landfill resulting from the construction of the Scheme will not give rise to debris being left throughout Boston, or along the proposed haul routes and that the use of specific haul roads will minimise any potential disturbance.

Detailed Design of Works

4.2 The Environment Agency in discussions with Frontier Agriculture Ltd (OBJ/5) has agreed to the inclusion of a new planning condition in relation to the conveyor.
Location and Design of the Barrier

4.3 Mr Matthews (OBJ/2), Boston Motor Yacht Club (OBJ/10), Cllr. David Brown (Wyberton Ward) (OBJ/7), Captain BDC Franklin (OBJ/8), Boston and District Fisherman's Association (OBJ/22), and Mr H Smith (OBJ/21) raised objections regarding the location and design of the Scheme.

4.4 In my opinion the preferred location of the Scheme is most suitable, when put into the context of needing to balance the positive and negative aspects of multiple environmental and social factors in coming to a recommendation.

4.5 I am of the opinion that there is no other barrier / barrage type alternative which would have less environmental impact than the proposed Scheme and is most likely to allow a future water management scheme to be implemented at a later stage with the least environmental harm.

Comments on Environmental Statement by IWA

4.6 I set out as fact clarifications and corrections identified by the IWA (IWA/9) none of which in my opinion alter the overall assessment as reported in the submitted ES (A/17/1).

Water Level Management

4.7 Mr H Smith (OBJ/21) raised concerns with regard to water level management. WLM is complex and detailed technical environmental assessments would need to be undertaken. My opinion on potential environmental impacts is as stated above.

Response to Statement of Matters

4.8 I have addressed the identified items in the Statement of Matters 2, 3, 4, 5c, 5d, 6, 7, 8, 9a, 9b, 9c and 10.

5 Conclusions

5.1 Overall I conclude that there are no reasons, in terms of environmental impact, why the Secretary of State should not authorise the Order.