Mitigation in EIA: paper promises or actual practice?

Lauren Tinker
Dick Cobb
Jon Gurr
Alan Bond

InteREAM, School of Environmental Sciences,
University of East Anglia, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, UK

The English Regions




18
19
20
17
21
22
25
26
16
14
15
13
12
24
23
27
28
11
10
29
9
8
30
31
7
33
32
34
35
6
5
3
4
2
1
0
50
Scale (km)

Environmental Aspect



Environmental Aspect



Environmental Aspect



Mitigation Type



Effect of Publications



Use of EMPs



Conclusions

- Half of mitigation measures in EIS not covered by conditions or obligations
- Large numbers of extra conditions and obligations
- Environmental aspect and mitigation type influence use of mitigation measures
- Change over time not attributable to single events
- Guidance / policies institution-specific?
- Need a greater role for EMPs or equivalent