

NRW's response to Examiners second questions for deadline 5

Request number	Request to	Request	NRW Response
2.1 Air Quality and Emissions			
2.1.3	The Applicant, the Kellogg Company of Great Britain (Kellogg's) and NRW	<p>Dust and air quality mitigation</p> <p>The Applicant and Kellogg's are requested to document their position on air quality and particularly dust impacts and the adequacy of mitigation proposals as at Deadline 4.</p> <p>NRW comments are sought at Deadline 5.</p>	<p>NRW would be responsible for regulating air quality and fugitive dust emissions following a successful EPR permit application. The potential for dust emissions once construction is complete is considered to be low based on experience with other sites of this nature.</p> <p>Given that construction impacts appear to be the primary concern and construction may commence without an EPR permit in place, the LPA would be best placed to comment on the regulation of fugitive dust emissions during construction.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, as expressed at the issue specific hearing for environmental and other issues (23/11/206), NRW consider that there would have to be a significant breach of the control measures proposed by the applicant (WPL) for the permits at the Kellogs site to be at risk of a breach. This was the primary concern outstanding following deadline 4 submissions.</p>
2.7. Gas and Electricity Connections			
2.7.13	NRW	Revised electrical connection route: HRA and the	NRW Is satisfied that no material

Request number	Request to	Request	NRW Response
		<p>NSER Is NRW content with the uCA conclusion that the revised electrical connection route does not give rise to any change to the conclusions in the NSER [APP-046]? NRW is requested to review its response to this question in the light of the responses of others to questions in section 2.7 at Deadline 4 and to respond again at Deadline 5 if any factors emerge that change its judgment.</p>	<p>increase in effects or additional effects are likely as a result of the amended connection route. As such NRW would not request any further assessment with regard to this matter. This is in line with NRW's representations made at deadline 3 to questions raised at the issue specific hearings.</p>
2.17 Water Environment			
2.17.2	The Applicant and NRW	<p>Water environment: WFD screening (FWQ 1.17.3) In [REP1-015], NRW suggested in response to FWQ 1.17.3 that the WFD assessment undertaken by the Applicant was not sufficiently specific to allow confidence in its conclusions at this point. NRW sought a map showing the water bodies in relation to the proposed development, asked that water body baseline data should be set out and that any potential impacts against the WFD quality elements should be considered in full. Whilst the Applicant has highlighted that NRW did not express any concerns at the outset about its WFD approach, which was equivalent to that taken at Meaford and supported by the Environment Agency [REP1-032], it has also identified data across the ES [REP2-009] that in part respond to the issues raised by NRW in its response to FWQ 1.17.3 [REP1-015]. This notwithstanding, it would assist the ExA if a single consolidated summary WFD assessment was prepared by the Applicant for Deadline 4, addressing the requests made by NRW in [REP1-015].</p> <p>NRW is requested to respond to this document at Deadline 5.</p>	<p>Having reviewed the information presented at deadline 4, NRW is satisfied that the developer has presented sufficient information to assess the WFD implications of the project. NRW is satisfied that no further information is required with regard to WFD and that our requirements set out at deadline 1 (examiners Q 1.17.3) have been met.</p>