

## The Millbrook Power (Gas Fired Power Station) Order

# Applicants Comments on Central Bedfordshire Council's Local Impact Report – Submitted at Deadline 3

**Planning Act 2008** 

The Infrastructure Planning

(Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

PINS Reference Number: EN010068

Document Reference: N/A Regulation Number: N/A

Author: Peter Brett Associates LLP

Revision 0

Date May 2018

**Description** Examination Version





# The Millbrook Power (Gas Fired Power Station) Order



Applicant's Response to CBC Local Impact Report [REP2-024]

**PINS Reference Number: EN010068** 

**Deadline 3 – 17 May 2018** 

Project Ref: 40334 | Rev: 01 | Date: May 2018



#### Response to CBC LIR

Millbrook Power Project

### **Summary**

- 1.1.1 The Applicant, Millbrook Power Limited, is applying to the Secretary of State (SoS) under the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) for development consent to construct, operate and maintain an Open Cycle Gas Turbine (OCGT) gas fired peaking power generating station, fuelled by natural gas with a rated electrical output of up to 299 Megawatts (MW) together with associated development of a gas connection and electrical connection (the Millbrook Power Project).
- 1.1.2 The Development Consent Order (DCO) Application for the Millbrook Power Project (the Project) was submitted by the Applicant to the SoS in October 2017. It was formally accepted to progress to examination in November 2017.
- 1.1.3 This document contains the Applicant's response to the Local Impact Report submitted to the ExA by Central Bedfordshire Council (CBC) at Deadline 2.



## **Applicants Comments on CBCs Local Impact Report**

| LIR Reference   | Summary of CBCs Comments   | Applicants Response   |
|---|--|---|
| 1.0 - Introduction  | Provides an introduction to and purposes of the LIR.   | The Applicant assumes that CBC meant to refer to Advice note one: Local Impact Reports (dated April 2012). The Applicant also assumes that references to "the Commission" are meant to be references to the "Secretary of State"  |
| 2.0 -Structure  | Outlines the structure of the LIR.   | The Applicant has no comments.  |
| 3.0 - Site Description and Surroundings/ Location   | Provides a description of the site and wider setting of the Rookery.   | The Applicant has no comments.  |
| 4.0 - Historical<br>Background  | Provides a background to the Marston Vale, including history of the brickmaking industry.  | The Applicant notes the historical background of the area but has no comments.  |
| 5.0 - Relevant<br>development plan<br>policies  | Outlines relevant development plan policies, supplementary planning guidance or documents, development briefs or approved master plans and an appraisal of their relationship and relevance to the proposals   | The Applicant notes the relevant development plan policies and how these relate to the Project. The Applicant confirms that these policies have been taken into consideration in preparing the DCO Application, including within the Planning Statement [APP-056] and Chapter 2 and relevant topic chapters of the ES [APP-033].  |
| 5.5 - Relevant<br>development<br>proposals under<br>consideration or<br>granted permission<br>but not commenced<br>or completed | <ul> <li>Whilst there are no sites which will be directly affected by the proposal, it is clear that there is the possibility that a number of sites may be indirectly affected, particularly by vehicle movements and potentially noise, odour and other amenity issues. These include:</li> <li>Land South of Wixams (MA3) - 1000 dwellings and 5ha Employment land – This development has not been started.</li> <li>NIRAH (EA8) – This planning permission, which was linked to the allocation of the site within the Site Allocations DPD, has</li> </ul> | The Applicant notes the list of developments and these have been included within the list of cumulative developments for assessment presented in section 4.10 of the ES [APP-033].  These developments have been taken forward for assessment in each topic chapter. Apart from some isolated examples of landscape and visual effects, no likely significant cumulative effects have been predicted. |

#### Response to CBC LIR Millbrook Power Project



|                                     | <ul> <li>Land at Moreteyne Farm, Marston Moretaine (MA4) - 125<br/>dwellings, 7ha B1, B2 and B8 and the possibility of 320<br/>dwellings as a contingency – This development is under<br/>construction.</li> </ul>  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| 6.1 - Compulsory<br>Acquisition     | The Local Authority is not aware of any local issues in relation to this topic.   | The Applicant notes the comments. Compulsory Acquisition was discussed at an Issue Specific Hearing on 03 <sup>rd</sup> May 2018. A written summary of the hearing has been submitted to the ExA at Deadline 3.  |
| 6.2 - Design, Layout and Visibility | The development, due to its scale and location, would have a major landscape impact, and would intrude into valued views from Ampthill Park and from other sites on the Greensand Ridge.  The site is currently set within a landscape setting of productive farmland and the Millennium Country Park. It is accepted that the current setting would be impacted by the Covanta Resource Recovery Facility, to the north. The Proposal, coupled with the Covanta Resource Recovery Facility, would present a more industrial setting. Requirements 3 and 4 of the draft DCO identifies the need for landscaping works, which may significantly mitigate this issue. | The Applicant does not agree that the Project would have a major landscape impact. The full assessment of landscape impacts is presented in Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-033].  The Applicant also refers to the Statement of Common Ground signed by CBC [REP2 – 039]. Paragraph 5.162 states that:  "The Parties agree that variance regarding the findings of LVIA is not uncommon. In this case, the Parties agree that the LVIA has been prepared in accordance with the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (3rd Edition) and the Parties agree that the overall assessment is considered to be comprehensive and the scale of the visual impacts are acceptable".  Furthermore, CBC has agreed the Requirements contained in the dDCO (Revision 1) - see paragraph 5.274 of the Statement of Common Ground between CBC and the Applicant [REP-2-039]. Agreement has therefore been reached with CBC regarding the acceptability of the Project on design, layout and visibility. |
| 6.3 – DCO                           | There are concerns about how the various impacts will be mitigated, monitored and controlled through an appropriately worded DCO.   | The Applicant has discussed the wording of the draft DCO, and specifically the Requirements contained in Schedule 2 of the DCO, with CBC on several occasions.   |



|                                   |   | The Applicant refers to paragraph 5.274 of the Statement of Common Ground signed by CBC [REP2 – 039] which states that the DCO Requirements are agreed.  |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| 6.4 – Economic and Social Impacts | It is felt that there may be some positive impact on the local area in respect to the creation of jobs both during construction and the operation of the plant.   | The Applicant notes the comments and refers to Chapter 14 of the ES [APP-033] which presents an assessment of the Socio-economic impacts of the Project. No likely significant effects are anticipated.  |
|                                   | These positive impacts need to be considered against any negative impacts. Such a large facility may well have a negative impact on attracting new development to the area, on house prices and the ability to sell property and generally on the ongoing regeneration of the area from its industrial past to a greener cleaner future       | Section 7.4 of the Planning Statement [APP- 056] provides a summary of the likely benefits and disbenefits of the Project and concludes that although there would be some disbenefits, there would also be a number of benefits both to the local community and national energy security.  |
|                                   |   | The Applicant also refers to paragraphs 5.237 to 5.265 of the Statement of Common Ground signed by CBC [REP2 – 039] which states that there is agreement regarding the assessment and effects of the economic and social impacts.  |
| 6.5 – EIA                         | The assessment process has been generally comprehensive although some detailed concerns remain with aspects of the visual assessment and air quality.   | The Applicant notes the comments and refers to the Environmental Statement [APP-033] which provides a detailed assessment of landscape and visual impacts and air quality impacts. The Applicant also refers to the Statement of Common Ground signed by CBC [REP2 – 039] where CBC confirms that the visual assessment (paragraphs 5.148 to 5.176) and air quality assessment (paragraphs 5.2 to 5.30) are appropriate. |
| 6.6 –Environmental Issues         | Representations have raised concern regarding the impact to the environment. These comments highlight that the development would present an impact in terms of increased levels of pollution, including noise and odour. In relation to noise, it is noted that the proposed construction hours, during which noisy works can take place, are | Whilst it is recognised that interested parties have raised concerns over certain environmental aspects of the Project, the Applicant considers that these matters have been sufficiently addressed in the ES [APP-033], Comments on Relevant Representations [REP2-014] and Responses to First Written Questions [REP2-016].  |



outside of those which Central Bedfordshire Council would normally consider acceptable.

Representations have also raised concerns regarding impacts from the proposed development upon air quality. Specifically, the generation of Carbon Monoxide, Nitrogen Oxides and greenhouse gases, has been suggested as a significant issue by representations. Marston Moretaine Parish Council have also raised issue regarding the environmental impact and the potential increase of ground levels of Nitrogen Dioxide. The Parish Council are concerned that this could present a subsequent detrimental impact subsequent upon environmental habitats and upon both human life and wildlife. Concerns have also been raised regarding the impact in terms of contamination and impact to ground water.

The Applicant also refers to the Statements of Common Ground signed with statutory consultees (including Natural England and the Environment Agency) which deal with these issues [REP2-040] and [REP2-041].

The construction hours set out in requirement 14 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [REP2-015] have now been agreed with CBC as being appropriate for the Project (see paragraph 5.274 of the Statement of Common Ground signed by CBC [REP2 – 039]).

#### 6.7 – Habitats, Ecology and Nature Conservation

It is noted that several representations have been received that have raised concerns regarding the impact to the Forest of Marston Vale, the Millennium Country Park and the Rookery Clay Pit County Wildlife Site. Due to the scale of the proposal and the close proximity of the development to several areas of important ecological interest, this is a matter of significance.

Whilst it is recognised that interested parties have raised concerns over certain environmental aspects of the Project, the Applicant considers that these matters have been sufficiently addressed in the ES [APP-033]. Comments on Relevant Representations [REP2-014] and responses to First Written Questions [REP2-016]. In particular, impacts on the Millennium Country Park have been addressed in the Applicant's response to RR-016 [REP2-014] and Chapters 11 and 14 of the ES. Potential impacts on Rookery Clay Pit CWS have been addressed in Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-033] and the assessment methodology and conclusion of effects have been agreed with Natural England (see the Statement of Common Ground signed by Natural England [REP2-040]). No likely significant effects have been predicted on these receptors.

There is a Low-Level Restoration Scheme approved for both Rookery North and South Pits through the review of the old minerals permission. This provides for the ongoing ecological management of the pits up to 2024. However, it is important that this habitat management is ongoing and that local habitats are enhanced and species protected for the duration of the development.

The development may present opportunities to provide ecological value, for example through screen planting and additional habitats.

In respect of protected species, the Applicant refers to paragraph 5.57 of the Statement of Common Ground signed by Natural England [REP2-040], and its response to First Written Question 1.5.1 [REP2-016]. which confirms that the Great Crested Newt License for the

#### Response to CBC LIR Millbrook Power Project



|                               |   | Rookery South pit has been extended to 2026 and the Applicant will abide by the terms and conditions of the licence and any subsequent licence revisions.  The details of habitat enhancement are provided in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation and Management Strategy (Revision 1) [REP2-004].  |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| 6.8 – Historic<br>Environment | Representations have highlighted concerns regarding the existence and operation of the generating station, and its impact to designated heritage assets, such as listed buildings and parks.  The development, and in particular the gas and electricity connections, is likely to impact archaeological remains outside Rookery Pit South. Requirement 9 of the draft DCO suggests mitigation in response to this issue. | The comments are acknowledged and the Applicant refers to Appendix 13.3 of the ES [APP-047] which confirms CBC are satisfied with the approach to archaeological mitigation. The Applicant also refers to the signed Statement of Common Ground [REP2-039] at paragraphs 5.221 to 5.236 where agreement is recorded between the Applicant and CBC over the historic environment. |
|                               |   | The Applicant has assessed potential impacts on designated heritage assets in Chapter 13 of the ES [APP-033] as well as supplementary visual information submitted to Historic England (included as Appendix C to comments on Relevant Representations [REP2-014]).  |
|                               |   | The conclusion of the assessment is that the impacts of the Project on heritage assets will not be significant either in isolation or cumulatively. The Applicant has agreed a Statement of Common Ground with Historic England which has been submitted to the ExA at Deadline 3.   |
| 6.10 – Transport and Traffic  | The principle access for the Project would be accessed via Green Lane. Green Lane is the main access into Stewartby village from the  | The Applicant considers that these matters have been fully addressed in the ES [APP-033] and TA [APP-046].   |
|                               | A421. Whilst there is also access from the A6 Bedford Road to the east height is restricted by a railway arch. As the Green Lane access is proposed to be shared with the Covanta Resource Recovery Facility, consideration should be paid to the cumulative impact upon  | The Applicant also refer to the Statements of Common Ground signed by CBC [REP2 – 039], BBC [REP2-009] and Highways England [REP-1-003] which agree to the   |



traffic, construction traffic movement, road safety, routing and footpath management.

Representations have highlighted the need to consider the impact the development would have on heavy loads and whether the proposal would have any impact to heavy load routes.

Marston Moretaine Parish Council have also raised concerns in relation to traffic and traffic noise. The Parish Council have requested that the access route for construction traffic exits the A421 dual carriage way at Marsh Leys interchange, and not Beancroft Road roundabout, Marston Moretaine. This has been raised by the Parish Council to ensure that there is no disruption to local traffic for both entering and exiting the village at either Beancroft Road or Bedford Road and to also protect the amenity of local residents from vibration and noise.

assessment methods and conclusions of the assessment of traffic and transport effects.

The Applicant refers to its comments on Relevant Representation RR-019 [REP2-014]. The Applicant will include this alternative route as the preferred route for the majority of construction movements in the construction traffic management plan to be submitted pursuant to Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO should the highways authorities deem it necessary or more suitable than the route proposed in the ES. The final decision on the routing would therefore be left to CBC (in consultation with the Parish Council) at the point when construction is scheduled to commence, which is the appropriate time to consider the local road network.

#### 6.11 - Health Issues

It is noted that several representations have raised concerns regarding the impact to public health. It is noted that the supporting documents, such as the Environmental Statement, have considered this matter. This has done little to ameliorate the concerns of local residents in respect to the potential health impacts of the proposed facility. This is particularly because many residents can recall the effect on their health of living in the vicinity of the brickworks which spewed out noxious malodourous gases and smoke. Many residents experienced respiratory illnesses, including asthma, which they consider were linked to the operation of the brickworks and which only improved when the works closed. The residents do not want to return to this sort of situation.

Local residents not only have the experience of the emissions from the brickworks but also of the odour emanating from the waste landfilled at Brogborough, Stewartby and other sites in the Vale. There is also the perceived health impact of the proposed facility. It will be visually intrusive and residents will be aware that it is nearby. Seeing views of the facility every day will be a constant reminder to residents that their health could be harmed by the emissions from the facility. Some

The comments are acknowledged and an assessment of potential effects on human health have been considered in Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-033] which concludes that the Project would not give rise to any likely significant effects on human health.

It is noted that the emission characteristics of gas fired power stations are totally different to those from brickworks. There would be no visible plume from the Generating Equipment.

The Applicant also refers to the submission made by Public Health England at Deadline 1 [REP1-006] which confirms that they do not have comments on the Application.

#### Response to CBC LIR

Millbrook Power Project



| illnesses may be generated of a psychological nature if not actually |  |
|--|--|
| caused by the emissions themselves.                                  |  |