

Appendix 19.2

Air Quality Cumulative Impact Assessment with the Proposed East Anglia ONE North Project

Environmental Statement Volume 3

Applicant: East Anglia TWO Limited Document Reference: 6.3.19.2

SPR Reference: EA2-DWF-ENV-REP-IBR-000911_002 Rev 01

Pursuant to APFP Regulation: 5(2)(a)

Author: Royal HaskoningDHV

Date: October 2019 Revision: Version 1





| Revision Summary | | | | |
|------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Rev | Date | Prepared by | Checked by | Approved by |
| 01 | 08/10/2019 | Paolo Pizzolla | Julia Bolton | Helen Walker |

| Description of Revisions | | | |
|--------------------------|------|---------|----------------------|
| Rev | Page | Section | Description |
| 01 | n/a | n/a | Final for Submission |





Table of Contents

| 19.2 | Cumulative Impact Assessment with the proposed E | ast Anglia |
|------|--|------------|
| | ONE North Project | 1 |
| 19.1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 19.2 | Construction Scenarios Realistic Worst Case Parameters | 1 |
| 19.3 | Cumulative Impact Assessment during Construction | 8 |
| 19.4 | Summary | 18 |
| 19.5 | References | 19 |





Appendix 19.2 is supported by the tables listed below.

| Table Number | Title | |
|--------------|---|--|
| Table A19.1 | Scenario 1 Realistic Worst Case | |
| Table A19.2 | Scenario 2 Realistic Worst Case | |
| Table A19.3 | Defined Dust Emission Magnitudes Associated for each Construction Activity for Scenario 1 | |
| Table A19.4 | Dust Emission Magnitudes for the onshore works - Scenario 1 | |
| Table A19.5 | Sensitivity of the Area to each activity - Scenario 1 | |
| Table A19.6 | Risk of Dust Impacts - Scenario 1 | |
| Table A19.7 | Annual Mean NO ₂ results at Sensitive Human Receptor Locations – Scenario 1 | |
| Table A19.8 | Annual Mean PM ₁₀ results at Sensitive Human Receptor Locations – Scenario 1 | |
| Table A19.9 | Short-Term PM ₁₀ Results at Sensitive Human Receptor Locations – Scenario 1 | |
| Table A19.10 | Annual Mean PM _{2.5} results at Sensitive Human Receptor Locations - Scenario 1 | |
| Table A19.11 | Air Quality Strategy Objectives (England) for the Purposes of LAQM | |
| Table A19.12 | Nutrient Nitrogen Deposition Results | |
| Table A19.13 | Nutrient Nitrogen Deposition as Percentage of Critical Load | |
| Table A19.14 | Summary of Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 Realistic Worst-Case Assumptions | |



Glossary of Acronyms

| AADT | Annual Average Daily Traffic |
|-------------------|---|
| CCS | Construction Consolidation Sites |
| CIA | Cumulative Impact Assessment |
| DCO | Development Consent Order |
| ES | Environmental Statement |
| HDD | Horizontal Directional Drilling |
| HGV | Heavy Goods Vehicle |
| IAQM | The Institute of Air Quality Management |
| LAQM | Local Air Quality Management |
| PM ₁₀ | Particulate Matter with a mean aerodynamic diameter of less than 10 µm |
| PM _{2.5} | Particulate Matter with a mean aerodynamic diameter of less than 2.5 µm |
| TG | Technical Guidance |
| μg.m-3 | Micrograms (of pollutant) per cubic meter (of air) |



Glossary of Terminology

| Applicant | East Anglia TWO Limited. | |
|--|--|--|
| Cable sealing end compound | A compound which allows the safe transition of cables between the overhead lines and underground cables which connect to the National Grid substation. | |
| Cable sealing end (with circuit breaker) compound | A compound (which includes a circuit breaker) which allows the safe transition of cables between the overhead lines and underground cables which connect to the National Grid substation. | |
| Construction consolidation sites | Compounds associated with the onshore works which may include elements such as hard standings, lay down and storage areas for construction materials and equipment, areas for vehicular parking, welfare facilities, wheel washing facilities, workshop facilities and temporary fencing or other means of enclosure. | |
| Development area | The area comprising the onshore development area and the offshore development area (described as the 'order limits' within the Development Consent Order). | |
| East Anglia TWO project | The proposed project consisting of up to 75 wind turbines, up to four offshore electrical platforms, up to one construction, operation and maintenance platform, inter-array cables, platform link cables, up to one operational meteorological mast, up to two offshore export cables, fibre optic cables, landfall infrastructure, onshore cables and ducts, onshore substation, and National Grid infrastructure. | |
| East Anglia TWO windfarm site | The offshore area within which wind turbines and offshore platforms will be located. | |
| European site | Sites designated for nature conservation under the Habitats Directive and Birds Directive, as defined in regulation 8 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and regulation 18 of the Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. These include candidate Special Areas of Conservation, Sites of Community Importance, Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas. | |
| Horizontal directional drilling (HDD) | A method of cable installation where the cable is drilled beneath a feature without the need for trenching. | |
| HDD temporary working area | Temporary compounds which will contain laydown, storage and work areas for HDD drilling works. | |
| Jointing Bay | Underground structures constructed at regular intervals along the onshore cable route to join sections of cable and facilitate installation of the cables into the buried ducts. | |
| Landfall | The area (from Mean Low Water Springs) where the offshore export cables would make contact with land, and connect to the onshore cables. | |
| Link boxes | Underground chambers within the onshore cable route housing electrical earthing links. | |
| Mitigation areas Areas captured within the onshore development area specifically for expected or anticipated impacts. | | |



| National electricity | The high voltage electricity transmission network in England and Wales | |
|--|---|--|
| grid | owned and maintained by National Grid Electricity Transmission | |
| National Grid infrastructure | , 5 | |
| National Grid overhead line realignment works | Works required to upgrade the existing electricity pylons and overhead lines (including cable sealing end compounds and cable sealing end (with circuit breaker) compound) to transport electricity from the National Grid substation to the national electricity grid. | |
| National Grid overhead line realignment works area | The proposed area for National Grid overhead line realignment works. | |
| National Grid substation | The substation (including all of the electrical equipment within it) necessary to connect the electricity generated by the proposed East Anglia TWO project to the national electricity grid which will be owned by National Grid but is being consented as part of the proposed East Anglia TWO project Development Consent Order. | |
| National Grid substation location | The proposed location of the National Grid substation. | |
| Natura 2000 site | A site forming part of the network of sites made up of Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas designated respectively under the Habitats Directive and Birds Directive. | |
| Onshore cable corridor | The corridor within which the onshore cable route will be located. | |
| Onshore cable route | This is the construction swathe within the onshore cable corridor which would contain onshore cables as well as temporary ground required for construction which includes cable trenches, haul road and spoil storage areas. | |
| Onshore cables | The cables which would bring electricity from landfall to the onshore substation. The onshore cable is comprised of up to six power cables (which may be laid directly within a trench, or laid in cable ducts or protective covers), up to two fibre optic cables and up to two distributed temperature sensing cables. | |
| Onshore development area | The area in which the landfall, onshore cable corridor, onshore substation, landscaping and ecological mitigation areas, temporary construction facilities (such as access roads and construction consolidation sites), and the National Grid Infrastructure will be located. | |
| Onshore infrastructure | The combined name for all of the onshore infrastructure associated with the proposed East Anglia TWO project from landfall to the connection to the national electricity grid. | |
| Onshore preparation works Activities to be undertaken prior to formal commencement of onshore construction such as pre–planting of landscaping works, archaeologinvestigations, environmental and engineering surveys, diversion and services, and highway alterations. | | |





| Onshore substation | The East Anglia TWO substation and all of the electrical equipment within the onshore substation and connecting to the National Grid infrastructure. | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Onshore substation location | The proposed location of the onshore substation for the proposed East Anglia TWO project. | |
| Transition Bay | Underground structures at the landfall that house the joints between the offshore export cables and the onshore cables. | |



19.2 Cumulative Impact Assessment with the proposed East Anglia ONE North Project

19.1 Introduction

- 1. This appendix to *Chapter 19 Air Quality* covers the cumulative impact assessment of the proposed East Anglia TWO project with the proposed East Anglia ONE North project in relation to air quality.
- 2. The East Anglia ONE North offshore windfarm project (the proposed East Anglia ONE North project) is also in the application phase. The proposed East Anglia ONE North project has a separate Development Consent Order (DCO) which has been submitted at the same time as the proposed East Anglia TWO project. The two projects share the same landfall location and onshore cable corridor and the two onshore substations are co-located, and connect into the same National Grid substation.
- 3. The proposed East Anglia TWO project Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA) for air quality will therefore initially consider the cumulative impact with only the East Anglia ONE North project against two different construction scenarios (i.e. construction of the two projects simultaneously and sequentially). The realistic worst case scenario of each impact is then carried through to the main body of the CIA which considers other developments which have been screened into the CIA.
- 4. For a more detailed description of the CIA please refer to **Chapter 5 EIA Methodology**.

19.2 Construction Scenarios Realistic Worst Case Parameters

- 5. This appendix considers the proposed East Anglia TWO project and the proposed East Anglia ONE North project under two construction scenarios:
 - Scenario 1 the proposed East Anglia TWO project and proposed East Anglia ONE North project are built simultaneously; and
 - Scenario 2 the proposed East Anglia TWO project and the proposed East Anglia ONE North project are constructed sequentially.
- 6. As discussed in **section 19.1**, the realistic worst case (based on the assessment of these two construction scenarios) for each impact is then carried through to



- the wider CIA which considers other developments, projects or plans which have been screened into the CIA for the proposed East Anglia TWO project.
- 7. It should be noted that the operational phase impacts on air quality will be the same irrespective of the construction scenario. Therefore, operational impacts identified in scenario 1 will be the same as those for scenario 2.
- 8. Embedded and additional mitigation measures for the proposed East Anglia TWO project and proposed East Anglia ONE North project will be the same. These are detailed in *Chapter 19 Air Quality*

19.2.1 Scenario 1

9. **Table A19.1** presents the realistic worst case parameters of scenario 1. In this instance, the proposed East Anglia TWO project and proposed East Anglia ONE North project are built simultaneously. Areas provided for onshore infrastructure are maximum footprints with indicative dimensions provided in brackets.

Table A19.1 Scenario 1 Realistic Worst Case

| Impact | Parameter | Notes |
|--|--|---|
| Construction | | |
| Construction duration | The minimum realistic duration that the onshore works can be completed in, resulting in the highest traffic demand due to the intensity of activities, is 36 months (three years). | Vehicle movements have been calculated using this parameter and are detailed further in Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport . |
| Construction date | Earliest start of construction is mid 2023. | Vehicle movements have been calculated using this parameter and are detailed further in Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport . |
| Impacts related to the landfall | HDD temporary working area: 13,300m ² (70m x 190m) | Construction footprints are provided as a proxy for |
| | Transition bay temporary working area (for 4 transition bays): 3,108m² (37m x 42m) | construction dust emissions |
| | Landfall Construction Consolidation Site (CCS) (x1): 14,080m² (88m x 160m) | |
| Impacts related to the onshore cable route | Onshore cable route: 581,824m² (9,091m x 64m) | Construction footprints are provided as a proxy for |
| | Jointing bay temporary working area: 570m ² (30.6m x 18.6m). Total for 76 jointing bays: 43,320m ² (570m ² x 76) | construction dust emissions |
| | HDD (retained as an option to cross SPA / SSSI): | |



| Impact | Parameter | Notes |
|--|---|--|
| | Entrance pit temporary working area (x1): 12,250m² (175m x 70m) | |
| | Exit pit temporary working area (x1): 5,250m² (175m x 30m) | |
| | Onshore cable route large CCS (1): 33,000m ² (165m x 200m). | |
| | Onshore cable route medium CCS (2): 28,160m² total (88m x 160m per each medium CCS) | |
| | Onshore cable route small CCS (2): 12,000m² total (120m x 50m per each small CCS) | |
| | Total footprint of all onshore cable route CCS: 73,160m ² | |
| | Onshore cable route laydown area: 1,000m² | |
| | Onshore cable route haul road between landfall and Snape Road (7,331m in length x 4.5m wide with additional 4m for passing places at approximately 90m intervals): 40,435m ² | |
| | Onshore cable route and substation access haul road (1,570m in length x 9m wide): 14,130m ² | |
| | Temporary access roads (957m in length x 4.5m wide with additional 4m for passing places at approximately 90m intervals): 5,231m ² | |
| Impacts related to the onshore substations | Onshore substation CCS (x2): 34,200m ² (190m x 90m per each onshore substation) | Construction footprints are provided as a proxy for |
| | Permanent footprint (used as CCS during construction) (x2): 72,200m² (190m x 190m per each onshore substation) | construction dust emissions |
| | Substation operational access road: 13,600m² (1,700m x 8m) | |
| | Onshore substation approximate quantity of spoil material: 38,102m ³ | |
| Impacts related to the | National Grid CCS: 23,350m ² | Construction footprints are |
| National Grid | National Grid operational substation (AIS | provided as a proxy for |
| Infrastructure | technology) (used as a CCS during construction): 44,950m² (310m x 145m) | construction dust emissions. AIS technology is assessed as |
| | Temporary pylon/mast temporary working area (x4): 10,000m² (2,500m² per each temporary pylon) | the worst case due to a larger footprint. Futher detail regarding GIS tehcnology is provided in Chapter 6 Project Description . |
| | Permanent pylon permanent footprint (x4): 1,600m² (400m² per each permanent pylon) | |



| Impact | Parameter | Notes |
|--------|---|-------|
| | Permanent pylon temporary working area (x4): 8,400m² (2,100m² per each permanent pylon) | |
| | Overhead line realignment temporary working area: 5,000m ² | |
| | Cable sealing end/Cable sealing end (with circuit breaker) compounds permanent footprint: 10,000 m ² (total for three compounds) | |
| | Cable sealing end/Cable sealing end (with circuit breaker) compounds temporary working area: 30,000m² (for three compounds) | |
| | Temporary access road (for pylon works): (1,100m in length x 4.5m wide with additional 4m for passing places at approximately 90m intervals): 5,629m ² | |
| | Permanent access road to sealing end compound: 1,850m² (500m x 3.7m) | |

Operation

Operational phase air quality impacts have been scoped out as detailed in the Scoping Report (SPR 2017)

Decommissioning

No decision has been made regarding the final decommissioning policy for the onshore infrastructure as it is recognised that industry best practice, rules and legislation change over time. An Onshore Decommissioning Plan will be provided, as secured under the requirements of the draft DCO. The onshore substation will likely be removed and be reused or recycled. It is anticipated that the onshore cable would be decommissioned (de-energised) and either the cables and jointing bays left *in situ* or removed depending on the requirements of the Onshore Decommissioning Plan approved by the Local Planning Authority. The detail and scope of the decommissioning works will be determined by the relevant legislation and guidance at the time of decommissioning and agreed with the regulator. As such, for the purposes of a worst-case scenario, impacts no greater than those identified for the construction phase are expected for the decommissioning phase.

19.2.2 Scenario 2

- 10. **Table A19.2** presents the realistic worst case parameters of scenario 2. Scenario 2 represents the realistic worst-case in the eventuality that the proposed East Anglia TWO project and proposed East Anglia ONE North project are constructed sequentially. Areas provided for onshore infrastructure are maximum footprints with indicative dimensions provided in brackets.
- 11. Under scenario 2, either the proposed East Anglia TWO project or the proposed East Anglia ONE North project could be constructed first. However, there will be no difference in impact regardless of which project is constructed first. The CIA



presented in this ES is presented using the intended development strategy of the proposed East Anglia TWO project being constructed first. However, in the eventuality that the proposed East Anglia ONE North project is constructed first, the impacts presented would be the same. Further detail regarding the sequential construction is provided in *Chapter 5 EIA Methodology*.

Table A19.2 Scenario 2 Realistic Worst Case

| Impact | Proposed East Anglia TWO Project Parameters | Proposed East Anglia ONE North Project Parameters (on the assumption that the proposed East Anglia TWO project is post- construction) | Notes |
|---|--|--|---|
| Construction | | | |
| Construction duration | The minimum realistic duration that the onshore works can be completed in, resulting in the highest traffic demand due to the intensity of activities, is 36 months (three years). | The minimum realistic duration that the onshore works can be completed in, resulting in the highest traffic demand due to the intensity of activities, is 36 months (three years). | Vehicle movements have been calculated using this parameter and are detailed further in Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport . |
| Construction date | Earliest start of construction is mid 2023. | Earliest start of construction is mid 2023. | Vehicle movements have been calculated using this parameter and are detailed further in Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport. |
| Impacts related to the landfall | HDD temporary working area: 7,000m² (70m x 100m) Transition bay temporary working area (for 2 transition bays): 1,554m² (37m x 42m) Landfall Construction Consolidation Site (CCS) (x1): 7,040m² (88m x 80m) Landfall transition bays approximate quantity of spoil material (for 2 transition bays): 454m³ | HDD temporary working area: 7,000m² (70m x 100m) Transition bay temporary working area (for 2 transition bays): 1,554m² (37m x 42m) Landfall Construction Consolidation Site (CCS) (x1): 7,040m² (88m x 80m) Landfall transition bays approximate quantity of spoil material (for 2 transition bays): 454m³ | Construction footprints are provided as a proxy for construction dust emissions |
| Impacts related to the onshore cable route | Onshore cable route: 290,912m² (9,091m x 32m) Jointing bay temporary working area: 570m² (30.6m x 18.6m). Total for 38 jointing bays: 21,660m² (570m² x 38) | Onshore cable route: 290,912m² (9,091m x 32m) Jointing bay temporary working area: 570m² (30.6m x 18.6m). Total for 38 jointing bays: 21,660m² (570m² x 38) | Construction footprints are provided as a proxy for construction dust emissions |



Impact Proposed East Anglia TWO Proposed East Anglia ONE Notes

Project Parameters

North Project Parameters (on the assumption that the proposed East Anglia TWO project is post-construction)

HDD (retained as an option to cross SPA / SSSI):

Entrance pit temporary working area (x1): 6,300m² (90m x 70m)

Exit pit temporary working area (x1): 2,700m² (90m x 30m)

Onshore cable route large CCS (1): 16,500m² (165m x 100m).

Onshore cable route medium CCS (2): 14,080m² total (88m x 80m per each medium CCS)

Onshore cable route small CCS (2): 6,000m² total (60m x 50m per each small CCS)

Total footprint of all onshore cable route CCS: 36,580m²

Onshore cable route laydown area: 1.000m²

Onshore cable route haul road between landfall and Snape Road (7,331m in length x 4.5m wide with additional 4m for passing places at approximately 90m intervals): 40,435m²

Onshore cable route and substation access haul road (1,570m in length x 9m wide): 14,130m²

Temporary access roads (957m in length x 4.5m wide with additional 4m for passing places at approximately 90m intervals): 5,231m²

Onshore cable trench approximate quantity of spoil material: 14,325m³

HDD (retained as an option to cross SPA / SSSI):

Entrance pit temporary working area (x1): 6,300m² (90m x 70m)

Exit pit temporary working area (x1): 2,700m² (90m x 30m)

Onshore cable route large CCS (1): 16,500m² (165m x 100m).

Onshore cable route medium CCS (2): 14,080m² total (88m x 80m per each medium CCS)

Onshore cable route small CCS (2): 6,000m² total (60m x 50m per each small CCS)

Total footprint of all onshore cable route CCS: 36,580m²

Onshore cable route laydown area: 1,000m²

Onshore cable route haul road between landfall and Snape Road (7,331m in length x 4.5m wide with additional 4m for passing places at approximately 90m intervals): 40,435m²

Onshore cable route and substation access haul road (1,570m in length x 9m wide): 14,130m²

Temporary access roads (957m in length x 4.5m wide with additional 4m for passing places at approximately 90m intervals): 5,231m²

Onshore cable trench approximate quantity of spoil material: 14,325m³



| Impact | Proposed East Anglia TWO Project Parameters | Proposed East Anglia ONE North Project Parameters (on the assumption that the proposed East Anglia TWO project is post- construction) | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|
| Impacts related to the onshore substation | Onshore substation CCS: 17,100m² (190m x 90m) Permanent footprint (used as CCS during construction): 36,100m² (190m x 190m) Substation operational access road: 13,600m² (1,700m x 8m) Onshore substation approximate quantity of spoil material: 24,486m³ | Onshore substation CCS: 17,100m² (190m x 90m) Permanent footprint (used as CCS during construction): 36,100m² (190m x 190m) Onshore substation approximate quantity of spoil material: 24,486m³ | Construction footprints are provided as a proxy for construction dust emissions |
| Impacts related to the National Grid Infrastructure | National Grid CCS: 23,350m² National Grid operational substation (AIS technology) (used as a CCS during construction): 44,950m² (310m x 145m) Temporary pylon/mast temporary working area (x4): 10,000m² (2,500m² per each temporary pylon) Permanent pylon permanent footprint (x4): 1,600m² (400m² per each permanent pylon) Permanent pylon temporary working area (x4): 8,400m² (2,100m² per each permanent pylon) Overhead line realignment temporary working area (x4): 8,400m² (2,100m² per each permanent pylon) Overhead line realignment temporary working area: 5,000m² Cable sealing end/Cable sealing end (with circuit breaker) compounds permanent footprint: 10,000 m² (total for three compounds) Cable sealing end/Cable sealing end (with circuit breaker) compounds temporary working area: 30,000m² (for three compounds) Temporary access road (for pylon works): (1,100m in | National Grid infrastructure will be constructed as part of the proposed East Anglia TWO project | Construction footprints are provided as a proxy for construction dust emissions. AIS technology is assessed as the worst case due to a larger footprint. Further detail regarding GIS technology is provided in Chapter 6 Project Description. |



| Impact | Proposed East Anglia TWO Project Parameters | Proposed East Anglia ONE North Project Parameters (on the assumption that the proposed East Anglia TWO project is post- construction) | Notes |
|--------|---|--|-------|
| | length x 4.5m wide with additional 4m for passing places at approximately 90m intervals): 5,629m ² | | |
| | Permanent access road to sealing end compound: 1,850m² (500m x 3.7m) | | |

Operation

Operational phase air quality impacts have been scoped out as detailed in the Scoping Report (SPR 2017)

Decommissioning

No decision has been made regarding the final decommissioning policy for the onshore infrastructure as it is recognised that industry best practice, rules and legislation change over time. An Onshore Decommissioning Plan will be provided, as secured under the requirements of the draft DCO. The onshore substation will likely be removed and be reused or recycled. It is anticipated that the onshore cable would be decommissioned (de-energised) and either the cables and jointing bays left *in situ* or removed depending on the requirements of the Onshore Decommissioning Plan approved by the Local Planning Authority. The detail and scope of the decommissioning works will be determined by the relevant legislation and guidance at the time of decommissioning and agreed with the regulator. As such, for the purposes of a worst-case scenario, impacts no greater than those identified for the construction phase are expected for the decommissioning phase.

19.3 Cumulative Impact Assessment during Construction

12. The following sections discuss which of the two construction scenarios detailed in **section 19.2** will be the realistic worst case in terms of impacts to air quality.

19.3.1 Cumulative Impact 1: Construction Phase Dust and Fine Particulate Matter Emissions

13. Under scenario 2 each project is constructed individually, whereby any works are completed for the proposed East Anglia TWO project (full reinstatement), and then the proposed East Anglia ONE North project construction would follow at a later date. Therefore, the impact significance during construction of the proposed East Anglia TWO project alone will then be the same for construction of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project alone at the landfall, onshore cable route and substation sites. Therefore, under scenario 2, whilst acknowledging the repeated 3-year construction period and thereby the duration of impact is extended, the cumulative impact with the proposed East Anglia ONE North project under scenario 2 will be **not significant** as presented for the proposed East Anglia TWO project alone in **Chapter 19 Air Quality**.



14. The following assessment was therefore carried out for scenario 1.

19.3.1.1 Step 1: Screen the need for a Detailed Assessment

15. The same receptors were identified and are considered to represent the worst-case for scenario 1 as for the proposed East Anglia TWO project alone assessment as detailed in **section 19.6.1.1** of **Chapter 19 Air Quality**. A detailed assessment is therefore required.

19.3.1.2 Step 2A: Define the Potential Dust Emission Magnitude

16. The dust emission magnitude calculated for scenario 1 is presented in *Table A19.3.*

Table A19.3 Defined Dust Emission Magnitudes Associated for each Construction Activity for Scenario 1

| Construction Activity | Dust Emission Magnitude Assessment – Human Receptors | Dust Emission Magnitude Assessment – Ecological Receptors |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| Earthworks | It was assumed that up to two CCS areas will be built within 350m of human receptors, as the worst case scenario is near the junction of two sections within the onshore development area each CCS having an area of 40,950m². Earthworks within the onshore cable route will comprise removal and storage of topsoil, followed by excavation and reinstatement of 4 trenches Total earthworks area is greater than 10,000m². The dust emission magnitude is therefore Large. | It was assumed that an HDD entrance and exit pit CCS are both located within 50m of the ecological receptor, with a combined footprint of 19,500m². Total earthworks area is greater than 10,000m². The dust emission magnitude is therefore Large. |
| Construction | There are not anticipated to be any buildings constructed within the mobilisation areas, however it was assumed that cement-bound sand will be used to line the cable trench and pack around the ducts then backfilled using the stored subsoil and topsoil. The dust emission magnitude is therefore Medium. | There are not anticipated to be any buildings constructed within the CCS, however it was assumed that cement-bound sand will be used to line the cable trench and pack around the ducts then backfilled using the stored subsoil and topsoil which is potentially dusty. The dust emission magnitude is therefore Medium. |



| Construction Activity | Dust Emission Magnitude Assessment – Human Receptors | Dust Emission Magnitude Assessment – Ecological Receptors | |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| Trackout | There are greater than 50 outward daily Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements from the CCS during the construction phase. | There are between 10 and 50 outward daily HGV movements from the CSS during the construction phase. | |
| | The dust emission magnitude is therefore Large. | The dust emission magnitude is therefore Medium. | |

17. The dust magnitudes for earthworks, construction and trackout associated with scenario 1 are summarised for each worst case area in *Table A19.4.*

Table A19.4 Dust Emission Magnitudes for the onshore works - Scenario 1

| Activity | Dust Emission Magnitude for Worst Case Scenario | | | | |
|--------------|---|--------|--|--|--|
| | Human Receptors Ecological Receptors | | | | |
| Earthworks | Large | Large | | | |
| Construction | Medium | Medium | | | |
| Trackout | Large Medium | | | | |

19.3.1.3 Step 2B: Define the Sensitivity of the Area

18. The sensitivity of the area to dust soiling, human health impacts and ecological impacts remains as per the proposed East Anglia TWO project alone assessment, and is restated in *Table A19.5*.

Table A19.5 Sensitivity of the Area to each activity - Scenario 1

| Potential Impact | Sensitivity of the Surrounding Area | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|------|--------|--|--|--|
| | Earthworks Construction Trackout | | | | | |
| Dust Soiling | Low | Low | Medium | | | |
| Human Health | Low | Low | Low | | | |
| Ecological impacts | High | High | High | | | |

19.3.1.4 Step 2C: Define the Risks of Impacts

19. The dust emission magnitude and sensitivity of the area are combined and the risk of impacts determined using *TableA19.1 – TableA19.7* in *Appendix 19.3*. The risks for dust soiling and human health are shown in *Table A19.6*.



Table A19.6 Risk of Dust Impacts - Scenario 1

| Potential Impact | Dust Risk | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| | Earthworks | Construction | Trackout | | | |
| Dust Soiling | Low Risk | Low Risk | Medium Risk | | | |
| Human Health | Low Risk | Low Risk | Low Risk | | | |
| Ecological Impacts | High Risk | Medium Risk | Medium Risk | | | |

- 20. As described in **section 19.6.1.1.4** of **Chapter 19 Air Quality**, the proposed East Anglia TWO project would employ embedded mitigation measures relating to construction dust. The Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) construction dust assessment methodology does not include the consideration of embedded mitigation measures when determining the potential risk of dust impacts.
- 21. Implementation of embedded mitigation measures would ensure that the risk of dust impacts is lower than those in *Table A19.6.*
- 22. Step 3 of the IAQM guidance identifies the appropriate good practice mitigation measures required based on the findings of Step 2 of the assessment methodology. Step 2 of the dust assessment determined that the greatest risk of impacts was 'high risk' resulting from earthworks, construction and trackout without the implementation of mitigation measures.
- 23. The identified level of dust risk for scenario 1 is the same as for the proposed East Anglia TWO project alone. Therefore, the mitigation measures detailed in **section 19.6.1.1.5** of **Chapter 19 Air Quality** remain applicable to scenario 1.
- 24. The implementation of the appropriate mitigation measures, in addition to embedded mitigation measures, will reduce the magnitude of dust emissions and the likelihood of their occurrence. The residual impacts from construction are considered to be **not significant**, in accordance with IAQM guidance.

19.3.2 Cumulative Impact 2: Construction Phase Road Traffic Emissions 19.3.2.1 Human Receptors

25. The worst-case cumulative impact scenario for road traffic emissions was determined based on the change in traffic flows associated with scenario 1 and scenario 2. Traffic flows are expected to increase year on year, therefore the assessment of the years of project construction in 2030, under scenario 2, is the most conservative scenario with regard to total traffic movements. However, this far into the future, vehicle emissions would be lower than in preceding years due to the expected evolution of the vehicle fleet and the use of lower emission vehicles. Furthermore, there would be more construction works undertaken



under scenario 1 as both projects would be constructed simultaneously; therefore, there would be a higher project impact at receptors due to a greater number of vehicle movements. It is therefore considered that this higher magnitude of change represents the worst-case scenario, and therefore the cumulative assessment was carried out for scenario 1, commencing in 2023.

- 26. The 24-hour Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flows and Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) percentages used in the cumulative scenario 1 assessment are detailed in *Appendix 19.3*. It should be noted that traffic flows associated with both the proposed East Anglia TWO and East Anglia ONE North projects being constructed concurrently would not result in a simple doubling of traffic flows, as elements of the onshore infrastructure would be shared between the two projects. This is detailed further in *Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport*.
- 27. Predicted NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations for the 2023 year of peak construction 'with scenario 1' are detailed in *Table A19.7* to *Table A19.910*. Concentrations for 'without scenario 1' and the predicted change in NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations, as a result of Scenario 1, are also shown for comparison purposes.

Table A19.7 Annual Mean NO₂ results at Sensitive Human Receptor Locations – Scenario 1

| Receptor ID | Annual mean NO₂ concentrations (μg.m ⁻³) | | | | |
|-------------|--|--------------------|--------|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| | Without Scenario 1 | With Scenario 1 | Change | Change as % of Objective | Impact descriptor |
| R1 | 28.68 | 29.21 | 0.53 | 1% | Negligible |
| R2 | 16.47 | 16.71 | 0.24 | 1% | Negligible |
| R3 | 15.46 | 15.69 | 0.23 | 1% | Negligible |
| R4 | 14.34 | 14.46 | 0.12 | 0% | Negligible |
| R5 | 13.10 | 13.21 | 0.11 | 0% | Negligible |
| R6 | 12.10 | 12.25 | 0.15 | 0% | Negligible |
| R7 | 12.28 | 12.43 | 0.15 | 0% | Negligible |
| R8 | 11.97 | 12.06 | 0.09 | 0% | Negligible |
| R9 | 8.55 | 8.76 | 0.21 | 1% | Negligible |
| R10 | 7.76 | 7.91 | 0.15 | 0% | Negligible |
| R11 | 8.03 | 8.16 | 0.13 | 0% | Negligible |
| R12 | 7.90 | 8.00 | 0.10 | 0% | Negligible |
| R13 | 10.89 | 11.12 | 0.23 | 1% | Negligible |



| Receptor ID | Annual mean NO₂ concentrations (μg.m ⁻³) | | | | | |
|-------------|--|--------------------|--------|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | Without Scenario 1 | With Scenario 1 | Change | Change as % of Objective | Impact descriptor | |
| R14 | 10.20 | 10.36 | 0.16 | 0% | Negligible | |
| R15 | 8.84 | 9.15 | 0.31 | 1% | Negligible | |
| R16 | 8.74 | 9.04 | 0.30 | 1% | Negligible | |

Table A19.8 Annual Mean PM₁₀ results at Sensitive Human Receptor Locations – Scenario 1

| Receptor ID | nual Mean PM ₁₀ results at Sensitive Human Receptor Locations – Scenario 1 Annual mean PM ₁₀ concentrations (μg.m ⁻³) | | | | | |
|-------------|---|--------------------|--------|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | Without Scenario 1 | With Scenario 1 | Change | Change as % of Objective | Impact descriptor | |
| R1 | 18.25 | 18.45 | 0.21 | 1% | Negligible | |
| R2 | 16.61 | 16.70 | 0.09 | 0% | Negligible | |
| R3 | 15.36 | 15.43 | 0.08 | 0% | Negligible | |
| R4 | 14.95 | 15.03 | 0.08 | 0% | Negligible | |
| R5 | 14.74 | 14.81 | 0.07 | 0% | Negligible | |
| R6 | 16.22 | 16.29 | 0.07 | 0% | Negligible | |
| R7 | 16.25 | 16.32 | 0.07 | 0% | Negligible | |
| R8 | 15.07 | 15.12 | 0.05 | 0% | Negligible | |
| R9 | 14.18 | 14.24 | 0.06 | 0% | Negligible | |
| R10 | 14.77 | 14.81 | 0.04 | 0% | Negligible | |
| R11 | 13.56 | 13.61 | 0.05 | 0% | Negligible | |
| R12 | 13.90 | 13.94 | 0.04 | 0% | Negligible | |
| R13 | 14.96 | 15.04 | 0.08 | 0% | Negligible | |
| R14 | 15.54 | 15.59 | 0.06 | 0% | Negligible | |
| R15 | 13.54 | 13.62 | 0.09 | 0% | Negligible | |
| R16 | 13.52 | 13.60 | 0.08 | 0% | Negligible | |



Table A19.9 Short-Term PM₁₀ Results at Sensitive Human Receptor Locations – Scenario 1

| Receptor ID | ceptor ID Number of Exceedences of the Short-Term PM ₁₀ Objective (Days) | | | | |
|-------------|---|-----------------|--------|--|--|
| | Without Scenario 1 | With Scenario 1 | Change | | |
| R1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | | |
| R2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | |
| R3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| R4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| R5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| R6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| R7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| R8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| R9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| R10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| R11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| R12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| R13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| R14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| R15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| R16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

Table A19.10 Annual Mean PM_{2.5} results at Sensitive Human Receptor Locations - Scenario 1

| Receptor ID | Annual mean PM _{2.5} concentrations (μg.m ⁻³) | | | | |
|-------------|--|--------------------|--------|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| | Without Scenario 1 | With Scenario 1 | Change | Change as % of Objective | Impact descriptor |
| R1 | 11.02 | 11.15 | 0.13 | 1% | Negligible |
| R2 | 9.78 | 9.83 | 0.05 | 0% | Negligible |
| R3 | 9.30 | 9.35 | 0.05 | 0% | Negligible |
| R4 | 9.07 | 9.12 | 0.05 | 0% | Negligible |
| R5 | 8.95 | 8.99 | 0.04 | 0% | Negligible |
| R6 | 9.25 | 9.29 | 0.04 | 0% | Negligible |
| R7 | 9.27 | 9.31 | 0.04 | 0% | Negligible |
| R8 | 9.05 | 9.08 | 0.03 | 0% | Negligible |



| Receptor ID | Annual mean PM _{2.5} concentrations (μg.m ⁻³) | | | | |
|-------------|--|--------------------|--------|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| | Without Scenario 1 | With Scenario 1 | Change | Change as % of Objective | Impact descriptor |
| R9 | 8.45 | 8.48 | 0.04 | 0% | Negligible |
| R10 | 8.54 | 8.57 | 0.03 | 0% | Negligible |
| R11 | 8.26 | 8.29 | 0.03 | 0% | Negligible |
| R12 | 8.46 | 8.49 | 0.02 | 0% | Negligible |
| R13 | 8.92 | 8.96 | 0.04 | 0% | Negligible |
| R14 | 9.01 | 9.04 | 0.03 | 0% | Negligible |
| R15 | 8.33 | 8.38 | 0.05 | 0% | Negligible |
| R16 | 8.32 | 8.36 | 0.05 | 0% | Negligible |

- 28. The results of the scenario 1 road traffic emissions assessment show a similar pattern to those predicted for the proposed East Anglia TWO project alone assessment. Annual mean concentrations of NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} were predicted to be 'well below' (i.e. less than 75% of) the respective air quality Objectives at all receptors, including within the Stratford St Andrew Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), both with and without scenario 1.
- 29. The change in pollutant concentrations was no greater than 1% at all receptors; this corresponded to a 'negligible' impact at all receptors, in accordance with IAQM and Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) guidance (IAQM and EPUK 2017).
- 30. As for the proposed East Anglia TWO project alone assessment, a sensitivity test was carried out to consider a scenario in which emissions would not improve from the base year (2018). The results of this sensitivity test are shown in *Appendix* 19.4.
- 31. All predicted annual mean NO₂ concentrations were well below 60μg.m⁻³ and therefore, in accordance with Defra guidance in Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance (LAQM.TG) (16) (Defra 2016), the 1-hour mean Objective is unlikely to be exceeded (see *Table A19.11*). Based on the calculation provided by Defra, as detailed in *section 19.4.3.2.9* of *Chapter 19 Air Quality*, the short-term PM₁₀ objective was predicted to be met at all modelled locations, with fewer than 35 exceedances of the daily mean objective of 50μg.m⁻³. Using the Defra calculation, there was no change in the number of days exceeding the daily mean objective between the 'without' and 'with' development scenarios.



Table A19.11 Air Quality Strategy Objectives (England) for the Purposes of LAQM

| Pollutant | Air Quality Objective | | To Be Achieved By | |
|--|---|--|-------------------|--|
| | Concentration | Measured as* | | |
| Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂) | 200 μg.m ⁻³ | 1 hour mean not to be exceeded more than 18 times per year | 31/12/2005 | |
| | 40 μg.m ⁻³ | Annual mean | 31/12/2005 | |
| Particles (PM ₁₀) | 50 µg.m ⁻³ | 24-hour mean not to be exceeded more than 35 times per year | 31/12/2004 | |
| | 40 μg.m ⁻³ | Annual mean | 31/12/2004 | |
| Particles (PM _{2.5}) 25 μg.m ⁻² | | Annual mean (target) | 2020 | |
| | 15% cut in annual mean (urban background exposure) | 2010 - 2020 | | |

- 32. The mitigation measures detailed in *Chapter 19 Air Quality* will also be applied to scenario 1, and therefore a reduction in pollutant concentrations would be experienced of a similar magnitude.
- 33. This assessment concludes that traffic impacts associated with scenario 1 upon local air quality are not significant based upon:
 - A predicted negligible impact at all receptor locations;
 - Predicted pollutant concentrations were 'well below' the relevant air quality
 Objectives at all selected receptor locations; and
 - Scenario 1 traffic flows were not predicted to cause a breach of any of the air quality Objectives at any identified sensitive receptor location.

19.3.3 Ecological Receptors

34. The results of the cumulative assessment of nutrient nitrogen deposition on designated ecological sites are detailed in *Table A19.12*.



Table A19.12 Nutrient Nitrogen Deposition Results

| Designated | Transect ID | Habitat | Nutrient nitrogen deposition (kgN.ha.y ⁻¹) | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|--|
| ecological site | | | Contribution from background traffic growth | Contribution from Scenario 1 | | |
| Sandlings SPA/Leiston- | T1-1 | Broadleaved woodland | 0.03 | 0.05 | | |
| Aldeburgh | T1-2 | | 0.00 | 0.01 | | |
| SSSI | T1-3 | Dwarf shrub heath | 0.00 | 0.00 | | |
| | T1-4 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | | |
| | T1-5 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | | |
| Sizewell | T2-1 | Fen, marsh and swamp | 0.02 | 0.03 | | |
| Marshes SSSI | T2-2 | | 0.00 | 0.01 | | |
| | T2-3 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | | |
| | T2-4 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | | |
| | T2-5 |] | 0.00 | 0.00 | | |

Table A19.13 Nutrient Nitrogen Deposition as Percentage of Critical Load

| Designated ecological site | Transect ID | Impact of Scenario 1 as Percentage of Critical Load | | | Impact of Scenario 1 In- Combination with Background Traffic Growth | | |
|----------------------------|----------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| | | % of lowest Critical Load | % of mid- range Critical Load | % of highest Critical Load | % of lowest Critical Load | % of mid- range Critical Load | % of highest Critical Load |
| Sandlings SPA/Leiston- | T1-1 | 0.5% | 0.3% | 0.2% | 0.8% | 0.5% | 0.4% |
| Aldeburgh SSSI | T1-2 | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| | T1-3 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | T1-4 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | T1-5 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Sizewell | T2-1 | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.1% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.2% |
| Marshes SSSI | T2-2 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | T2-3 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | T2-4 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | T2-5 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |



- 35. As detailed in *Table A19.13*, increases in nutrient nitrogen deposition as a result of scenario 1 were no greater than 1% of the Critical Load range at all transect locations, including those closest to the road network. The impact associated with scenario 1 in isolation is therefore considered to be not significant.
- 36. The 'in-combination' assessment showed that increases in nutrient nitrogen deposition were also below 1% of the Critical Loads. Impacts are therefore considered to be insignificant.

19.4 Summary

37. **Table A19.14** gives an overarching summary of which of the two construction scenarios, detailed above, will be the realistic worst case in terms of impacts relating to air quality.

Table A19.14 Summary of Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 Realistic Worst-Case Assumptions

| Impact | Worst Case | Notes |
|--|------------|--|
| Impact 1: Construction phase dust and fine particulate matter – Human and Ecological receptors | Scenario 1 | Identified as worst case, but with mitigation measures is predicted not to be significant. |
| Impact 2: Construction phase road traffic emissions – Human receptors | Scenario 1 | Identified as worst case, but with mitigation measures is predicted not to be significant. |
| Impact 2: Construction phase road traffic emissions – Ecological receptors | Scenario 1 | Not significant |

38. Overall, construction scenario 1 creates a realistic worst case in terms of impacts to air quality. Therefore, scenario 1 was carried through into the wider CIA with other developments.

Environmental Statement



19.5 References

Department for the Environment Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) (2016) Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance Document Local Air Quality Management.TG (16) London: Defra

Environment Agency (2017) Air Emissions Risk Assessment for your Environmental Permit. [Online]. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/air-emissions-risk-assessment-for-your-environmental-permit

Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) and Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) (2017). Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality.

Environmental Statement



This page is intentionally blank.