

<b>2. Assessment Methodology</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1 General Assessment Approach	1
2.2 Rochdale Envelope	6
2.3 Spatial Scope: Geographical Area	7
2.4 Temporal Scope: Assessment Years	7
2.5 Definition of Existing and Future Baseline	8
2.6 Development Design, Impact Avoidance and Mitigation	8
2.7 Impact Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria	9
2.8 Cumulative and Combined Effects	11
2.9 Inter-related Effects and Interdependencies	12
2.10 Transboundary Effects	14
2.11 References	14

**Tables**

Table 2-1: Classification of effects	11
Table 2-2: Inter-relationships between environmental topics in this ES	13

## 2. Assessment Methodology

### 2.1 General Assessment Approach

2.1.1 This Environmental Statement (ES) has been prepared to satisfy the requirements of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 (as amended) (the 2009 EIA Regulations) (Ref 2-1) (see **Chapter 1: Introduction, Table 1-1**).

2.1.2 In preparing this ES (in line with the 2009 EIA Regulations as it forms part of the EIA process), reference has been made to the following guidance:

- Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 3: EIA Consultation and Notification (Planning Inspectorate, 2017a) (Ref 2-2);
- Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Preliminary Environmental Information, Screening and Scoping (Planning Inspectorate, 2017b) (Ref 2-3);
- Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 9: Rochdale Envelope (Planning Inspectorate, 2018a) (Ref 2-4);
- Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 10: Habitats Regulations Assessment (Planning Inspectorate, 2017c) (Ref 2-5);
- Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 12: Transboundary Impacts (Planning Inspectorate, 2018b) (Ref 2-6);
- Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment (Planning Inspectorate, 2015) (Ref 2-7); and
- Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 18: Water Framework Directive (Planning Inspectorate, 2017d) (Ref 2-8).

2.1.3 Reference has also been made to the Scoping Opinion received from the Secretary of State on 7 June 2017 (**Appendix 1B** (ES Volume II)) and the advice contained within it regarding assessment methodology, topics and presentation of the ES, together with responses received through consultation.

2.1.4 In response to the Scoping Opinion, the EIA and this ES include assessments of the following environmental topics:

- **Chapter 6:** Air Quality;
- **Chapter 7:** Traffic and Transport;
- **Chapter 8:** Noise and Vibration;
- **Chapter 9:** Ecology;
- **Chapter 10:** Landscape and Visual Amenity;
- **Chapter 11:** Ground Conditions and Hydrogeology;

- **Chapter 12:** Flood Risk, Hydrology and Water Resources;
- **Chapter 13:** Socio-economics;
- **Chapter 14:** Cultural Heritage;
- **Chapter 15:** Sustainability, Waste and Climate Change; and
- **Chapter 16:** Cumulative and Combined Effects.

2.1.5 The EIA Scoping Report (**Appendix 1A** (ES Volume II)) concluded that a number of topics did not need to be considered as part of the EIA accompanying the Application for the Proposed Development and could be scoped out. These topics and, where relevant, the response in the Scoping Opinion are described in this chapter.

### Aviation

2.1.6 The Civil Aviation Association (CAA) charts all known structures of 91.4m (300ft) or more above ground level. The two chimney stacks of West Burton A (WBA) Power Station are each 198m in height, and the eight natural draught cooling towers are each 112m in height. The stacks have lighting on them for aviation purposes. The three stacks of West Burton B (WBB) Power Station are each 80m in height and, therefore, below the CAA threshold.

2.1.7 Given the Site's distance from the nearest airfield (Sturgate Airfield), approximately 7km to the east, and as none of the proposed buildings or structures would be 91.4m or more above ground level, the potential for impacts on aviation have been scoped out of this assessment. The height of the tallest structure proposed (up to 45m) precludes risk of obstruction/obstacle, given the distance from airfields. Relevant details on the height of the structures proposed and lighting is detailed within **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development**.

2.1.8 Notwithstanding the above, the Applicant consulted with the organisations listed in the Scoping Opinion (**Appendix 1B** (ES Volume II)) as part of the formal (statutory) consultation process. Organisations consulted included: the CAA (the aviation regulator); NATS (responsible for managing civilian air traffic being routed through the en-route Controlled Airspace (CAS) above the UK); Ministry of Defence (MOD) Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) (responsible for safeguarding the interests of the MOD); and Sturgate and Retford Gamston Aerodromes.

2.1.9 The CAA did not respond to the formal consultation stage. It is considered unlikely that aviation warning lighting would be required, taking into account the heights of structures within the Proposed Development.

2.1.10 NATS, MOD DIO and Sturgate and Retford Gamston Aerodromes did not respond to the formal consultation. It is considered unlikely that the Proposed Development presents the potential for any adverse effects on either military or

civil aviation radar or the existing Ingham Meteorological Radar, some 15km south-east of the Site.

### Electronic Interference

- 2.1.11 The EIA Scoping Report noted that the proposed maximum building heights and expected temporary construction cranes would be no higher than the existing cooling water towers and stacks associated with WBA Power Station and the stacks of WBB Power Station. Therefore, an assessment of the Proposed Development's effect on electronic interference was not considered to be required.
- 2.1.12 Further to this, most analogue signals have ceased to be transmitted and have been replaced by digital signals. As such, the Proposed Development's potential to interfere with television, radio (both analogue and digital) and mobile phone reception is considered negligible.
- 2.1.13 As requested in the EIA Scoping Opinion (**Appendix 1B** (ES Volume II)), further technical consideration has been given, since the publication of the EIA Scoping Report, to the potential for electronic interference. Ofcom guidance '*Tall structures and their impact on broadcast and other wireless services*' (Ofcom, 2009) (Ref 2-9) states that '*Problems are more likely to occur if a building or structure is constructed which is significantly taller than those around it, or is on high ground*' and that the '*shadow*' (interference) caused by a tall structure between a transmitter and receiver disappears 1-5km away from the tall structure.
- 2.1.14 According to published data ([www.mastdata.com](http://www.mastdata.com)), there are a number of telecommunications transmitters within 5km of the Site, as follows:
- Vodafone and CTIL transmitters on Carr Lane in Gainsborough, approximately 2km north of the Site;
  - Orange, EE and O2 transmitters south of Wintern Court in Gainsborough, approximately 2.2km north-west of the Site;
  - Three and EE transmitter on Bridge Street in Gainsborough, approximately 3.1km north-west of the Site;
  - T-Mobile transmitter on Bridge Street in Gainsborough, approximately 3.2km north-west of the Site;
  - CTIL transmitter south of Heaton Street in Gainsborough, approximately 3.4km north-west of the Site;
  - BT transmitter on Albert Terrace, approximately 3.4km north-west of the Site;
  - CTIL transmitter on White's Wood Lane, Gainsborough, approximately 4.4km north-west of the Site; and
  - O2, EE, T-Mobile, CTIL, Vodafone, Orange and Three transmitters on Ash Grove, approximately 4.5km north-west of the Site.

- 2.1.15 The Proposed Development would not introduce new buildings or structures that are significantly taller than those around it. The tallest structures associated with the existing WBA Power Station are the existing stacks at 198m high and the cooling towers at 112m high, whilst those associated with WBB Power Station are the three existing stacks at 80m high. The tallest structures associated with the Proposed Development would be the stacks at up to 45m high.
- 2.1.16 Relevant telecommunications companies were formally consulted at the Stage 1 consultation stage (refer to the **Application Document Ref 4.1: Consultation Report**). No concerns have been raised regarding electronic interference by any of the bodies consulted.
- 2.1.17 On the basis of the above, it is concluded that there is no potential for significant electronic interference effects as a result of the Proposed Development.

### Accidental Events/Health and Safety

- 2.1.18 The majority of emergency response plans and contingency measures will be dealt with in the Environmental Permit, which is required for the operation of the Proposed Development and determined and regulated by the Environment Agency. Prevention of any accidents associated with hazardous materials storage and use will be addressed under the Environmental Permit. Based on the proposed volumes of hazardous materials to be stored at the Proposed Development, the Site would not require a Hazardous Substances Consent or a lower tier Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) licence. Comments made by National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc (**Appendix 1B** (ES Volume II)) relating to appropriate safety clearances have been noted and considered in the design of the Proposed Development.
- 2.1.19 Comments specifically raised by Public Health England (PHE) and the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) at the scoping stage in relation to public health are addressed in **Appendix 13A: Human Health**, which effectively acts as a 'signposting' document to those chapters which include an assessment of effects on human health. In the Scoping Opinion (**Appendix 1B** (ES Volume II)) PHE expressed a preference to see the summation of relevant issues into a specific section to provide a focus which ensures that public health is given adequate consideration. As such, **Appendix 13A: Human Health** summarises key information, risk assessments, proposed mitigation measures and residual impacts, relating to human health.
- 2.1.20 The HSE provided advice at the scoping stage regarding relevant consents that may be required relating to hazardous substances and noted consultation distances in relation to apparatus, including the gas pipeline supplying the WBB gas receiving facility. These have been taken into account in the design of the Proposed Development (refer to **Application Document Ref. 4.2: Schedule of Other Consents and Licences**).

## Waste Management

2.1.21 The EIA Scoping Report (**Appendix 1A** (ES Volume II)) considered that, due to the size and nature of the Proposed Development, waste arisings would be very minor in nature from the operational power plant and would be managed by the procedures already in place from WBA and WBB Power Stations. As such, it was proposed that waste management should be scoped out of the EIA. However, the Scoping Opinion (**Appendix 1B** (ES Volume II)) states:

*“in light of NPS-EN1 requirements regarding Site Waste Management Plan and waste management, it is not considered appropriate to scope out waste management as an issue, however the SoS considers that provision of relevant information as part of the Sustainability and Climate Change Chapter would be acceptable.”* (paragraph 3.18)

2.1.22 Given the above, waste management has been considered within **Chapter 15: Sustainability, Waste and Climate Change**. **Application Document Ref. 7.3: Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)** includes a framework Site Waste Management Plan.

## Environmental Statement

2.1.23 The ES summarises the outcomes of the following ongoing EIA activities:

- establishing baseline conditions;
- consultation with statutory and non-statutory consultees;
- consideration of relevant local, regional and national planning policies, guidelines and legislation relevant to the EIA;
- consideration of technical standards for the development of significance criteria and specialist assessment methodologies;
- design review;
- review of secondary information, previous environmental studies, publicly available information and databases;
- expert opinion;
- physical surveys and monitoring;
- desk-top studies;
- modelling and calculations; and
- reference to current guidance and advice.

2.1.24 Each technical chapter follows the same structure for ease of reference, as follows:

- Introduction;

- Legislation, Planning Policy and Guidance;
- Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria;
- Baseline Conditions;
- Development Design and Impact Avoidance;
- Likely Impacts and Effects;
- Mitigation and Enhancement Measures;
- Limitations or Difficulties;
- Residual Effects and Conclusions; and
- References.

## 2.2 Rochdale Envelope

- 2.2.1 As discussed in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development**, a number of technical parameters have yet to be finalised for the Proposed Development in order to maintain flexibility as the Proposed Development design progresses. This is important as the technology for gas fired power stations continues to advance, and also to maintain commercial flexibility to meet the changing demands of the UK market, prior to plant construction. Therefore, the Rochdale Envelope approach has been applied within the EIA to ensure a robust assessment is presented of the likely significant environmental effects of the Proposed Development, in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 9: The Rochdale Envelope (Ref 2-4). This involves assessing the proposed maximum (and where relevant, minimum) parameters for the elements of the Proposed Development where flexibility needs to be retained, recognising that the worst-case parameter for one technical assessment may differ from another. Where this approach is applied, this has been confirmed within the relevant chapters of this ES.
- 2.2.2 As is relevant for each technical discipline, alternative designs under the Rochdale Envelope approach have been assessed in order to predict worst-case overall impacts. These have been used in the assessment of effects significance. Each of the topic specific chapters (**Chapters 6–15**) describe the parameters applied in relation to the particular discipline.
- 2.2.3 As the Proposed Development design has evolved, key elements of the design have been fixed. This includes choice of technology type; the Application now seeks consent for open cycle gas turbines (OCGT) only, whereas at the scoping stage gas engines were also under consideration. Stack orientations have also been fixed (refer to **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development**) such that for the option of up to five turbines, the units (and stacks) would be located in a nominal north-south orientation, unless it can be demonstrated that environmental effects for any parameter would be no worse than those assessed and presented in this ES.



2.2.4 Whilst fixing a number of key parameters, the Applicant has sought to maintain flexibility over a number of other aspects of the Proposed Development:

- use of one to five gas turbines;
- whether certain buildings are to be used and the sizing of buildings (or enclosures);
- flexibility in stack location(s) within a defined area; and
- flexibility in stack heights.

2.2.5 The need for flexibility in these parameters is outlined in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development**.

2.2.6 Where flexibility is retained, each topic specific assessment (**Chapters 6-16**) considers and evaluates the worst-case option of the Rochdale Envelope being considered. As outlined in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 9 (Ref 2-4), the worst-case parameter for one technical assessment differs from another. For example, the worst-case landscape and visual amenity assessment considers the maximum height of stacks, whereas the worst-case air quality impact assessment considers the lowest height of stacks.

## 2.3 Spatial Scope: Geographical Area

2.3.1 The topic specific chapters of this ES (**Chapters 6-16**) describe their spatial scope, including the rationale for determining the specific area within which the assessment is focussed. The study areas are a function of the nature of the impacts and the locations of potentially affected environmental resources or receptors. The widest spatial scope considered is 5km, which relates to the appraisal of potential landscape and visual amenity effects. Justification for the spatial scope considered appropriate is documented in each topic specific chapter (**Chapters 6-16**).

## 2.4 Temporal Scope: Assessment Years

2.4.1 The approach has been to assess the environmental impacts of the Proposed Development at key stages in its construction and operation and, as far as practicable, its decommissioning.

2.4.2 The 'existing baseline' date is 2019, however, surveys and baseline data collection has been undertaken between 2017 and 2019, as reported in each chapter. 'Future baseline' conditions are also predicted for each assessment scenario, whereby the conditions anticipated to prevail at a certain point in the future (assuming the Proposed Development does not progress) are identified for comparison with the predicted conditions with the Proposed Development. This can include the introduction of new receptors and resources into an area, or new development schemes that have the potential to change the baseline, where these form committed developments.



2.4.3 The assessment scenarios that are considered for the purposes of the EIA (and considered in this ES) are as follows:

- Existing Baseline (Q1 2019);
- Future Baseline (2020);
- Construction (subject to the necessary consents being granted and an investment decision being made, potentially commencing as early as Q3 2020). Construction activities are expected to be completed within four years and are more likely to be completed within three years (assessment years chosen by specialists as the worst-case for each topic);
- Opening (potentially as early as Q3 2023) and/or Operation (assessment years chosen by specialists as the worst-case for each topic); and
- Decommissioning (it is envisaged that the Proposed Development would have an operational life of up to circa 40 years, therefore decommissioning activities are currently anticipated to commence after 2063).

2.4.4 In the majority of cases, assessment years are 'self-selecting', as they simply reflect the anticipated dates on, or periods within which certain activities are predicted to take place.

2.4.5 The Development Consent Order (DCO) would be valid for seven years after receipt and could be started at any time. Consequently, for the majority of topics, the ES assesses the worst-case as the earliest date that construction works or operation would commence (as set out in paragraph 2.4.3). In certain cases, however, a later date has been selected where this could represent the worst-case (e.g. traffic, where background traffic growth would result in a worst-case assessment year later in the construction programme).

## 2.5 Definition of Existing and Future Baseline

2.5.1 Existing baseline conditions have been defined for each topic specific chapter (**Chapters 6-15**), based on desk-based studies and site surveys, where necessary. As described above, it is also important to consider future baseline conditions (in the absence of the Proposed Development) against which the effects of the Proposed Development can be assessed. Where relevant, future baseline conditions describe and take into account developments that are consented and would be constructed and/or operational prior to construction of the Proposed Development.

## 2.6 Development Design, Impact Avoidance and Mitigation

2.6.1 The design process for the Proposed Development has been heavily influenced by the findings of early environmental appraisals and the EIA process. Therefore, the Proposed Development has been sited, and has had a number of measures incorporated into the concept design, to avoid or minimise environmental impacts. The key aspects where the design has evolved are described in **Chapter 4**: The

Proposed Development. These include measures needed for legal compliance, as well as measures that implement the requirements of best practice guidance documents (e.g. series of Environment Agency Guidelines on Pollution Prevention (GPP)). The initial assessment in each chapter has been undertaken on the basis of these measures being implemented (i.e. they are 'embedded mitigation').

- 2.6.2 Implementation of the impact avoidance and minimisation measures relied on in the assessments will be secured in the DCO, either through the setting of limits of deviation (e.g. specific maximum above ordnance datum (AOD) heights) or specifying mitigation measures via a Requirement. Refer to **Application Document Ref. 2.1** for a copy of the draft DCO.
- 2.6.3 Once the likely impacts and effects were identified and quantified, consideration has been given to any further mitigation, over and above anything identified within the development design and impact avoidance sections of each topic specific chapter that may be required to mitigate any significant adverse effects identified. A summary of the likely significant residual effects, after the implementation of mitigation (or where relevant, enhancement) measures, has then been presented in each topic specific chapter.
- 2.6.4 A summary of the likely significant residual effects is presented in **Chapter 17: Summary of Likely Significant Residual Effects**.

## 2.7 Impact Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

- 2.7.1 Impacts are defined as changes arising from the Proposed Development, and consideration of the result of these impacts on environmental receptors enables the identification of associated effects and their classification (major, moderate, minor and negligible, and adverse, neutral or beneficial). Each effect has been classified both before and after mitigation measures have been applied. Effects likely to remain after mitigation and/or enhancement are referred to as 'residual effects'.
- 2.7.2 The classification of effects is undertaken with due regard to the following:
- extent (local, regional or national) and magnitude of the impact;
  - effect duration (whether short, medium or long-term);
  - effect nature (whether direct or indirect, reversible or irreversible);
  - whether the effects occur in isolation are cumulative or interactive (i.e. to combine with other effects);
  - performance against environmental quality standards and in the context of relevant legislation, standards and accepted criteria;
  - number of receptors affected;
  - sensitivity of receptors;
  - compatibility with environmental policies; and

- professional experience and judgement of the assessor.

2.7.3 Further details are provided in each topic specific chapter.

2.7.4 Where it has not been possible to quantify effects, qualitative assessments have been carried out, based on available knowledge and professional judgment. Where any uncertainty exists, this has been noted in the relevant topic specific chapter in the Limitations or Difficulties section.

2.7.5 To enable comparison between technical topics and aid understanding of the EIA findings, standard terms are used, wherever possible, to classify effects throughout the ES (major, moderate, minor and negligible), whilst effects are also described as being adverse, neutral or beneficial. Where the quality standards for each technical discipline result in deviations in the standard assessment methodology, these are described in the relevant technical chapters, as applicable.

2.7.6 Definitions of the standard terms are provided below:

- negligible – imperceptible effects to an environmental resource or receptor;
- minor – slight, very short or highly localised effect;
- moderate – limited effect (by extent, duration or magnitude);
- major – considerable effect (by extent, duration or magnitude) of more than local scale or in breach of recognised acceptability, legislation, policy or standards;
- adverse – detrimental or negative effects to an environmental resource or receptor;
- neutral – effects to an environmental resource or receptor that are neither advantageous or detrimental; and
- beneficial – advantageous or positive effect to an environmental resource or receptor.

2.7.7 Moderate and major effects are generally considered to be ‘significant’ for the purposes of the 2009 EIA Regulations (Ref 2-1), in accordance with standard EIA practice.

2.7.8 Each topic specific chapter provides further description and definition of the assessment criteria relevant to each topic. Where possible, this has been based upon quantitative and accepted criteria (for example noise assessment guidelines), together with the use of value judgement and professional interpretation to classify effects.

2.7.9 In general, the classification of an effect is based on the magnitude of the impact and sensitivity or importance of the receptor, using the matrix shown at **Table 2-1**. Where there are deviations away from this matrix, due to the technical guidance

for a specific assessment topic, this is highlighted within the relevant topic specific chapter and the reason for the variation explained.

**Table 2-1: Classification of effects**

Magnitude of impact	Sensitivity/importance of receptor			
	High	Medium	Low	Very low
High	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor
Medium	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Low	Moderate	Minor	Negligible	Negligible
Very low	Minor	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

2.7.10 In the context of the Proposed Development, short-term effects are considered to be those associated with the construction and/or decommissioning phases, which cease when those works are completed. Long-term effects are those associated with the duration of the operational phase. Effects may also be permanent (irreversible) or temporary (reversible) and direct or indirect.

2.7.11 Effects on areas on the scale of the Nottinghamshire or Lincolnshire County, or Bassetlaw or West Lindsey Districts (or similar scale across local authority boundaries) are considered to be of a regional level, whilst effects that cover different parts of the country, or England as a whole, are considered to be of a national level. Smaller scale effects are considered to be of a local level.

## 2.8 Cumulative and Combined Effects

2.8.1 As required by the 2009 EIA Regulations (Ref 2-1), when considering the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Development, there is a need to consider the potential for cumulative and combined effects. Cumulative effects are those that may arise where the impacts associated with the Proposed Development have the potential to interact with those associated with one or more other schemes located in proximity to the Proposed Development (e.g. interaction of impacts which leads to effects of the same type (e.g. air quality) on the same receptor). Combined effects are those that may arise when several different impacts resulting from the Proposed Development (e.g. decrease in air quality, increase in noise disturbance) have the potential to affect a single receptor or group of receptors.

2.8.2 These issues are further discussed in **Chapter 16: Cumulative and Combined Effects**, which details the impact assessment methodology applied and presents a list of potential developments that have been considered, together with a list of other developments in the vicinity of the Proposed Development that have been scoped into the cumulative assessment.

## 2.9 Inter-related Effects and Interdependencies

- 2.9.1 It is recognised that different consultees have interests in different aspects of the environment. For ease of reference, **Table 2-2** illustrates where inter-related effects have the potential to arise.

**Table 2-2: Inter-relationships between environmental topics in this ES**

	Chapter 6: Air Quality	Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport	Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration	Chapter 9: Ecology	Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity	Chapter 11: Ground Conditions and Hydrogeology	Chapter 12: Flood Risk, Hydrology and Water Resources	Chapter 13: Socio economics	Chapter 14: Cultural Heritage	Chapter 15: Sustainability Waste and Climate Change
Chapter 6: Air Quality										
Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport										
Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration										
Chapter 9: Ecology										
Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity										
Chapter 11: Ground Conditions and Hydrogeology										
Chapter 12: Flood Risk, Hydrology and Water Resources										
Chapter 13: Socio economics										
Chapter 14: Cultural Heritage										
Chapter 15: Sustainability, Waste and Climate Change										

## 2.10 Transboundary Effects

- 2.10.1 The Scoping Opinion (**Appendix 1B** (ES Volume II)) recommended consideration be given to discharges to the air and water, potential impacts on migratory species and to impacts on shipping and fishing areas, when considering transboundary effects. For the purposes of identifying any cumulative effects with other developments in the area, the Scoping Opinion also noted that applicants should consult consenting bodies in other EU states to assist in identifying those developments.
- 2.10.2 Subsequently, the Secretary of State undertook an initial transboundary screening exercise for the Proposed Development under Regulation 24 of the 2009 EIA Regulations (Ref 2-1). The screening exercise concluded, on the basis of the information available from the Applicant at scoping stage, that the Proposed Development is not likely to have a significant effect on the environment in another European Economic Area (EEA) state. A copy of the matrix is provided (**Appendix 2A** (ES Volume II)).
- 2.10.3 Initial consideration has been given to the Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 12: Transboundary Impacts (Ref 2-6) and specifically Annex A, which sets out the criteria and relevant considerations taken into account by the Planning Inspectorate when screening Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) for likely significant effects on the environment in another EEA state.
- 2.10.4 Taking into account the impacts predicted to arise from the Proposed Development, set out in **Chapter 6: Air Quality**, **Chapter 9: Ecology** and **Chapter 12: Flood Risk, Hydrology and Water Resources** within their respective spatial scopes, and given the distance to the nearest EEA state (Republic of Ireland at over 350km west and the Netherlands at over 375km east) the likelihood of significant effects on the environment of another EEA state is considered negligible. Therefore, significant transboundary effects associated with the Proposed Development are not anticipated.

## 2.11 References

- Ref 2-1 HM Government (2009) *Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009*.
- Ref 2-2 Planning Inspectorate (2017a) *Advice Note 3: EIA Consultation and Notification*. Version 7, published August 2017.
- Ref 2-3 Planning Inspectorate (2017b) *Advice Note 7: Environmental Impact Assessment: Preliminary Environmental Information, Screening and Scoping*. Version 6, published December 2017.
- Ref 2-4 Planning Inspectorate (2012) *Advice Note 9: Rochdale Envelope*. Version 3, republished July 2018.



- Ref 2-5 Planning Inspectorate (2017c) *Advice Note 10: Habitats Regulations Assessment* Version 8, published November 2017.
- Ref 2-6 Planning Inspectorate (2018) *Advice Note 12: Regulation 24 of the EIA Regulations: Transboundary Impacts.* Version 5, published March 2018.
- Ref 2-7 Planning Inspectorate (2015) *Advice Note 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment.* Version 1, published December 2015.
- Ref 2-8 Planning Inspectorate (2017d) *Advice Note 18: Water Framework Directive.* Version 1, published June 2017.
- Ref 2-9 Ofcom (2009) *Tall structures and their impact on broadcast and other wireless services*, August 2009.