



**Application by EDF Energy (Thermal Generation) Limited for the West Burton C Power Station**  
**The Examining Authority's Written Questions and requests for information (ExQ1)**  
**Issued on 6 November 2019**

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information - ExQ1. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ2.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Annex B to the Rule 6 letter of 26 September 2019. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 1 (indicating that it is from ExQ1) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on general and cross-topic issues is identified as Q1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please contact [WestBurtonC@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:WestBurtonC@planninginspectorate.gov.uk) and include 'West Burton C' in the subject line of your email.

**Responses are due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

**Abbreviations used:**

<b>PA2008</b>	The Planning Act 2008	<b>MP</b>	Model Provision (in the MP Order)
<b>Art</b>	Article	<b>MP Order</b>	The Infrastructure Planning (Model Provisions) Order 2009
<b>dDCO</b>	Draft DCO	<b>NPS</b>	National Policy Statement
<b>EM</b>	Explanatory Memorandum	<b>NSIP</b>	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
<b>ES</b>	Environmental Statement	<b>R</b>	Requirement
<b>ExA</b>	Examining Authority	<b>SI</b>	Statutory Instrument
<b>LIR</b>	Local Impact Report	<b>SoS</b>	Secretary of State
<b>LA</b>	Local Authority		

**The Examination Library**

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010088/EN010088-000383-Examination%20Library%20West%20Burton%20C.pdf>

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

**Citation of Questions**

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, eg ExQ1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



## Index

<b>1. General and Cross-topic Questions.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Air Quality and Emissions.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)) .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. Draft Development Consent Order.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5. Ground Conditions .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>6. Historic Environment .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>7. Landscape and Visual.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>8. Noise and Vibration .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>9. Socio-economic .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>10. Transportation and Traffic .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>11. Water Environment.....</b>	<b>26</b>

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>1. General and Cross-topic Questions</b>		
Q1.1	The Applicant	Table 4.1 of ES Chapter 4 [APP-033] includes maximum dimensions for the main generator transformer and the demineralised water storage tank. However, unlike the dimensions for the other elements of the Proposed Development, the dimensions for the main generator transformer and water tank are not listed in the dDCO. If the dimensions of these structures are not constrained by the dDCO, how can the ExA be confident that the worst-case scenario has been assessed in the dDCO?
Q1.2	The Applicant	Would West Burton A or West Burton B need to cease operation for any period of time during construction of the Proposed Development?
Q1.3	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.8.6 of ES Chapter 4 [APP-033] sets out that the design of the Proposed Development 'has been undertaken with the aim of preventing or reducing adverse environmental effects (following the mitigation hierarchy of avoid, reduce and, if possible, remediate) while maintaining operational efficiency and cost-effectiveness'. However, the ES does not explicitly explain how environmental factors were taken into account in developing the design. Can the Applicant comment on this?
Q1.4	Environment Agency	Paragraph 4.2.42 of ES Chapter 4 [APP-033] states that the Applicant holds an abstraction licence and that the licenced capacity is sufficient to provide for the volume of water required for the Proposed Development. Could the Environment Agency confirm if they agree with this statement.
Q1.5	The Applicant	The ES does not appear to set out the quantity of gas that the Proposed Development is to use and as such, it is not clear how such information has been factored into the assessment of Greenhouse Gases for climate change. Can the Applicant comment on this?
Q1.6	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.2.42 of ES Chapter 4 [APP-033] states that the Applicant has an abstraction licence for water abstraction for West Burton A and West Burton B. The ES goes on to state that this licence and small amounts of water would be used on site for the Proposed Development, but quantities are not specified. Can the Applicant comment on this?
Q1.7	The Applicant	The mitigation measures proposed in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [APP-137] are caveated in some instances with the phrase 'where reasonably practical'? Could the Applicant explain what the effects would be if the measures in the CEMP did not prove to be 'reasonably practical'? How would this affect the

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		conclusions in the ES?
Q1.8	The Applicant, Bassetlaw District Council and West Lindsey District Council	Has the shortlist of major projects in respect of the assessment of cumulative effects identified in Table 16-5 of ES Chapter 16 [APP-045] and on ES Figure 16.2 [APP-131] been agreed with/by the relevant local authorities?
Q1.9	The Applicant	Is there any further information available relating to plans for the closure of West Burton A which might affect the ES for the Proposed Development?
Q1.10	The Applicant	Does the recent closure of Cottam Power Station have any bearing on any aspect of the ES for the Proposed Development?
Q1.11	The Applicant	Do the indicative elevational drawings [APP-023 and APP-024] reflect that the Proposed Development may sit at up to 14m above ground level and if not, should they?
Q1.12	The Applicant	Does the Applicant intend to submit a s106 agreement in relation to any part of the Proposed Development?
Q1.13	The Applicant	Can the Applicant provide a mitigation hierarchy document which explains how the various plans and strategies in the ES relate to each other and how they are to be secured? The Applicant should ensure that this is updated during the course of the Examination.
Q1.14	The Applicant	How would it be ensured that the Proposed Development would not generate in excess of 299MW of electricity and at what point is this figure taken from?
Q1.15	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.2.67 of ES Chapter 4 [APP-033] states that no allowance has been made for the delivery of materials by railway in order to assess the worst-case scenario for road traffic impacts. However, to what extent might rail be used for such a purpose, how might this impact on the assessments of the ES and how can it be ensured that the use of rail for the delivery of materials would not go beyond any worst-case scenarios assessed?
Q1.16	The Applicant	The ExA notes the potential for the site to be built up to a maximum of 14 metres above ordnance datum (AOD). Paragraphs 4.5.3 – 4.5.6 of ES Chapter 4 [APP-033] note that soils are to be used within the site and that it is not predicted that there will be a need for soil to be transported off the site. Can the Applicant: a) Confirm that the up to 14mAOD build up would provide a consistent level across the

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>Proposed Development site;</p> <p>b) Confirm the potential level difference between the potential maximum level of the Proposed Development site with the site of West Burton A and West Burton B;</p> <p>c) That the Applicant does not require spoil to be brought into the site to make up levels; and</p> <p>d) Whether the Applicant has considered the use of a soil management plan to ensure best practice soil management.</p>
Q1.17	The Applicant	Can the applicant provide an update with regard to licence/consent requirements and any progress in respect of these, including those mentioned in the Environment Agency's Additional Submission [AS-003]?
Q1.18	The Applicant	Having regard to the nature and characteristics of the Proposed Development, including the intended period of operation, can the Applicant explain the extent to which it is compatible with the Government's 2050 net zero target?
<b>2. Air Quality and Emissions</b>		
Q2.1	The Applicant	Paragraph 6.3.26 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-035] sets out that the assessment has been conducted conservatively, assuming the 2019 baseline as the opening baseline, as air quality is expected to improve in the future. Can the Applicant qualify this expectation?
Q2.2	Environment Agency, Natural England, Bassetlaw District Council and West Lindsey District Council	In relation to the assessment of Air Quality, do the Statutory Parties agree with the methodology adopted to determine the baseline information and the baseline information itself, specifically whether the 2019 baseline is, as the Applicant notes in Paragraph 6.3.26 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-035], conservative?
Q2.3	The Applicant	Can the Applicant confirm whether the study area for the Air Quality Assessment has been determined by the likely extent of impacts and the sensitivity of affected receptors rather than an arbitrary distance measure?
Q2.4	The Applicant	Table 6-6 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-035] sets out that 'The effects of WBA Power Station and WBB Power Station have been considered with reference to previous modelling results for the combined stations, and as part of the baseline reported in Section 6.4; the cumulative effects of existing WBB Power Station contributions have been modelled with the Proposed Development emissions, discussed in Section 6.5 and Appendix 6A: Air Quality (ES Volume

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		II)'. The ExA notes the explanation in ES Paragraph 6.4.14 of ES Chapter 6 but can the Applicant explain how with West Burton B CCGT being modelled with the proposed emissions (Paragraph 6.3.30) this enables the baseline position to be fully understood as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment?
Q2.5	The Applicant	Paragraph 3.1.9 of ES Appendix 6A [APP-051] sets out that meteorological data from 2011 has been used to represent a worst-case scenario for the assessment of effects on Air Quality. Can the Applicant explain the reasons for this and why more recently obtained data is not more appropriate for the purposes of the assessment?
Q2.6	The Applicant	Paragraph 6.3.24 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-035] sets out that SO <sub>2</sub> and PM <sub>10</sub> have been scoped out of the assessment of operational impacts due to emissions being considered 'negligible'. Can the Applicant define what is considered negligible in this respect and what SO <sub>2</sub> and PM <sub>10</sub> emissions the Proposed Development is anticipated to produce to warrant being scoped out?
Q2.7	The Applicant	Noting Paragraph 6.3.33 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-035], the assessment omits consideration of impacts from changes in air quality on non-statutory wildlife sites. The ExA notes that there is a local wildlife site located within the study area which may experience changes in air quality as a result of the Proposed Development. Can the Applicant explain why the assessment of impacts from changes in air quality at local wildlife sites has not been undertaken?
Q2.8	The Applicant	The Air Quality assessments have been carried out using the Rochdale envelope approach as the location and design of the plant has not yet been determined. ES Chapter 6 [APP-035] does not, as part of the methodology, set out which is the worst-case scenario in relation to the assessment but notes that the worst-case has been assessed. Data has been collated from the manufacturers of the OCGT units and then the maximum/worst-case has been used from that data, though further detail is not provided. Can the Applicant set out, in terms of the worst-case scenario, the parameters used for this assessment, particularly the location of the stack(s) within the site and the relationship between this and the worst-case process contribution at sensitive receptor locations.
Q2.9	The Applicant	Having regard to Paragraphs 6.3.45 and 6.3.47 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-035] relating to process contribution and the National Air Quality Strategy, can the Applicant provide an update on what progress has been made towards obtaining the necessary Environment

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Agency permit/s?
Q2.10	The Applicant	ES Chapter 6 [APP-035] references the use of professional experience as part of the methodological assumptions. However, it is stated that despite this, assessments have been carried out. Can the Applicant confirm what has and has not been assessed in terms of carbon monoxide (CO) and Air Quality?
Q2.11	The Applicant	Paragraph 6.3.50 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-035] sets out that the assessment for point source emissions will draw upon Table 6-8 of ES Chapter 6 should an effect not be negligible. However, this table relates to the assessment of traffic emissions. In light of this, can the Applicant qualify the appropriateness of this approach?
Q2.12	The Applicant	The Air Quality assessments appear to have used the same criteria for determining the magnitude of impact for all assessments. Can the Applicant confirm this approach?
Q2.13	The Applicant	Can the Applicant explain what assumptions have been applied to the qualitative assessment of impacts from site machinery? Can the Applicant explain how the assumptions affect the anticipated outcome to the Air Quality assessment and how they are to be secured relevant to the Proposed Development?
Q2.14	The Applicant	Table 6-6 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-035] suggests that eutrophication has been considered. Can the Applicant highlight where this has been considered, and if not considered, the reasons for this?
Q2.15	The Applicant	Paragraph 6.3.37 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-035], in respect of constructing dust and exhaust emissions from non-road mobile machinery (NRMM), states that that the application of appropriate mitigation should ensure that residual effects will normally be 'not significant'. Can the Applicant specify such mitigation, indicate how it would be secured and confirm whether this has been agreed with the relevant statutory consultees?
Q2.16	The Applicant	Paragraph 6.6.6 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-035] sets out that effects of dust and NRMM emissions during demolition have been screened out. Can the Applicant provide justification for this?
<b>3. Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))</b>		
Q3.1	The Applicant	It states in Paragraph 9.5.16 of ES Chapter 9 [APP-038] that updated ecological surveys would be completed prior to the start of construction where necessary. However, it is not specified what surveys are expected to be undertaken or why they are necessary. Can the



**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Applicant indicate what surveys will be carried out, why they are necessary and how they will be secured?
Q3.2	The Applicant	The worst-case scenario in Paragraph 9.3.23 of ES Chapter 9 [APP-038] is assessed by assuming that the majority of the proposed power station site would be cleared regardless of the final sizing and layout of the structure. However, it is not clear what is meant by 'majority' and no quantitative area is given. Can the Applicant define the worst-case scenario in terms of the area to be cleared and the total habitat to be lost?
Q3.3	Natural England	Considering that some species (for example, great crested newts and bats) are internationally protected species, is Natural England satisfied with the application of sensitivity to the list of ecological receptors as set out in Table 9-7 of ES Chapter 9 [APP-038]?
Q3.4	The Applicant	It is unclear in ES Chapter 9 [APP-038] over what timeframe habitat enhancement and restoration is to take place/mature. Can the Applicant specify a timeframe for the implementation of ecological mitigation measures?
Q3.5	The Applicant	Two broad impact types are considered for ecological receptors: habitat loss and disturbance, which are defined in Paragraph 9.6.3 of ES Chapter 9 [APP-038]. From these descriptions it is not evident that traffic impacts, during both construction and operation, on ecological receptors have been considered (for example, direct mortality and pollution from vehicle movements). Can the Applicant verify whether this has been included in the assessment and indicate where this can be found but if not, justify the reason for this?
Q3.6	The Applicant	Can the Applicant confirm the extent to which impacts from noise and vibration, particularly during the construction phase, have been assessed on ecological receptors?
Q3.7	The Applicant	In ES Chapter 9 [APP-038], there are a number of references to surrounding optimal habitat to reduce the potential significance of effects, yet the extent of this surrounding optimal habitat is not defined. Can the Applicant define the extent of the surrounding optimal habitat for the relevant species?
Q3.8	The Applicant	It is stated in Table 9.2 of ES Chapter 9 [APP-038] that the relationship between West Burton B and the Proposed Development would be considered in sections 9.6 and 9.7 of ES Chapter 9. However, it remains unclear how the management of the Proposed Development fits in with secured ecological mitigation measures in relation to West Burton B. Can the

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Applicant clarify this point?
Q3.9	The Applicant	In Paragraph 5.2.9 of the Landscape and Biodiversity Management and Enhancement Plan (LBMEP) [APP-139] it is stated that after a 5 year review, there is potential to integrate the management and maintenance proposed in the plan into existing arrangements for the West Burton site. Can the Applicant clarify what management is currently existing for the West Burton site and if this has any bearing on the ecological assessment for the Proposed Development?
Q3.10	The Applicant and Natural England	Hibernacula which was used as mitigation for West Burton B is to be dismantled and reconstructed in an alternative area to allow for construction of the Proposed Development. Can the Applicant justify how/why this does not undermine the mitigation implemented for West Burton B and how such mitigation measures and their ability to reduce effects are not being inflated when they were applied to a different development? Also, can Natural England confirm whether it is content with the application of this mitigation and its subsequent impact on assessment of significance and provide reasoning in the response.
Q3.11	The Applicant	The LBMEP [APP-139] recommends monitoring to be undertaken during operation of the Proposed Development following the implementation of habitat enhancement/restoration measures. However, within the dDCO, it does not require that the LBMEP incorporates monitoring measures. Can the Applicant clarify how this monitoring will be secured?
Q3.12	The Applicant and Nottinghamshire County Council	Are Nottinghamshire County Council and Natural England content with the enhancement mitigation for Area 5 as set out in Paragraphs 5.2.20 to 5.2.25 of the LBMEP following the suggestion of additional land required by the Council [APP-139]?
Q3.13	The Applicant	Whilst the consultation responses demonstrate that consultees are content with the scope of the Environmental Assessment of ecology and biodiversity, this was based on the original PEI report where riverine receptors were scoped into the assessment. Since the PEI report, outfalls to the River Trent have been removed from the Proposed Development and the Applicant has scoped out riverine ecological receptors, such as fish and river habitat on this basis. However, no justification appears to have been provided and there is no substantive evidence of agreement through consultation. As it is stated in the Scoping Opinion issued by the SoS [APP-048] that aspects should only be scoped out if justified or agreed through consultation, can the Applicant provide such evidence to support scoping out impacts to riverine receptors?

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Q3.14	The Applicant	It is set out in the Drainage Design Risk Assessment at Appendix F of the Outline Drainage Strategy [APP-142] that there is a 'moderate' final risk rating of harm to aquatic organisms and habitats in the River Trent. Can the Applicant clarify what the risk would be?
Q3.15	Natural England	Is Natural England satisfied with the No Significant Effects report [APP-027] in relation to European protected sites?
Q3.16	The Applicant and Natural England	Has the Applicant prepared a draft European Protected Species mitigation licence in respect of great crested newts for review by Natural England? If not, when can this be expected? If so, is Natural England satisfied that a licence is likely to be granted?
Q3.17	The Applicant and Natural England	Is there likely to be a need for a protected species mitigation licence in respect of any other protected species? If so, has this been progressed?
Q3.18	The Applicant	Should ES Figure 9.1 Landscaping, Biodiversity Management and Enhancement Areas [APP-086] reflect and make provisions for any potential works along the northern and southern drainage corridors and any necessary reinstatement and management of vegetation/habitat? Is this matter adequately addressed in the LBMEP [APP-139] and might there be a need for a soil management plan if any works are required in these areas? If so, can the Applicant provide a timeframe for when this will be submitted.
<b>4. Draft Development Consent Order</b>		
Q4.1	The Applicant	Article numbering on the first and second page of the dDCO [APP-004] does not fully correlate with the numbering of Articles set out in main body of the dDCO (for example, articles leap from Article 10 to Article 13). Also, the first and second page of the dDCO lists page numbers but the pages of the dDCO are not numbered. Can the Applicant rectify these matters?
Q4.2	The Applicant	In its Relevant Representation [RR-002], the Canal and Rivers Trust request Protective Provisions and states that it has standard provisions that could be used. Does the Applicant intend to include such Protective Provisions in the dDCO?
Q4.3	The Applicant	<b>Questions/comments relating to Articles (Art):</b> a) Art 2(1) (and Art 17): Various definitions refer to documents to be certified by the Secretary of State. The certification article (Art 17) then refers to application document reference numbers. Is that sufficient, as opposed to, for example, drawing numbers and revision numbers? Why not refer to Art 17 in the relevant Art 2(1)

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>definitions mentioning certification?</p> <p>b) Art 2(1): Why are there are separate 'Order limits plans' if Order limits have been defined by reference to 'works plans'? Is it necessary to have two different sets of plans in this regard?</p> <p>c) Art 2(1): There is a definition of 'the plans'. That defined term is only used in Schedule 1 (in the paragraph immediately before paragraph '(a)' at the end of that Schedule). Might this lead to ambiguity or confusion? Could this be deleted and, then, in Schedule 1 'the plans', be replaced with 'the land plans, Order limits plans and works plans' (if indeed Order limits plans are necessary – see above).</p> <p>d) Art 2(1): Might the definition of 'undertaker' be amended and shortened to read 'means, subject to article 7(3), EDF Energy (Thermal Generation) Limited (company number 4267569)'? Is the remainder of it superfluous due to Art 7(3)?</p> <p>e) Art 2(1): Is the definition of 'West Burton Power Station Site' sufficiently precise? Would it benefit from a plan to it to show the entire boundary of that site?</p> <p>f) Art 2(1) and Art 17(1)(d): These refer to a 'framework construction transport management plan'. However, the document submitted is titled 'Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan'. The wording of the dDCO should reflect the title of the documents submitted.</p> <p>g) Art 2(3): The word 'work' is used here, but there is an earlier definition in Art 2(1) of 'scheduled works'. Is this consistent?</p> <p>h) Art 5: Is it appropriate to include 'use' as s140 PA 2008 refers only to 'operation'? Furthermore, due to s140, should it refer to a right to 'operate the generating station comprised in the authorised development' rather than to 'operate' the whole of the authorised development?</p> <p>i) Art 6 refers to 'relevant work areas'. What are these? Where are they defined in the dDCO?</p> <p>j) Art 9: Is it intended to temporarily stop up, alter or divert any streets and public rights of way? If so, which ones and where are they specified in a table? If not, is this Article justifiable?</p> <p>k) Art 14: The words in brackets are not an accurate reproduction of the heading of s264 being referred to. This should be rectified.</p> <p>l) Art 15(1): Can the Applicant justify the power sought over 'publicly maintainable highway'?</p> <p>m) Art 15(3): The Applicant has not defined 'relevant tree preservation order' anywhere</p>

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019**

**Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>in the dDCO. Furthermore, any known protected trees to be affected should be listed in the dDCO, as should the name(s) of the tree preservation order(s) under which they are protected, so that this (and disapplication of s260(1) TCPA 1990) may be fully examined.</p> <p>n) Art 16: This appears to refer to an incorrect Schedule number.</p>
Q4.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Questions/comments relating to Schedule 1:</b></p> <p>a) Schedule 1 Work No.1(a): Might the definition of 'OCGT' be better placed in Art 2(1)?</p> <p>b) Schedule 1 Work No 10: This refers to 'the plans' - see previous comment above.</p>
Q4.5	The Applicant and Natural England (in respect of Q4.5g only)	<p><b>Questions/comments relating to Requirements (R):</b></p> <p>a) R1(2): Should the relevant planning authority be precluded from agreeing to amend anything that the Secretary of State has already approved at the time of making the DCO?</p> <p>b) R6: Should the 'landscape and biodiversity management and enhancement plan' to be submitted and approved as set out in R6(1) be somehow distinguished from the 'landscape and biodiversity management and enhancement plan' mentioned in R6(3)?</p> <p>c) R9(1) and (2): Should provision also be made for the submission and approval of a details of the maintenance of surface and foul water drainage schemes given that R6(4) requires that such schemes should be maintained?</p> <p>d) R11(1): This refers to 'significant harm'. However, this is not defined and as such how can this be determined? Should it instead refer to 'significant effects'?</p> <p>e) R13: 'Historic England' should be defined in Art 2(1) as 'The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England'.</p> <p>f) R13(3): 'and/or' should not be used in legislation. This should be rectified.</p> <p>g) R14: Does Natural England consider it reasonable to request pre-commencement surveys?</p> <p>h) R17: This refers to a 'Construction traffic and routing management plan' in the heading and in R17(1). Is this the correct reference/title given that R17(2) requires it to be in accordance with the 'framework construction transport management plan'. In addition, is reference to a framework construction transport management plan correct given that the submitted document, as mentioned above is titled 'Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan'?</p> <p>i) R17: Highways England should be defined in Art 2(1) by its full company name and</p>

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019**

**Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>number.</p> <p>j) R18(1): Should this require a 'construction worker's travel plan' rather than a 'written travel plan for construction staff' for consistency?</p> <p>k) R19(1): Should it be specified for clarity that works will not take place on Sundays as well as on Bank Holiday and outside of the other specified hours?</p> <p>l) R24: This does not specify how many representatives any one party may have on the committee. It could therefore be possible for the Applicant to always have a majority of committee members, which might be regarded as unfair (for example in relation to agreeing frequency of meetings).</p> <p>m) R26(1): The term 'decides' is used, but this is not defined? Is it a resolution of the board of the company that is the undertaker? This term should be defined.</p>
Q4.6	The Applicant	<p><b>Questions/comments relating to Schedule 3:</b></p> <p>Schedule 3 Paragraph 4(2)(a): Should provisions be made for the Applicant to set out its grounds of appeal? If not, how could an appeal be decided?</p> <p>Schedule 3 Paragraph 4(10): 'Planning Practice Guidance' should be defined.</p>
Q4.7	The Applicant	<p>In the Explanatory Note, no document inspection location has been included. Can this be included?</p>
Q4.8	The Applicant	<p><b>Questions/comments relating to the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-005]:</b></p> <p>Paragraph 3.3(e): Should this refer to other persons who may obtain the benefit under Art 7?</p> <p>Paragraph 4.1: This mentions that there are 22 articles in the dDCO, but there are only 19.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.4: The article referred to is not fully in accordance with s140 of the Planning Act 2008, as highlighted above.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.21(h): This suggests that no stage of the authorised development should commence, but R9 only limits Works 1, 2 and 4. Can the Applicant clarify this matter?</p> <p>Paragraph 4.21 (w): R24 refers to needing agreement of a 'majority' of members for different meeting frequencies, but this paragraph makes no mention of only needing a 'majority'. Can the Applicant clarify this matter?</p>
<p><b>5. Ground Conditions</b></p>		
Q5.1	The Applicant	<p>Intrusive ground investigation surveys were undertaken in December 2017/January 2018.</p>

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Paragraph 11.3.28 of ES Chapter 11 [APP-040] notes that this was a Phase 2 survey whereas Paragraphs 11.3.4 to 11.3.7 call this a Phase 1 survey. Can the Applicant explain what activities have been carried out in accordance with Phase 1 and Phase 2 since there appears to be a contradiction in this regard within the ES?
Q5.2	The Applicant	The Socotec report provided at ES Appendix 11B [APP-065] is marked as 'draft'. Can the Applicant confirm whether this is the correct and final version?
Q5.3	Environment Agency	Paragraph 11.4.28 of ES Chapter 11 [APP-040] acknowledges the site is located in an area where the risk to groundwater is high. Having regard to the characteristics of the site and potential risks to the receiving environment can the Environment Agency confirm the extent to which it is content with the surveys undertaken by the Applicant in assessing the likely effects from impacts to ground conditions?
Q5.4	The Applicant	Paragraph 11.3.24 of ES Chapter 11 [APP-040] references the existing West Burton B purge line for drainage. However, there is no discussion about how this will operate once West Burton B is decommissioned, if indeed it is decommissioned before the operation of the Proposed Development. Can the Applicant comment on this matter?
Q5.5	The Applicant	ES Chapter 11 [APP-040] demonstrates that the Proposed Development intends to make use of the existing West Burton B purge line/drainage infrastructure as a route for onsite drainage discharge. Can the Applicant explain the extent to which this existing infrastructure is suitable to service the discharge capacity requirements of both developments? Can the Applicant also explain whether the design life of the purge line drainage feature/existing drainage infrastructure is sufficient to remain fully operable for the duration of the operational life span of the Proposed Development?
Q5.6	The Applicant	Can the Applicant explain why a 2km zone of influence study area was applied to the assessment in ES Chapter 11 [APP-040] and the extent to which this choice has been informed by relevant information on the anticipated impacts from the Proposed Development (e.g. the Groundsure report)? In the absence of this explanation it is unclear to what extent the pathways and receptors addressed in ES Chapter 11 are adequate.
Q5.7	The Applicant	Paragraph 11.3.29 of ES Chapter 11 [APP-040] states that the Rochdale envelope approach does not affect the assessment and therefore is not considered further. Can the Applicant provide justification for this and confirmation that that ground disturbance for a single OCGT would be the same as for five OCGTs?

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Historic Environment</b>	
Q6.1	The Applicant	In ES Chapter 14 [APP-043] why do designated heritage assets have a search area with a 3km and 5km radius from the centre of the site but non-designated heritage assets have a search area with a 1km radius?
Q6.2	The Applicant	The search area for non-designated heritage assets as shown on ES Figure 14.1 [APP-127] does not appear to be circular. What is the reason for this if, as indicated, it has a 1km radius from the centre of the site?
Q6.3	Historic England, Bassetlaw District Council and West Lindsey District Council	Are Historic England, Bassetlaw District Council and West Lindsey District Council satisfied with the extent of the search areas for designated and non-designated heritage assets as set out in ES Chapter 14 [APP-043] and as shown on ES Figure 14.1 [APP-127] and ES Figure 14.2 [APP-128]?
Q6.4	The Applicant and Historic England	The ExA notes the explanation within Paragraph 14.3.14 of ES Chapter 14 [APP-043] that moderate or major effects are considered to be significant in terms of the ES though moderate effects or lower are considered to represent 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of a heritage asset in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework. Can the Applicant clarify this approach and is this an approach that Historic England considers appropriate?
Q6.5	The Applicant	Appendix A of ES Appendix 14A [APP-068] identifies some locally listed buildings in Bole. These do not appear to be plotted on ES Figure 14.1 [APP-127]. Can the Applicant explain the reason for this?
Q6.6	Historic England, Bassetlaw District Council and West Lindsey District Council	Is Historic England, Bassetlaw District Council and West Lindsey District Council satisfied that the five designated and non-designated heritage assets identified within ES Chapter 14 [APP-043] are the only ones with the potential to be affected?
Q6.7	Historic England and Bassetlaw District Council	Are Historic England and Bassetlaw District Council satisfied that the significance of the five designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings (which includes West Burton Medieval Deserted Village, Segelocom Roman Town, Bole Manor House, Church of St Martin in Bole and West Burton Power Station) identified in ES Chapter 14 [APP-043], and



**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		the effect of the Proposed Development on their significance, has been adequately assessed?
Q6.8	The Applicant	In Table 14-2 of ES Chapter 14 [APP-043], it is noted that West Lindsey District Council made reference to listed buildings Gainsborough bridge and its former toll lodge buildings. Where have these been considered in the assessment, and if they have not, what is the reason for this?
Q6.9	Historic England	Is Historic England satisfied with the approach of the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [APP-143] in respect of archaeology?
Q6.10	The Applicant	Historic England recommends, in its Relevant Representation [RR-004], that the Applicant seeks opportunities whereby financial support can be given to the local community in the physical conservation of heritage assets and the reinforcement of historic landscape character in the immediate area. What is the Applicant's view on this?
Q6.11	The Applicant	ES Figure 14.2 [APP-128] identifies some Grade I listed buildings within the 5km search area, including at South Wheatly, Littleborough and Saundby. Where have these been considered in the heritage assessment?
<b>7. Landscape and Visual</b>		
Q7.1	The Applicant, Bassetlaw District Council and West Lindsey District Council	Have viewpoints and photomontage locations as shown on ES Figure 10.5 [APP-091] been agreed with the relevant local authorities?
Q7.2	The Applicant	Can the Applicant clarify why it considers the selected viewpoints ES Figure 10.5 [APP-091] to be representative and has not included any from footpaths along the River Trent to the east of the site?
Q7.3	The Applicant	Further to the first unaccompanied site inspection, the ExA notes that the location of Viewpoint 13 as shown on ES Figure 10.5 [APP-091] does not appear to correspond accurately with the associated photograph at Figure 10.18 [APP-104]. It appears to the ExA that the photograph was taken further to the north along the footpath identified as North Leverton with Hablesthorpe BOAT15 where it intersects with another footpath. Can the Applicant clarify why there is an inconsistency in this regard?

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Q7.4	The Applicant	There does not appear to be any detailed methodology for the creation of the photomontages and wireframes in respect of Viewpoints 4 and 12 [APP-107 to APP-126]. Do the photomontages and wireframes reasonably reflect the parameters and worst-case scenario based on potential ground levels of +14m above existing?
Q7.5	The Applicant	It is stated in Table 10-2 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039] that visible plumes from the Proposed Development would be very unlikely. Could there be a situation in which there could be visible plumes?
Q7.6	The Applicant	How might detailed design relating to form, siting, materials and use of colour minimise adverse visual effects as suggested in Table 10-2 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039]?
Q7.7	The Applicant	Significant adverse visual effects have been identified in ES Chapter 10 [APP-039] from Viewpoint 4 and in the vicinity of it. Has the Applicant considered all options for mitigating such effects?
Q7.8	The Applicant	The photograph associated with Viewpoint 11 at Figure 10.16 [APP-102] appears to show West Burton B with 4 stacks, whereas other viewpoint photographs show it with three stacks. What is the reason for this?
Q7.9	The Applicant	Paragraph 10.3.18 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039] states that the 5km Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) is based on a maximum stack height of 45m above ground level. Is this ZTV extent appropriate on the basis of the parameters and worst-case scenario mentioned elsewhere that the power station would sit up to +14m above ground level and thus for the stacks to be up to 59m high?
Q7.10	The Applicant	How would planting proposals set out in the Landscaping and Biodiversity Management and Enhancement Plan (LBMEP) [APP-139] reflect surrounding landscape character?
Q7.11	The Applicant	In Table 10-9 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039], why is the receptor sensitivity of footpath users from Viewpoint 9 considered 'low' when the sensitivity of other footpath users is considered to be 'medium'?
Q7.12	The Applicant	Can the Applicant explain, with reference to the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology at ES Appendix 10A [APP-063], why no visual receptors with a 'high' receptor sensitivity are identified?
Q7.13	The Applicant	Can the Applicant provide further explanation as to why it considers that the Proposed

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Development would have a negligible beneficial effect on the landscape features of the site as identified in Table 10-11 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039], given that the Proposed Development would be constructed on an existing area of plantation woodland and semi-improved grassland which would result in its loss?
Q7.14	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.2.2 of the LBMEP [APP-139] mentions that an Arboricultural Report and Method Statement in line with BS 5837:2012 would be undertaken with the detailed design. Can the Applicant explain how this would be secured?
<b>8. Noise and Vibration</b>		
Q8.1	The Applicant	Having regard to the dates that noise surveys took place to inform the noise assessment in ES Chapter 8 [APP-037], can the Applicant explain the extent to which seasonal variance in noise monitoring, from factors such as weather and vegetation, has been accounted for in the noise assessment?
Q8.2	The Applicant	Key noise sensitive receptor (NSR) locations as shown on ES Figure 8.1 [APP-085] have been selected to represent the nearest and most sensitive existing receptors to the site. However, it is unclear specifically what receptors they represent. Can the Applicant define what noise receptors are represented by each NSR location and whether they are suitably representative of the baseline environment?
Q8.3	The Applicant, Bassetlaw District Council and West Lindsey District Council	Have noise monitoring locations been agreed with the relevant local authorities?
Q8.4	Bassetlaw District Council	It is stated in Table 8.4 of ES Chapter 8 [APP-037] that following the decision to include wind direction in the assessment of noise for NSRs, Bassetlaw District Council asked to respond with any comments on this proposed method but to date, no response had been received. Can Bassetlaw District Council confirm whether they are content that the appropriate wind direction data has been used to inform the assessment?
Q8.5	The Applicant	No ecological receptors are identified for noise and vibration impacts yet some are located in close proximity to the Proposed Development. Can the Applicant explain how noise impacts to sensitive ecological receptors, including Cetti's Warbler, have been taken into

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		account in relevant assessments within the ES?
Q8.6	The Applicant	ES Chapter 8 [APP-037] assesses the impacts of construction traffic noise and construction activities on NSRs separately. However, there is the potential for a combined effect. Can the Applicant clarify if it has undertaken a combined assessment of simultaneous noisy activities and what impacts this may have on NSRs and if this has not been undertaken, provide justification for this?
Q8.7	The Applicant	Can the Applicant explain whether it anticipates piling to be required during construction and if so, can the Applicant indicate where potential impacts associated with this activity have been assessed in ES Chapter 8 [APP-037] or else provide such an assessment?
Q8.8	The Applicant	Can the Applicant explain the relationship between the Proposed Development and anticipated decommissioning works required for West Burton A? To what extent have these works been assessed cumulatively with the Proposed Development and what measures are required to ensure that likely significant effects associated with concurrent activities have been identified and addressed in ES Chapter 8 [APP-037]?
Q8.9	The Applicant	Noise control and monitoring measures during construction are to be secured through a scheme to be submitted and approved under Regulation 20 of the dDCO [APP-004] and during operation under Regulation 21 of the dDCO. A draft of these measures has not been provided with the ES though in Paragraph 8.8.5 of ES Chapter 8 [APP-037] it is stated that they will be based on measures set out throughout the Chapter. However, it is not specifically clear which measures will be included in the construction and operation noise management schemes. Can the Applicant provide a draft of these schemes outlining the anticipated measures, their effectiveness and a timeframe of their implementation?
Q8.10	The Applicant	How achievable are the proposed mitigation measures set out in Paragraph 8.7.10 of ES Chapter 8 [APP-037] relating to operational noise and how has their effectiveness as set out in Paragraph 8.7.11 and Tables 8-35 and 8-36 of ES Chapter 8 [APP-037] been evidenced?
Q8.11	The Applicant	In Table 8.3 of ES Chapter 8 [APP-037], in response to the indication that the noise and vibration assessment should inform the terrestrial/aquatic/marine ecological assessments by the SoS, it is stated that aquatic/marine ecological receptors had been scoped out due to the decision to exclude outfalls to the River Trent from the Proposed Development. However, there is little other evidence to support scoping out these receptors. Can the Applicant provide further explanation as to why aquatic/marine ecological species have

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		been scoped out of the assessment?
Q8.12	The Applicant	Can the Applicant expand on the reliability of construction noise forecasts given that a construction contractor has not yet been appointed and details of construction activities and plant are not yet available? Furthermore, can the Applicant confirm when a contractor likely to be appointed to allow a detailed noise assessment to be carried out as set out in Paragraph 8.5.7 of ES Chapter 8 [APP-037]?
Q8.13	The Applicant	Paragraph 8.3.36 of ES Chapter 8 [APP-037] states that based on professional judgement, given the lack of details of construction activity and plant, vibration effects of annoyance on humans have been scoped out due to distance from the site to residential receptors. Can the Applicant evidence why it considers this an appropriate approach to take and also evidence why it considers the same approach to be appropriate for vibration impacts on residential buildings.
Q8.14	The Applicant	Paragraph 8.4.12 of ES Chapter 8 [APP-037] states that the most significant background sound sources are the existing West Burton A and West Burton B power stations. Does this relate to night-time background noise sources?
Q8.15	The Applicant	In Paragraph 8.3.36 of Chapter 8 [APP-037], it is acknowledged that there is potential for vibration impacts (annoyance) on occupants of adjacent buildings associated with the wider West Burton Power Station site. However, no assessment has been carried out in paragraphs 8.6.17 to 8.6.19. Can the Applicant justify the reason for omitting this assessment or provide such an assessment and if provided, how might any effects be mitigated?
Q8.16	The Applicant	Paragraph 8.5.1 of ES Chapter 8 [APP-037] states that some works may take place outside of core working hours. How often would construction work be likely to occur outside of the identified core working hours and have the potential noise impacts from this been incorporated into the assessment?
<b>9. Socio-economic</b>		
Q9.1	The Applicant	Paragraph 13.5.1 of ES Chapter 13 [APP-042] notes that the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development would be supportive of the local economy, through the creation of jobs. How would the use of local labour be achieved and secured?
Q9.2	The Applicant	Paragraph 13.6.15 of ES Chapter 13 [APP-042] mentions that some specific receptors

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		(including local businesses G Bartle & Son Dairy Farm, W E Proudley & Sons and Heald T & Son, local residents at Mill House and Middle Farm, and users of the public right of way close to the Site) are likely to be susceptible to short term impacts on amenity during construction works. Where are the likely effects on these specific receptors identified in the ES and to what extent would they be affected? In addition, can the Applicant provide a map to show the location of these receptors and clarify the type of businesses mentioned?
Q9.3	The Applicant	The Relevant Representation [RR-022] of an Interested Party raises some concerns in respect of low frequency and/or extra low frequency sound waves and electro-magnetic fields. To what extent would the Proposed Development emit low frequency and/or extra low frequency sound waves and electro-magnetic fields? To what extent would any emissions of such sound waves and electro-magnetic fields have an impact on amenity and human health and where in the ES has this been considered?
Q9.4	The Applicant	In Paragraph 5.1.3 of ES Appendix 13A [APP-067], should 'EMI' be 'EMF'? Also, how would any risks to construction workers and operational staff due to electro-magnetic fields from relevant sources be reduced/mitigated using the ALARP (as low as reasonably possible) principle, as indicated in Paragraph 5.1.3 of ES Appendix 13A, and how would this be secured?
<b>10. Transportation and Traffic</b>		
Q10.1	The Applicant	Table 7-7 of ES Chapter 7 [APP-036] sets out the baseline traffic flows for each of the four junctions identified for the assessment. However, the naming of these junctions does not appear to fully correlate to those included in the assessment. What is the reason for this?
Q10.2	The Applicant	Can the Applicant confirm the correlation between the junctions named in Table 7-7 of ES Chapter 7 [APP-036] and the names used on Figure 1 of ES Appendix 7A: Transport Assessment [APP-052], as these are not consistent?
Q10.3	The Applicant	Can the Applicant provide a figure that clearly depicts the transport assessment study area and the proposed construction traffic routes?
Q10.4	The Applicant	The traffic count locations do not appear to have taken place south of Sturton Le Steeple towards Cottam Power Station where materials brought in via the River Trent would move onward via land-based transport to the site. Can the Applicant confirm whether baseline traffic counts have been undertaken on the route between Cottam Power Station and the

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		site, and if not, the reasons for this?
Q10.5	The Applicant	Can the Applicant confirm whether an assessment has been undertaken of the route of the construction materials between Cottam Power Station to the site and if not, the reasons for this?
Q10.6	The Applicant	ES chapter 7 [APP-036] uses the Rochdale envelope to assess potential effects. However, it is not clear whether the single stack option or the five stack option represents the worst-case scenario. Can the Applicant confirm the worst-case assumptions and parameters used for the traffic and transport assessment?
Q10.7	The Applicant	In Table 7.3 of ES Chapter 7 [APP-036], the ExA notes the reference to professional judgement in determining the magnitude of impact in respect of some types of impact. Can the Applicant provide greater information and justification in relation to this approach?
Q10.8	The Applicant	Paragraph 7.5.1 of ES Chapter 7 [APP-036] sets out that the alternative designs being considered as part of the assessment 'do not affect this assessment and is therefore not considered further'. Can the Applicant provide justification that decisions relating to the design of the Proposed Development will not have a bearing on assessment of likely significant effects?
Q10.9	The Applicant	With reference to Paragraph 7.3.14 of ES Chapter 7 [APP-036], can the Applicant explain the reason why examination of the 'A631/A620/Station Road Roundabout' and the 'A620/Saundby Road/Sturton Road Roundabout' were undertaken in addition to the automatic traffic counts and not any other junctions? In addition, is the reference to 'Station Road' mentioned in the 'A631/A620/Station Road Roundabout' junction here correct?
Q10.10	The Applicant	Personal Injury data is provided for the Gainsborough Road/Station Road junction for the baseline in Table 7-8 of ES Chapter 7 [APP-036], but this junction is not assessed further in the Transport Assessment. Can the Applicant explain why this junction has not been included in further assessments?
Q10.11	The Applicant	The transport assessment appears to have considered a study area that is set out in the GEART guidelines rather than a study area determined by the receptors identified through scoping. On this basis, can the Applicant confirm that the study area is appropriate to ensure all potential receptors are captured?

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Q10.12	The Applicant	Public footpath West Burton FP4 has been scoped out of the assessment as a result of the outfall into the River Trent no longer being pursued. However, ES Figure 10.1 [APP-087] indicates that the Order Limits for the Proposed Development overlap this footpath despite the removal of the outfall works. Noting this, can the Applicant explain how impacts on public footpath West Burton FP4 can be scoped out?
Q10.13	The Applicant	ES Chapter 16 [APP-045] describes the approach to the assessment of cumulative impacts. It appears to overlook the fact that two non-significant and therefore relatively minor impacts can combine to result in a larger impact which could in turn be regarded as significant. Can the Applicant confirm that in undertaking the assessment of cumulative impacts they have not overlooked the potential for impacts to combine with and result in an effect greater than that presented.
Q10.14	The Applicant	Paragraph 7.3.19 of ES Chapter 7 [APP-036] sets out that 'the construction assessment has been based on the worst-case assumption of activities not commencing until 2027, assuming that consent is granted in 2020 and is valid for up to seven years'. The paragraph further notes that 'consequently the results presented in this assessment are representative of earlier assessment years and the overall effect of the Proposed Development may be less than that presented, as background traffic is expected to increase year on year'. However, how does this conclusion fit with traffic growing year on year?
Q10.15	The Applicant	With regard to cumulative effects, a number of committed projects are identified. In respect of the construction of a quarry access road at Cowpasture Lane Gravel Pit, Paragraph 7.4.1 of ES Appendix 7A: Transport Assessment [APP-052] states that this will need to be taken into account. Where is it shown that this been taken into account? Also, how has the mixed use development at Gainsborough, as mentioned in the Transport Assessment, been taken into account?
Q10.16	The Applicant	Mitigation measures are set out in Section 7.5 of ES Chapter 7 [APP-036]. This includes: controlled traffic movements during the construction phase; HGV routing; implementation of a Construction Workers' Travel Plan; and liaison with the appointed contractor for the potential to implement construction worker minibuses and car sharing options. Can the Applicant explain how such measures would be secured?
Q10.17	The Applicant	A 'Construction Traffic and Routing Management Plan' and 'Construction Traffic Mitigation Plan' are referred to in Paragraph 12.3.1 of ES Appendix 7A [APP-052] and elsewhere



**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		(including within the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan), but no documents with these names appear to have been submitted. Can the Applicant clarify the reason for this?
Q10.18	The Applicant	The Applicant has submitted a Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan [APP-137], a Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-140] and a Framework Construction Workers' Travel Plan [APP-141] with the Application. However, these documents are not clearly cross referenced in ES Chapter 7 [APP-036] and ES Appendix 7A [APP-052] and therefore it is not clear where mitigation is secured. The request for a mitigation hierarchy document above should assist with clarification on this matter.
Q10.19	The Applicant	How would the potential for HGVs to park or wait for access to the site on the public highway be avoided during the construction of the Proposed Development? To what extent could this be effectively achieved with a condition of contract between the Applicant and contractors as suggested in Paragraph 2.3.2 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-140] and what sanctions would be put in place and how would these be effectively enforced as suggested in the same paragraph?
Q10.20	The Applicant	Concerns have been raised by Bawtry Town Council and Doncaster Council in their Relevant Representations [RR-007 and RR-008] in respect of HGV traffic in Bawtry during the construction phase and on the relevant conservation area in Bawtry from such traffic and associated additional noise. Can the Applicant address this matter?
Q10.21	The Applicant	Some concerns have been raised in the Relevant Representations with regard to HGV routing and potential traffic impacts. To address these concerns, can the Applicant clarify; a) How would it be ensured that HGV traffic would not travel to and from the site along the A620, utilising roads, such as Smeath Road/Lane, which would avoid low bridges along parts of the A620; and b) How would it be ensured that HGVs would not utilise other routes to and from the site which pass through the villages of South Leverton, North Leverton with Hablesthorpe and Sturton le Steeple?
Q10.22	The Applicant	The Canal and Rivers Trust in its Relevant Representation [RR-002] notes that it is not included as a consultee in Paragraph 3.1.7 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-140] and requests that it is included in the final version. Is there any reason why this should not be the case?

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Q10.23	The Applicant	Article 9 of the dDCO [APP-004] relates to the temporary stopping up of streets and public rights of way. Which streets and public rights of way might be affected and where is this considered in the ES? (this matter is also addressed in the dDCO section above)
Q10.24	The Applicant	Paragraph 6.3.10 of the ES Non-Technical Summary [APP-028] refers to a 'CWMP' in respect of traffic management. Is this correct? If so, what is a 'CWMP' and where is this defined?
<b>11. Water Environment</b>		
Q11.1	The Applicant	The area of hardstanding is not quantified in ES Chapter 12 [APP-041]. Can the Applicant quantify this area to enable further understanding of what makes up the worst-case scenario?
Q11.2	Environment Agency	Can the Environment Agency confirm whether it is content that the 2016 climate change allowances used to inform the flood risk assessment in ES Appendix 12A [APP-066] are appropriate to inform the assessment of likely significant effects?
Q11.3	The Applicant	Where hydrological information for minor local watercourses within the vicinity of the Proposed Development is limited, the assessment is based on professional judgement together with information taken from mapping, publicly available data sources and local knowledge gained through consultation with statutory consultees, as set out in Paragraph 12.8.2 of ES Chapter 12 [APP-041]. Since this is a quantifiable assessment, can the Applicant explain why assessments were not carried out to gather this information?
Q11.4	The Applicant	Can the Applicant explain how it has determined the definition of 'long term' effects as mentioned in Paragraph 12.3.14 of ES Chapter 12 [APP-041] and its relevance in relation to the duration of the operational phase of the Proposed Development? Can the Applicant also explain whether this definition could result in effects not attached to 'the duration of operation' being presented as less than long term even though they may occur for a considerable length of time?
Q11.5	The Applicant	Whilst it is stated that the zone of influence of the Proposed Development's impacts is determined through professional judgement and that the assessment considers water bodies that are hydrologically connected with the site based on available data at Paragraph 12.4.2 of ES Chapter 12 [APP-041], there is no figure explicitly displaying the study area and it remains unclear. Can the Applicant provide a figure(s) which clearly depict the full

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		extent of the study area and the relevant waterbodies included within the assessment?
Q11.6	The Applicant	'Dilution potential' is consistently mentioned as a natural mitigation feature for hydrological receptors in ES Chapter 12 [APP-041]. However, there is no evidence of the dilution potential of contaminants for each feature. Can the Applicant explain the dilution potential or provide evidence/a reference to support this?
Q11.7	The Applicant	Some ecological receptors (Burton Round Ditch, Bole Ings Drain, Saundby ponds, mother drain upper Ings and Bole Ings Flood Pasture) have been included in the ecological assessment but not the flood risk/hydrological assessment. Can the Applicant explain why watercourses assessed in the ecological assessment are not addressed in the flood risk/hydrology assessment?
Q11.8	The Applicant	The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) commented in Table 12.2 of ES Chapter 12 [APP-041] that Paragraph 12.6.12 (of the PEI Report) states that there is potential for toxic effects on invertebrates and fish caused by compounds associated with suspended sediment but that this does not correlate with an earlier judgement that baseline sediment concentrations are high and as such localised impacts are likely to be trivial. The Applicant sets out in Paragraphs 12.6.11 to 12.6.19 of ES Chapter 12 that impacts on biodiversity would be of negligible adverse significance. However, it is unclear whether the MMO's concerns have been addressed, particularly as the flow of the River Trent is considered slow due to the small gradient. Can the Applicant clarify how it has addressed the MMO's concerns of sediment re-suspension direct/indirect impacts on biodiversity?
Q11.9	The Applicant	The Environment Agency notes in its Relevant Representation [RR-003] and Additional Submission [AS-003] that the Outline Drainage Strategy [APP-142] does not include provision for the disposal of foul drainage associated with the welfare offices (either temporary or permanent provision) and that whilst West Burton Sewage Treatment Works is within the wider site, Paragraph 4.7.3 of the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-066] proposes foul drainage from any permanent welfare facilities would be directed to an on-site septic tank for storage and treatment. The Environment Agency further notes that the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that discharge of foul drainage arising from developments should be directed to the mains sewage network where it is reasonable to do so. Can the Applicant address this matter and provide justification as to why it is not intended to connect to the main sewage network?

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019****Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Q11.10	The Applicant	The Environment Agency in its Relevant Representation [RR-003] and Additional Submission [AS-003] notes that details of the site investigations undertaken show that some contaminants are leachable and groundwater impact is locally significant and as a result, any attenuation pond forming part of the surface water drainage scheme should be lined. Can the Applicant confirm whether it is the intention to line any attenuation pond and explain how would this be secured?
Q11.11	The Applicant	Parts of the northern and southern drainage corridors, which might be used for drainage purposes to connect to existing drainage infrastructure, lie within flood zones 2 and 3. Have these areas and any activity in them been assessed as part of the flood risk assessment? If not, can the Applicant explain how it intends to address flood risk in these areas should either drainage option be adopted and how any risk would be mitigated?
Q11.12	Environment Agency	The Applicant considers, in Paragraph 3.2.11 of the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-066], that as the drainage options within flood zone 3 would be underground there is no need to satisfy the requirements of the Exception Test as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Can the Environment Agency confirm that it agrees with this approach?
Q11.13	Environment Agency and Nottinghamshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority	Are the Environment Agency and Nottinghamshire County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority, satisfied with the Applicant's flood risk assessment and its approach to flood risk?

**ExQ1: 6 November 2019**

**Responses due by Deadline 2: 6 December 2019**